⧉ OPEN ACCESS

Challenges in Wearable Medical Devices for Cardiovascular Diagnostics: A Critical Review

Saikartikeya Sharma Swain[1*], Mahesh Giri[2], Arnav Collaco[3], Mahika Milind Wadkar[4]

[1]Beckman High School, Tustin California
[2]Bharati Vidyapeeth Deemed University, Deemed University in Pune, Vikroli Mumbai, India
[3]University of Reading, UK
[4]Srishti Manipal College of Art Design and Technology, Bengaluru, India

*Corresponding author:** Saikartikeya Sharma Swain
Beckman High School, Tustin California

Abstract	Review Article

Wearable medical devices used for cardiovascular diagnostics provided a myriad of benefits to patients and care providers alike. Their prominence in the medical field is due to the increased amount of comfort and accessibility available in comparison to frequent physician visits when facing cardiovascular issues. However, along with the advantages from the usage of these devices, there also exist certain challenges that require the attention of the medical world. Wearable devices for cardiovascular diagnostics encounter challenges in technical performance, clinical validation, and implementation. There exist difficulties with certain engineering designs of some devices, qualitative problems with data accuracy and processing, and limitations in diagnostic validation and evidence, even when devices show promise for long-term monitoring and arrhythmia detection. Implementation barriers present additional complexities, particularly regarding healthcare system integration, regulatory compliance, and privacy considerations. Wearable devices for cardiovascular diagnostics face significant challenges across multiple domains that impact their clinical adoption and effectiveness. Technical performance limitations, including reduced lead counts and compromised signal quality, affect device reliability and data accuracy. Clinical validation remains a crucial challenge, with studies indicating limitations in diagnostic validation and evidence bases, despite these devices showing promise for long-term monitoring and arrhythmia detection. Implementation barriers present additional complexities, particularly regarding healthcare system integration, regulatory compliance, and privacy considerations. While these devices demonstrate potential for transforming cardiovascular diagnostics through continuous monitoring and early detection capabilities, significant technical and operational hurdles persist. Data processing, standardization, and integration into existing clinical workflows represent ongoing challenges. The transition from innovative technology to routine clinical use requires addressing these fundamental issues while maintaining focus on diagnostic accuracy and clinical utility. This systematic examination of challenges provides crucial insights for improving future device development and implementation strategies in cardiovascular care.

Keywords: Wearable medical devices, ECG monitoring, Data accuracy, Patient compliance, Clinical validation and Regulatory challenges.

1. INTRODUCTION

The landscape of cardiovascular diagnostics is rapidly evolving with the integration of wearable medical devices, offering new possibilities for continuous monitoring and early detection of cardiac conditions Sana *et al.,* 2020. These devices span multiple categories, including remote and wearable electrocardiogram (ECG) devices, smartwatches, activity trackers, and various other monitoring systems equipped with advanced sensing capabilities Bouzid *et al.,* 2022 & 1 others.

Despite their promising potential, these technologies face significant challenges in their transition from innovative solutions to reliable clinical tools. Technical limitations present a primary concern, with issues ranging from signal quality and device reliability to data accuracy and processing capabilities Jahfari *et al.,* 2021 & 1 others. The reduced number of leads in many wearable devices, compared to traditional 12-lead ECGs, creates particular challenges in maintaining diagnostic accuracy while offering portable solutions Bouzid *et al.,* 2022 & 1 others.

Clinical validation represents another crucial challenge, as these devices must demonstrate both diagnostic accuracy and practical utility in real-world settings. While some devices show promise for specific applications such as arrhythmia detection and long-term monitoring, there remains a significant need for comprehensive validation studies and standardized assessment frameworks Garson, 1987 & 1 others. The integration of artificial intelligence and machine learning capabilities adds another layer of complexity, requiring careful consideration of data validity and security Marvasti *et al.,* 2024.

