WhitePaper: Single-Lead vs 12-Lead ECG: Justification for Arrhythmia Detection, PQRST Evaluation, and Wearable Monitoring

Executive summary

Single-lead ECG (often lead-I or a limb lead recorded by a portable/wearable sensor) has been repeatedly shown to be accurate and clinically useful for *rhythm* detection tasks (particularly atrial fibrillation and many ectopic beats) and can provide acceptable measurements of key timing intervals (RR/HR, QRS duration, QT/QTc, PR) for many ambulatory applications. However, a 12-lead ECG remains the clinical gold standard for full diagnostic cardiac assessment (ischemia localization, axis, chamber enlargement, lead-specific ST changes and comprehensive conduction analysis). For monitoring, screening, and many remote/digital health use cases, single-lead wearable devices offer a favourable trade-off (accessibility, long-term monitoring, patient convenience) but carry intrinsic limitations tied to having only one electrical vector and to practical constraints of wearable/wireless systems. (heartlungcirc.org)

Background: What Each Modality Measures

- **12-lead ECG:** records cardiac electrical activity from multiple spatial vectors, enabling localization of regional ischemia, chamber enlargement, frontal/transverse plane axis, and more nuanced conduction abnormalities. It is the diagnostic gold standard in clinical cardiology. (Nature)
- **Single-lead ECG:** captures the time course of depolarization/repolarization along one vector. That single trace contains clear P, QRS, and T waves in many patients and is therefore useful for rhythm analysis and interval measurement, but lacks spatial information present in multi-lead recordings. (PMC)

Evidence: Arrhythmia Detection

Atrial fibrillation (AF):

- Numerous studies and device validations (consumer and medical single-lead devices) show high sensitivity and specificity for AF detection from single-lead recordings, especially when algorithmic/AI support is used. Single-lead devices are widely used for screening and ambulatory AF detection. (heartlungcirc.org)

Other arrhythmias (ectopy, VT, blocks):

- Single-lead ECGs reliably detect premature atrial/ventricular complexes and many tachyarrhythmias, but performance varies by arrhythmia type and by device/algorithm. Detection of complex or rare non-AF arrhythmias (e.g., some polymorphic VTs, subtle conduction abnormalities) is more limited with single-lead traces. Several recent comparisons show multi-lead or multi-channel wearables outperform single-lead in distinguishing AF from frequent PACs/PVCs and in reducing false-positives. (PMC)

Clinical implication: for rhythm detection and screening (e.g., AF screening, symptomatic palpitations, event capture), single-lead devices are often sufficient and practical; for definitive diagnostic workup of complex arrhythmias, 12-lead or multi-lead recordings remain preferable. (heartlungcirc.org)

Evidence: PQRST (interval) Measurement Accuracy

- **Heart rate / RR:** single-lead devices provide highly accurate HR/RR estimates.
- **PR, QRS, QT/QTc intervals:** multiple validation studies show acceptable correlation between single-lead automated/manual measurements and 12-lead references for many patients (reasonable intraclass correlations and mean absolute errors within clinically useful bounds). Accuracy depends on signal quality, sampling rate, device filtering, and ECG morphology. Some recent single-lead devices report correlation coefficients >0.7 for PR and QT and acceptable QRS/QTc reliability in many cohorts. AI models can further improve interval estimation and even reconstruct approximate multi-lead information from single-lead data in research settings. (BioMed Central)

Caveats: systematic biases (over/underestimation of QT in certain morphologies), measurement variability in low-amplitude P waves, and dependence on lead vector orientation can limit single-lead interval accuracy for some patients. Manual confirmation or follow-up 12-lead testing is warranted for borderline/critical interval findings (e.g., suspected long QT with high clinical stakes). (Frontiers)

A concise, evidence-backed table.1 of sensitivity / specificity (and key notes) from representative single-lead / wearable device studies and reviews. All rows cite the source so you can check the original papers. Only focussed on atrial fibrillation (AF) because that's the arrhythmia with the largest, best-validated literature for single-lead wearables.

