

# AI ECG vs. Cardiologist: Decoding the Future of Cardiac Diagnosis

Rasit Dinc

*Rasit Dinc Digital Health & AI Research*

Published: July 7, 2023 | AI Diagnostics

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.17997451](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17997451)

## Abstract

AI ECG vs. Cardiologist: Decoding the Future of Cardiac Diagnosis Introduction: The Digital Revolution in Electrocardiography The electrocardiogram (ECG...

# AI ECG vs. Cardiologist: Decoding the Future of Cardiac Diagnosis

## Introduction: The Digital Revolution in Electrocardiography

The electrocardiogram (ECG) remains the cornerstone of cardiac diagnosis, providing a rapid, non-invasive window into the heart's electrical activity. For decades, the interpretation of these complex waveforms has been the exclusive domain of trained cardiologists. However, the rapid advancement of **Artificial Intelligence (AI)**, particularly deep learning models, is fundamentally reshaping this landscape. The question is no longer *if* AI will interpret ECGs, but *how* its performance compares to the human expert, and what this means for the future of patient care and digital health [1]. This professional and academic analysis explores the comparative accuracy, unique capabilities, and critical limitations of AI-driven ECG interpretation versus the traditional cardiologist reading.

## The Algorithmic Advantage: Speed and Sensitivity

AI models, trained on massive datasets of annotated ECGs, have demonstrated remarkable proficiency in pattern recognition, often exceeding human capabilities in specific metrics. A systematic review on Acute Coronary Syndrome (ACS) detection found that AI models were more **sensitive** (90% of studies) and had a better **Positive Predictive Value (PPV)** (100% of studies) compared with clinicians [2].

The core strength of AI lies in its ability to detect subtle, non-linear patterns that are often imperceptible to the human eye. This capability extends beyond standard rhythm and morphology analysis, allowing AI-enabled ECG to predict conditions such as heart failure, pulmonary hypertension, hyperkalaemia, and even anaemia—diagnoses traditionally requiring additional tests [3]. The

speed of AI processing also offers a significant clinical advantage, enabling near-instantaneous interpretation in high-volume or emergency settings.

### **The Human Element: Specificity and Clinical Context**

---

Despite AI's superior sensitivity in certain areas, the cardiologist remains indispensable, particularly when considering the full spectrum of diagnostic accuracy and clinical context. The same systematic review noted that while AI excelled in sensitivity, **clinicians maintained a better Negative Predictive Value (NPV)** in 70% of the studies reviewed [2]. Furthermore, the specificity of AI models was mixed, with only half of the studies showing superior AI specificity compared to the human expert.

The cardiologist's role is not merely pattern recognition; it is the synthesis of the ECG data with the patient's full clinical picture—their symptoms, medical history, physical examination, and other test results. This holistic, contextual interpretation is where human expertise currently holds an undeniable edge. The human ability to recognize artifacts, manage noisy data, and apply clinical judgment to override an AI's recommendation is crucial for patient safety and accurate diagnosis [4].

### **The Partnership: AI as an Augmentation Tool**

---

The most promising future for ECG interpretation is not a competition, but a collaboration. Studies have shown that when cardiologists are assisted by AI, their diagnostic accuracy significantly improves. For instance, one study demonstrated that AI assistance could boost cardiologist accuracy to nearly 70% [5]. AI serves as a powerful, tireless screening and triage tool, flagging potential abnormalities and allowing the cardiologist to focus their expertise on the most complex or ambiguous cases.

This integrated approach mitigates the risk of systematic bias, a known limitation of AI models trained on non-diverse datasets, which can lead to reduced accuracy across different age, gender, or racial groups [6]. The cardiologist provides the necessary oversight and ethical check, ensuring that the technology is applied responsibly and equitably.

### **Conclusion: The Future is Integrated**

---

The debate over **AI ECG interpretation vs. cardiologist reading** is evolving from a zero-sum game to a symbiotic relationship. AI offers unprecedented speed and the ability to uncover hidden cardiac risk factors, while the cardiologist provides the essential specificity, clinical judgment, and ethical oversight. The integration of these two forces promises a future of cardiac care that is faster, more accurate, and more accessible.

For more in-depth analysis on the ethical and clinical adoption of digital health technologies, the resources at [www.rasitdinc.com] (<https://www.rasitdinc.com>) provide expert commentary and professional insight into the evolving intersection of medicine and technology.

\*\*

## References

---

- [1] Ose, B., et al. (2024). *Artificial intelligence interpretation of the electrocardiogram: a state-of-the-art review*. Current Cardiology Reports, 26(10), 115. [2] Fawzy, A., et al. (2025). *The Accuracy of Artificial Intelligence-Based Models Applied to 12-Lead Electrocardiograms for the Diagnosis of Acute Coronary Syndrome: A Systematic Review*. JACEP Open, 6(5). [3] Kwon, J., et al. (2021). *Artificial intelligence using electrocardiography: strengths and limitations*. Journal of Cardiovascular Development and Disease, 8(8), 94. [4] Cook, D. A., et al. (2020). *Accuracy of Physicians' Electrocardiogram Interpretations: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis*. JAMA Internal Medicine, 180(9), 1166-1176. [5] Poterucha, T. J., et al. (2025). *Detecting structural heart disease from electrocardiograms using artificial intelligence*. Nature, 630, 429-435. [6] Muzammil, M. A., et al. (2024). *Artificial intelligence-enhanced electrocardiography for accurate diagnosis of cardiovascular diseases: A review*. Journal of Electrocardiology\*, 83, 100-108.
-