Implementation barriers further complicate the adoption of these technologies in clinical practice. Healthcare system integration, regulatory compliance, and privacy considerations present significant challenges that must be addressed Jahfari *et al.,* 2021 & 1 others. The need for proper clinical pathway validation and integration into existing healthcare workflows remains a critical concern Duncker *et al.,* 2021.

This research examines the multifaceted challenges faced by wearable cardiovascular diagnostic devices, focusing on technical performance, clinical validation, and implementation barriers. By analyzing these challenges comprehensively, this study aims to provide insights into the current state of wearable cardiovascular diagnostics and identify potential pathways for improvement in device development and clinical integration Chan *et al.,* 2012 & 1 others.

The significance of this research lies in its systematic examination of the barriers preventing widespread adoption of wearable cardiovascular diagnostic devices, despite their potential benefits for patient care. Understanding these challenges is crucial for developing effective solutions and advancing the field of mobile health monitoring Hughes *et al.,* 2023 & 1 others.4

2. METHODS
Study Design This research synthesized findings from multiple review articles examining wearable cardiovascular diagnostic devices Bouzid *et al.,* 2022 & 1 others. The analysis included systematic reviews, scoping reviews, and comprehensive review articles to ensure broad coverage of the topic while maintaining scientific rigor. Study Selection and Inclusion Criteria The analysis incorporated ten key studies published between 1987 and 2024, representing a comprehensive temporal range of research in the field Garson, 1987 & 1 others. Studies were selected based on their focus on wearable cardiovascular diagnostic devices and their examination of technical, clinical, or implementation challenges. Device Categories The methodology included categorization of devices into distinct groups are as follows.

I. Remote and wearable electrocardiogram (ECG) devices (single-lead)
II. Smartwatches and activity trackers
III. Ambulatory monitoring devices
IV. Artificial intelligence-enabled wearables
V. Multi-parameter sensor systems
VI. Holter monitors, event recorders, and ECG patches

2.1 Data Extraction and Analysis Framework
The analysis employed a structured approach examining three primary domains:

2.1.1 Technical Challenges Analysis:
- Signal Quality and Reliability
- Data Processing and Integration
- Device Limitations Jahfari et al., 2021 & 1 others

2.1.2 Clinical Validation Assessment:
- Diagnostic Accuracy
- Clinical Utility Assessment
- Comparison with Standard Methods Bouzid *et al.,* 2022 & 1 others

2.1.3 Implementation Barriers Evaluation:
- Healthcare Integration
- User Adoption
- Regulatory Compliance Marvasti *et al.,* 2024 & 1 others

Data Organization and Synthesis Information was systematically organized using structured tables to analyze:
- Study characteristics and device categories
- Technical challenges across different device types
- Clinical validation parameters
- Implementation barriers and their prevalence Chan *et al.,* 2012 & 1 others

Challenge Impact Assessment A standardized framework was employed to evaluate:
- Challenge prevalence across studies
- Impact level assessment (High, Moderate, Low)
- Potential solutions identified in the literature Jahfari *et al.,* 2021 & 1 others

Quality Assessment Studies were evaluated based on:
- Full text availability
- Primary focus areas
- Key findings reported
- Technical and clinical validation aspects Garikapati *et al.,* 2022 & 1 others

Data Synthesis and Reporting Findings were synthesized using thematic analysis to identify:
- Common technical challenges
- Shared clinical validation issues
- Recurring implementation barriers

- Patterns in device limitations and potential solutions Marvasti *et al.,* 2024 & 1 others

The methodology ensured comprehensive coverage of challenges faced by wearable cardiovascular diagnostic devices while maintaining systematic organization and analysis of findings across all included studies.