Table.1 Short comparison table — device / study level sensitivity & specificity (AF detection)

Device / Study	**Population /**	**Metric**	**Sensitivity (or PPV if study**		
Apple Watch — Apple Heart Study (Perez et al., NEJM 2019). (New England Journal of	~420,000 participants, community (irregular pulse	Positive predictive value (PPV) of notifications vs. simultaneous	**PPV 84%** (notifications that matched AF on subsequent ECG patch). (New England Journal of	Not reported as classic sensitivity/specificity for entire cohort; study design measured PPV of alerts. (New England	Large real-world sample; low alert rate (0.5%); not a direct sensitivity
AliveCor KardiaMobile (pooled/ regulatory summaries). (AliveCor |	Multiple diagnostic accuracy studies; clinic	Sensitivity / Specificity for rhythm/AF detection (various	**Sensitivity range ~77.0% – 96.6%** (study-dependent). (AliveCor |	**Specificity range ~76.0% – 99.1%** (study-dependent). (AliveCor | AliveCor	Wide range due to differing populations, reference standards and algorithm versions; some indeterminate readings occur. (AliveCor |
Zenicor/hand-held single-lead ECG (validation cited in reviews — Ding et al. 2020). (AHA	Validation cohorts	Sensitivity / Specificity for	**Sensitivity ≈ 96%**. (AHA	**Specificity ≈ 92%**. (AHA	Example of high performance in targeted screening
Fitbit / wrist PPG-based detection (Lubitz et al. / Fitbit Heart Study and related analyses). (AHA	Large population-based wearable studies; PPG irregular rhythm	Various; confirmatory ECG patches used in	Pooled/large-study estimates vary; PPG pooled sensitivity reported in reviews around **~91.6%** (PPG meta-analyses).	Pooled specificity for PPG **~95.9%** in meta-analysis (PPG	PPG is indirect (pulse vs. electrical); good for screening but needs ECG confirmation for
Systematic reviews / single-lead ECG device reviews (Klier et al., Turnbull 2023–2024).	Aggregated diagnostic accuracy studies across devices &	Range across many single-lead	**Sensitivity range reported 54.5% – 100%** (most studies >87%). (PMC)	Specificity also variable across studies; many report >80–90% but depends on algorithm/population.	Heterogeneity high — device model, patient mix, whether automated vs clinician-read, and signal quality

Advantages of single-lead (especially wearable/wireless) devices

1. **Accessibility & scalability:** inexpensive, patient-operated, suitable for population screening and remote monitoring. (PMC)
2. **Continuous or event-driven ambulatory monitoring:** can capture intermittent/paroxysmal arrhythmias that a single 10-s 12-lead would miss. Wearables can record over days–weeks. (PMC)
3. **User convenience & adherence:** small form factor, less training required, greater adoption for symptom-triggered recordings. (PubMed)
4. **Integration with algorithms/AI:** high performance for AF detection and rhythm classification when combined with validated algorithms. AI can also estimate intervals and in some research reconstruct multi-lead signals. (heartlungcirc.org)
5. **Lower resource needs for remote care:** reduces need for clinic visits; useful in telemedicine workflows. (PMC)

Limitations of single-lead devices (intrinsic & practical)

Intrinsic (physiologic/electrical)

- **Single electrical vector:** cannot localize ischemia/ST changes reliably across the heart; many ischemic changes are lead-specific and can be missed. 12-lead is required for MI localization. (Nature)
- **Limited morphological information:** axis deviation, chamber enlargement, and certain conduction abnormalities require multiple leads for reliable diagnosis. (PMC)

Measurement & algorithmic

- **Signal quality & noise:** motion artifacts, poor skin contact, muscle noise degrade P-wave visibility and interval accuracy—this is critical for PR and QT measurements. (PMC)
- **False positives & specificity issues:** single-lead devices can misclassify frequent PACs/PVCs or artifact as AF; multi-lead or multi-channel approaches can improve specificity. (PMC)

Clinical workflow

- **Interpretation limitations:** automated single-lead outputs may require cardiologist review for definitive diagnosis; abnormal or ambiguous results should prompt 12-lead confirmation. (heartlungcirc.org)

Specific considerations when the single-lead device is wireless and wearable

Advantages

- **Real-world, long-duration capture:** captures paroxysms and exertional events outside clinic. (cardio.jmir.org)
- **Immediate event transmission:** wireless connectivity enables near-real-time alerting and telemedicine triage. (PMC)
- **Higher patient engagement:** wearables used as consumer health devices can increase health awareness and monitoring adherence. (PubMed)

Limitations & risks

- **Artifact from motion & posture:** wearables experience variable contact and motion artifacts (worse during exercise), degrading P-wave detection and interval measurement accuracy. (PMC)
- **Battery, connectivity, and data loss:** wireless transmission depends on power and network—gaps can miss events or reduce trace quality. (cardio.jmir.org)
- **Regulatory and clinical governance:** consumer wearables vary in clinical validation; not every device is FDA/CE-cleared for diagnostic use—careful device selection and awareness of intended use are required. (Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine)
- **Overdiagnosis & false alarms:** population-level screening with consumer wearables can increase downstream testing and anxiety from false positives; algorithms and clinician workflows must manage this. (PMC)

When to prefer a single-lead wearable vs. a 12-lead

Prefer single-lead wearable when:

- Screening for AF in ambulatory populations. (heartlungcirc.org)
- Symptom-triggered rhythm capture (palpitations, syncope workup adjunct). (PMC)
- Long-term trend monitoring and remote follow-up of known arrhythmia burden. (cardio.jmir.org)

Prefer 12-lead when:

- Suspected acute ischemia/acute coronary syndrome, new-onset chest pain, STEMI evaluation. (Nature)
- Need for full ECG interpretation: axis, chamber enlargement, precise conduction block localization, or preoperative baseline. (PMC)

Practical recommendations (clinical & engineering)

1. Use single-lead wearables as a **screening/monitoring** tool, not a full replacement for 12-lead diagnostics. Abnormal actionable findings should be confirmed with a 12-lead ECG. (heartlungcirc.org)
2. Ensure device validation papers are reviewed before clinical deployment—check sensitivity/specificity for target arrhythmias and interval accuracy (PR/QRS/QT). (BioMed Central)
3. For devices intended to measure intervals (QTc) clinically, adopt higher sampling rates, robust filtering, and clinician-review workflows and flag measurements with low signal quality. (Frontiers)
4. Combine single-lead rhythm detection with patient symptom logs or event markers to improve clinical interpretability. (PMC)

FibriArt in the Evolving Landscape of Cardiac Monitoring

As cardiac care increasingly shifts beyond traditional clinical settings, the role of wearable ECG technologies has become more prominent. Solutions such as FibriArt are aligned with this transition, supporting a model of care that extends monitoring into everyday environments while maintaining clinical relevance.

Rather than serving as a replacement for conventional diagnostic tools, FibriArt-I fits within a complementary framework enabling consistent rhythm tracking outside the clinic and providing data that can support timely clinical evaluation when needed. This approach helps bridge the gap between episodic testing and continuous monitoring.

By contributing to more accessible and ongoing cardiac assessment, FibriArt reflects the broader evolution of healthcare toward preventive, data-driven, and patient-centric monitoring.

Conclusion

Single-lead ECG—especially in wearable and wireless formats—has matured into a clinically valuable tool for arrhythmia detection (notably AF) and for many PQRST interval measurements in ambulatory settings. It offers major practical benefits in accessibility and long-duration monitoring. Nevertheless, because it records only a single electrical vector it cannot replace the 12-lead ECG when spatial information and full diagnostic detail are required (e.g., ischemia localization, complex conduction diagnoses). Appropriate use means leveraging single-lead devices for screening and monitoring while relying on 12-lead ECGs for confirmatory and comprehensive cardiac evaluation. (heartlungcirc.org)

Key cited references

- Turnbull S. *Accuracy of a Single-Lead ECG Device for Diagnosis ...* 2024
- Bacevicius J, et al. *Six-lead electrocardiography compared to single ...* 2023
- Kamga P, et al. *The Use of Wearable ECG Devices in the Clinical Setting.* 2022
- Presacan O, et al. *Evaluating the feasibility of 12-lead electrocardiogram reconstruction; 12-lead remains the gold standard.* 2025
- Mannhart D, et al. *Clinical Validation of Automated Corrected QT-Interval ...* 2022