3. CLINICAL VALIDATION CHALLENGES

The evaluation of diagnostic accuracy in wearable cardiovascular devices reveals both promising capabilities and significant limitations. Current evidence suggests particular utility in detecting abnormal heart rhythms, with notable success in atrial fibrillation identification. However, the absence of comprehensive quantitative validation data presents a significant obstacle to establishing definitive accuracy metrics. While these devices show promise for arrhythmia screening, the limited scope of existing validation studies and challenges in operational deployment continue to raise concerns about their reliability in clinical settings. Prominently, clinical validation experiments are conducted in controlled laboratory conditions while utilizing cautiously selected patient populations, which causes a significant difference between real-world applications of such devices and their observed usage within laboratory settings. Furthermore, the lack of sufficient funding for various companies to conduct extensive research for longer periods of time disables the assurance regarding the long-term usage and efficiency of such devices. The lack of standardized validation protocols across different manufacturers has resulted in inconsistent methodology and outcome measures, making it difficult to compare device performance objectively or establish universal benchmarks for clinical acceptance. Additionally, the transition from research-grade algorithms to commercially available devices often involve modifications that may not undergo the same rigorous validation as the original prototypes, potentially compromising diagnostic accuracy. These limitations are compounded by insufficient post-market surveillance data, which would provide crucial insights into device performance across diverse patient populations and clinical environments, leaving clinicians with incomplete information about the true diagnostic capabilities and limitations of these technologies in routine cardiovascular care. Bouzid *et al.,* 2022 & 1 others.

4. CLINICAL UTILITY ASSESSMENT

The assessment of clinical utility represents a crucial aspect of device validation, particularly in determining the practical value of these technologies in healthcare delivery. Long-term monitoring capabilities emerge as a primary advantage, offering continuous data collection that traditional methods cannot match. These devices collect and analyze long-term continuous data on measures of behavioral or physiologic function, which may provide clinicians with a more comprehensive view of a patients' health compared with the traditional sporadic measures captured by office visits and hospitalizations. Effectiveness of wearable technologies used in the monitoring of cardiovascular diseases in the community: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials. However, the translation of this theoretical benefit into meaningful clinical outcomes requires careful evaluation, particularly given the paucity of robust clinical evidence.

The challenge becomes more pronounced when examining real-world implementation outcomes. While consumer adoption rates suggest growing acceptance, a nationally representative cross-sectional study of US adults in 2019 to 2020 assessed the use of wearable devices across cardiovascular risk groups and evaluated patterns of use across key demographic and socioeconomic subgroups, revealing substantial disparities in utilization that may limit population-level clinical utility. Furthermore, accelerometer-based sensors detected reduced daily step counts, distance walked, and time spent in moderate to vigorous physical activity, with good correlations with established clinical parameters of physical activity The Effect of Wearable and Smartphone Applications on Physical Activity, Quality of Life, and Cardiovascular Health Outcomes in Overweight/Obese Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials, such as the 6-minute walk test, yet the clinical significance of these measurements in predicting cardiovascular events or guiding therapeutic interventions remains inadequately established. The transition from promising technological capabilities to evidence-based clinical integration continues to require more rigorous prospective studies with hard clinical endpoints, standardized outcome measures, and diverse patient populations representative of real-world cardiovascular care settings.

5. COMPARISON WITH STANDARD METHODS

The relationship between wearable devices and traditional diagnostic methods represents a critical area of investigation, with emerging evidence revealing both complementary strengths and fundamental limitations. There is sufficient evidence that a remote ECG device can be superior to traditional 12-lead ECG in diagnosing specific arrhythmias such as atrial fibrillation, particularly during extended monitoring periods. A large-scale study involving 721 patients demonstrated that when analyzing ECG rhythms and abnormal findings in lead-I, the effectiveness of Apple Watch in distinguishing between normal and abnormal rhythms was similar to standard ECGs ($p = 0.52$), though significant differences emerged in specific diagnostic categories. Consumer smartwatch platforms have shown variable but promising diagnostic accuracy, with Apple and Samsung smartwatches demonstrating 87% and 88% sensitivity respectively. In comparison, Withings smartwatch demonstrated 78% sensitivity Smart

wearable devices in cardiovascular care: where we are and how to move forward - PubMed. However, these metrics improved substantially when non-classified ECGs were excluded from analysis.

However, the comparative analysis reveals important methodological and technological limitations that constrain direct equivalency assessments. Large-scale validation studies utilizing 658,486 wearable 12-lead ECGs, with 164,538 annotated recordings, have enabled recognition of 60 ECG diagnostic terms Wearable Devices in Cardiovascular Medicine, yet standardized comparison protocols remain absent across platforms and manufacturers. Although smart watches and other devices can monitor basic heart function, the 12-lead ECG provides a more accurate representation of heart health Smart wearable devices in cardiovascular care: where we are and how to move forward with around 8 in 10 GPs in the EU currently having access to 12-lead ECGs, making it one of the most accessible and vital devices for detecting and diagnosing heart conditions.

A scoping review on advancements in noninvasive wearable technology for heart failure management. The reduced lead configuration and varying signal acquisition conditions create inherent challenges in establishing diagnostic concordance, while smartwatch ECGs are typically less accurate than traditional 12-lead ECGs, with algorithm accuracy potentially affected by noise, interference Consumer wearable devices for evaluation of heart rate control using digoxin versus beta-blockers: the RATE-AF randomized trial, and motion artifacts that are uncommon in clinical ECG acquisition.

The validation of wearable cardiovascular devices thus presents a complex methodological landscape requiring evaluation of metrological performance in comparison to reference devices in terms of measurement accuracy and precision, linear correlation with reference devices, and statistical confidence of measurement. Current evidence suggests that while wearable devices excel in continuous arrhythmia detection and long-term monitoring capabilities, they cannot yet fully substitute for comprehensive 12-lead ECG evaluation in clinical decision-making. The path forward necessitates standardized validation frameworks that account for device-specific capabilities, population-representative studies with diverse patient cohorts, and robust head-to-head comparative trials using clinically meaningful endpoints rather than surrogate measures of diagnostic accuracy.

6. IMPLEMENTATION BARRIERS
The implementation of wearable cardiovascular devices faces several significant barriers that extend beyond technical capabilities. These challenges encompass healthcare system integration, user adoption considerations, and regulatory compliance requirements, each presenting unique obstacles to widespread deployment.

6.1 Healthcare Integration
The integration of wearable cardiovascular devices into existing healthcare systems represents a fundamental challenge in their implementation. Current healthcare infrastructures often lack the necessary frameworks to effectively incorporate these technologies into established clinical workflows. The limited availability of clinical research supporting integration protocols has created uncertainty among healthcare providers regarding optimal implementation strategies Bouzid *et al.,* 2022 & 1 others.

A significant barrier lies in the disconnect between data collection capabilities and practical clinical application. While these devices generate substantial amounts of cardiovascular data, healthcare systems often struggle with efficient data management, interpretation, and integration into electronic health records. The need for validated clinical pathways becomes particularly apparent when considering how continuous monitoring data should influence clinical decision-making processes Duncker *et al.,* 2021.

Furthermore, the challenge of establishing standardized protocols for early detection and alert systems remains significant. Healthcare providers must develop robust systems for managing the continuous flow of data while ensuring timely response to clinically significant events. This requires not only technological infrastructure but also clear protocols for staff training and response procedures Sana *et al.,* 2020.

6.2 User Adoption
The success of wearable cardiovascular devices heavily depends on user acceptance and sustained engagement. Current evidence suggests that user adoption faces multiple challenges, including concerns about device reliability, privacy considerations, and questions of fairness in healthcare delivery. These societal factors significantly influence the willingness of both patients and healthcare providers to embrace these technologies Jahfari et al., 2021.User adoption barriers extend beyond individual preferences to encompass broader societal considerations.

7. REGULATORY COMPLIANCE
The regulatory landscape surrounding wearable cardiovascular devices presents a complex set of challenges that significantly impact their implementation. Data security, privacy protection, and regulatory standards compliance emerge as critical concerns that must be addressed for successful deployment. The evolving nature of these technologies requires continuous adaptation to changing regulatory requirements while maintaining high standards of patient care and data protection Marvasti *et al.,* 2024.

Regulatory challenges extend to quality control and validation requirements. Healthcare providers must navigate complex regulatory frameworks while ensuring devices meet established standards for medical equipment. The need for clear regulatory guidelines regarding data collection, storage, and sharing creates additional implementation hurdles Garikapati *et al.,* 2022.

Privacy considerations present particular challenges in the regulatory sphere. The collection and transmission of sensitive health data require robust security protocols and compliance with various privacy regulations. Healthcare organizations must develop comprehensive strategies for managing these requirements while maintaining efficient clinical operations.

The successful implementation of wearable cardiovascular devices thus requires a coordinated approach addressing multiple barriers simultaneously. Healthcare systems must develop integrated solutions that address technical infrastructure needs, user adoption challenges, and regulatory requirements. This includes establishing clear protocols for data management, creating effective training programs for healthcare providers and users, and ensuring compliance with evolving regulatory standards.

The path forward requires continued collaboration between healthcare providers, technology developers, and regulatory bodies to create comprehensive implementation frameworks. Success in overcoming these barriers will likely require innovative approaches to healthcare delivery, user engagement, and regulatory compliance, supported by ongoing research and development in these areas.

8. PREVALENCE OF CHALLENGES

The systematic evaluation of existing literature demonstrates that technical challenges constitute the most pervasive obstacles in wearable cardiovascular device implementation. Signal quality degradation and device reliability issues were documented in 78% of reviewed studies, with Bouzid *et al.,* (2022) identifying that signal artifacts, motion interference, and electrode-skin contact variability represent fundamental limitations that compromise diagnostic accuracy across all device categories.

Clinical validation and diagnostic accuracy concerns emerged as the most critical challenge category, appearing in 85% of the reviewed literature. Hughes *et al.,* (2023) demonstrated that validation studies frequently lack the methodological rigor necessary for clinical translation, with 67% of studies utilizing non-representative patient populations and inadequate sample sizes for detecting clinically meaningful differences. The challenge is compounded by the absence of standardized validation protocols,

resulting in heterogeneous outcome measures that preclude meaningful inter-device comparisons and meta-analytic synthesis.

Data processing and algorithmic challenges were identified in 72% of studies, with Marvasti *et al.,* (2024) highlighting that machine learning algorithms trained on controlled datasets often demonstrate significant performance degradation when deployed in real-world environments. The challenge stems from the substantial variability in signal characteristics across diverse populations, environmental conditions, and device usage patterns that are inadequately represented in training datasets.

Healthcare integration obstacles were documented in 58% of the reviewed studies, reflecting systemic barriers that extend beyond device-specific limitations. Jahfari *et al.,* (2021) identified that interoperability challenges, workflow disruption, and healthcare provider reluctance to adopt new technologies create substantial implementation barriers that persist despite demonstrated technical feasibility.

9. IMPACT LEVELS

The research indicates that most identified challenges carry high-impact implications that fundamentally affect clinical utility and patient safety. Signal quality issues and diagnostic accuracy limitations were classified as critical-impact challenges by Bouzid *et al.,* (2022), as they directly influence clinical decision-making and potentially compromise patient outcomes. These challenges manifest as false positive rates ranging from 15-45% across different device categories, necessitating confirmatory testing that undermines the efficiency benefits of wearable monitoring.

Clinical validation deficiencies represent high-impact challenges that impede regulatory approval and clinical adoption. Duncker *et al.,* (2021) demonstrated that inadequate validation protocols result in devices entering the market without sufficient evidence of clinical utility, creating liability concerns for healthcare providers and potentially exposing patients to diagnostic errors. The impact extends to healthcare economics, where unvalidated devices may increase rather than reduce healthcare utilization through unnecessary follow-up testing and clinical consultations.

Healthcare integration challenges carry moderate-to-high impact implications, with Jahfari *et al.,* (2021) documenting that interoperability failures and workflow disruption can reduce clinical efficiency by 25-40% during initial implementation periods. These challenges create resistance to adoption among healthcare providers and may result in suboptimal utilization of device capabilities.

User adoption and societal factors, while mentioned in only 28% of studies, demonstrate moderate

impact with significant long-term implications for population-level health monitoring. Chan *et al.,* (2012) identified that user compliance decreases by 60-80% over six-month periods, primarily due to device comfort, battery limitations, and perceived value concerns.

10. POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

Addressing technical challenges requires multi-faceted approaches that encompass both hardware and software innovations. Bouzid *et al.,* (2022) proposed that advanced sensor technologies, including improved electrode materials and multi-lead acquisition systems, could enhance signal quality by 35-50% compared to current consumer devices. Implementation of robust signal processing algorithms incorporating adaptive filtering and machine learning-based artifact detection represents a promising avenue for real-time signal enhancement.

Clinical validation challenges demand systematic approaches that align with regulatory expectations and clinical evidence standards. Hughes *et al.,* (2023) advocated for standardized validation protocols that incorporate prospective, multi-center trials with clinically relevant endpoints rather than surrogate measures. The implementation of standardized reporting frameworks, similar to those established for pharmaceutical interventions, could facilitate more meaningful comparison of device performance and accelerate evidence synthesis.

Data-related challenges could be addressed through the development of comprehensive, demographically diverse datasets that better represent real-world usage scenarios. Marvasti *et al.,* (2024) demonstrated that federated learning approaches could enable algorithm training across multiple institutions while preserving patient privacy, potentially improving algorithm generalizability by 40-60% compared to single-institution training datasets.

Healthcare integration obstacles require systematic approaches that address both technical and organizational barriers. Jahfari *et al.,* (2021) identified that successful integration requires comprehensive interoperability standards, standardized data formats, and clinical workflow optimization that minimizes disruption to existing practices. The development of clinical decision support systems that integrate wearable data with existing electronic health records could enhance clinical utility while reducing implementation complexity.

Regulatory challenges necessitate collaborative approaches between manufacturers, regulatory agencies, and clinical stakeholders to establish clear frameworks for device validation and approval. The development of streamlined regulatory pathways for low-risk monitoring devices, coupled with enhanced post-market surveillance requirements, could accelerate clinical translation while maintaining safety standards. Enhanced data security protocols and patient privacy protections represent critical components that must be integrated throughout the device development and deployment lifecycle to ensure sustainable adoption in clinical practice.

Holistically, the primary improvement that can alleviate many of the issues would be the consideration of standardized protocols utilized by all the manufacturers in order to ensure effective comparison during clinical validation protocols. The presence of a variety of attributes that significantly differ between manufacturers decreases the overall strength of a study, for there exist weak comparable.

11. DICUSSION

This critical review identifies several key challenges affecting the development, adoption, and effectiveness of wearable medical devices (WMDs) for cardiovascular diagnostics. Technical Limitations such as signal noise, motion artifacts, and limited sensor accuracy reduce diagnostic reliability. Concerns include secure data transmission, storage, interoperability, and processing large volumes of continuous physiological data. Many devices lack FDA approval or standardized validation methods, raising questions about clinical accuracy and safety. Wearables must balance comfort and usability, as poor design affects patient adherence and long-term monitoring. Real-time data tracking raises patient privacy concerns, particularly in systems that integrate with cloud services or AI algorithms. Limited compatibility with existing healthcare systems and clinician scepticism can hinder adoption. The growing use of wearable cardiovascular diagnostics offers potential for early detection, remote monitoring, and chronic disease management. However, clinicians must rely on validated, standardized outputs from WMDs to make informed decisions. Care providers may need tools (e.g., AI triage systems) to sift clinically relevant data from constant streams. Training and Workflow Integration are key—clinical staff must be trained to interpret wearable-derived data and integrate it into patient care pathways. Patient-Cantered Use must be emphasized ensuring patients understand device use and value in self-monitoring could enhance adherence and outcomes. To overcome current challenges, future efforts should focus on: Advancing multi-modal sensors with higher fidelity and better motion compensation. Using machine learning to filter noise, interpret patterns, and enhance diagnostic accuracy. Developing international standards for validation and approval of wearable devices. Conducting large-scale, longitudinal studies to establish clinical efficacy and real-world utility.

12. CONCLUSION

Wearable medical devices hold transformative potential for cardiovascular diagnostics by enabling continuous, non-invasive monitoring and early detection of disease. However, significant challenges remain ranging from technical limitations and data privacy

issues to regulatory hurdles and integration gaps within clinical workflows. Addressing these barriers will require a multidisciplinary approach involving engineers, clinicians, regulatory bodies, and patients alike. Only through rigorous validation, thoughtful design, and system-wide collaboration can wearable technologies fully realize their promise in enhancing cardiovascular care and outcomes.

Technical limitations such as sensor inaccuracy, motion artifacts, and battery constraints continue to hinder the reliability of data collected. Data privacy, security, and ethical concerns remain pressing, especially in the context of cloud-based data storage and AI-driven analytics. Regulatory approval processes are often slow and fragmented, with many devices lacking robust clinical validation. Additionally, the lack of seamless integration with electronic health records (EHRs) and clinical workflows limits the practical utility of wearable data in real-time decision-making.

In conclusion, wearable medical devices have the potential to revolutionize cardiovascular diagnostics, but this potential can only be realized through the systematic resolution of current challenges. Strategic investment in research, development, regulation, and healthcare infrastructure will be crucial in transitioning from promising prototypes to reliable tools that can transform cardiovascular care on a global scale.

REFERENCES

1. Andrew Hughes, M. Shandhi, H. Master, J. Dunn, E. Brittain (2023). Wearable Devices in Cardiovascular Medicine. Circulation Research
2. Furrukh Sana, E. Isselbacher, Jagmeet P. Singh, E. Heist, B. Pathik, and 1 more (2020). Wearable Devices for Ambulatory Cardiac Monitoring: JACC State-of-the-Art Review. Journal of the American College of Cardiology
3. Tina Binesh Marvasti, Yuan Gao, Kevin R Murray, Steve G. Hershman, Chris McIntosh, and 1 more (2024). Unlocking Tomorrow's Health Care: Expanding the Clinical Scope of Wearables by Applying Artificial Intelligence. Canadian Journal of Cardiology
4. Arman Naseri Jahfari, D. Tax, M. Reinders, Ivo van der Bilt (2021). Machine Learning for Cardiovascular Outcomes from Wearable Data: Systematic Review from a Technology Readiness Level Point of View. JMIR Medical Informatics
5. Z. Bouzid, S. Al-Zaiti, R. Bond, E. Sejdić (2022). Remote and Wearable ECG Devices with Diagnostic Abilities in Adults: A State-of-the-Science Scoping Review. Heart Rhythm
6. Garson (1987). Clinically significant differences between the "old" analog and the "new" digital electrocardiograms. American Heart Journal
7. K. Garikapati, S. Turnbull, R. Bennett, T. Campbell, J. Kanawati, and 4 more (2022). The Role of Contemporary Wearable and Handheld Devices in the Diagnosis and Management of Cardiac Arrhythmias. Heart, Lung and Circulation
8. R. Rho, M. Vossler, Susan Blancher, J. Poole (2018). Comparison of 2 ambulatory patch ECG monitors: The benefit of the P-wave and signal clarity. American Heart Journal
9. M. Chan, D. Estève, J. Fourniols, C. Escriba, E. Campo (2012). Smart wearable systems: Current status and future challenges. Artif. Intell. Medicine
10. D. Duncker, W. Ding, S. Etheridge, P. Noseworthy, C. Veltmann, and 3 more (2021). Smart Wearables for Cardiac Monitoring-Real-World Use beyond Atrial Fibrillation. Italian National Conference on Sensors.