A Transfer-Learning Based Ensemble Architecture for ECG Signal Classification
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Abstract—Manual interpretation and classification of ECG signals lack both accuracy and reliability. These continuous time-series signals are more effective when presented as an image for CNN-based classification. A continuous Wavelet transform filter is used here to get corresponding images. In achieving the best result generic CNN architectures lack sufficient accuracy and also have a higher run-time. To address this issue, we propose an ensemble method of transfer learning-based models to classify ECG signals. In our work, two modified VGG-16 models and one InceptionResNetV2 model with added feature extracting layers and ImageNet weights are working as the backbone. After ensemble, we report an increase of 6.36% accuracy than previous MLP based algorithms. After 5-fold cross-validation with the Physionet dataset, our model reaches an accuracy of 99.98%.

Index Terms—ensemble learning, deep learning, medical image processing, transfer learning, continuous wavelet transform

I. INTRODUCTION

ECG documents the electrical function of the heart by encapsulating essential electrical activities. It is crucial for the preliminary detection of numerous cardiac abnormalities and cardiovascular diseases. Substantial facts like a patient’s heart rate, heart rhythm, record of heart attack, probable narrowing of the coronary arteries, traces of reduced oxygen distribution to the heart, and so forth can be attained from an ECG report. ECGs are usually conducted in three basic ways: resting ECG, ambulatory ECG, and cardiac stress test. An ECG graph (Fig 1) can be characterized by a repeated series of $P$, $Q$, $R$, $S$, and $T$, and a conditional $U$ wave. The peaks ($P$, $Q$, $R$, $S$, $T$ and $U$), intervals ($PR$, $RR$, $QRS$, $ST$, and $QT$), and segments ($PR$ and $ST$) represent the traits of an ECG. Deviation from the expected form of electrical signals signifies several issues including defects or abnormalities in the heart’s shape, size, electrolytes, ischemia, heart rhythm etc. Once the anomaly is detected, risk factors for cardiovascular diseases can be diagnosed and treated, consequently upgrading the patient’s medication.

However, unlike detecting, classifying the abnormalities in ECG precisely is an immensely complicated task considering the numerous challenges that arise throughout the process. One of the challenges can be examining and identifying cardiac problems from ECG paper. Again, applying ordinary visual analysis approaches can be challenging for physicians as well. Resultantly, intelligent computer systems that utilize sophisticated image and signal processing techniques have been introduced. This aids in more precise diagnosis of patients and offers better treatment than empirical procedures. Even in the case of a fully automated and computerized system, it’s not an easy process, considering the presence of external noise and uneven classes in the dataset. The accuracy achieved applying machine learning is insufficient as well. Multiple attempts have been made to incorporate deep learning algorithms to address and solve the issue of precisely classifying cardiovascular diseases with a lower number of false positive detections.

Zihlmann et al. [1] presented two neural network architectures, a convolutional neural network (CNN) and a convolutional recurrent neural network (CRNN), for ECG classification. On the hidden challenge testing set, the second architecture exceeded the first in terms of accuracy, with an F1 score of 82.1 percent for the PhysioNet/CinC Challenge 2017 atrial fibrillation (AF) classification data set. Rajkumar et al. [2] employed CNN to attain the features automatically from the time domain ECG signals collected from the MIT-BIH database [3]. They achieved 93.6 percent accuracy using the ELU activation function. Syama et al. [4] implemented a multilayer-perceptron neural network (MLPNN) for the classification of ECG signals collected from the MIT-BIH database and achieved 94 percent accuracy. ESSA et al. [5] came up with a deep learning-
based multi-model ensemble by implementing a combination of a convolutional neural network (CNN) and long short-term memory (LSTM) network in order to classify ECG. The proposed approach was evaluated on the MIT-BIH database to derive the experimental findings with an overall accuracy of 95.81 percent. Boussaa et al. [6] employed Mel Frequency Cepstrum algorithm (MFCC) and artificial neural network (ANN) classifier for classifying ECG signal extracted from the MIT-BIH database. Hannun et al. [7] collected 91,232 single-lead ECGs from 53,549 individuals who used a single-lead ambulatory ECG monitoring device to create a deep neural network (DNN) to distinguish 12 rhythm categories. §EN et al. [8] proposed ECG time-series signal classification and ECG spectrogram pictures to classify heartbeat arrhythmia. Ullah et al. [9] proposed a two-dimensional (2-D) convolutional neural network (CNN) model in order to classify ECG signals into eight classes and achieved an accuracy of 99.11 percent. Cordos et al. [10] proposed a strategy to use ECG signal for biometric identification employing Inception-v3, Xception, MobileNet and NasNetLarge models. They found Inception-v3 model to be the most effective model for ECG classification having an accuracy of 99.5 percent. Gajendra et al. [11] used different modern deep networks trained on the ImageNet database to categorize scalograms (2D representations) of ECG signals collected from three PhysioNet databases. Rahuja et al. [12] introduced a classifier for automatic ECG classification employing continuous wavelet transform and AlexNet CNN. They used PhysioNet research dataset for their experiment and attained an overall accuracy of 97.3 percent with a limited dataset. Their works demonstrate that modern CNN architectures performs well for multi-class ECG signal classification [13]–[16].

Our major contribution is introducing modified VGG-16 and InceptionResNetV2 models pretrained with ImageNet weights and finally constructing a soft voting based ensemble architectures for taking maximum accuracy for respective classes.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Dataset Description

We used a pre-existing open-source dataset for this work which consists of three distinct types of ECG signals from three different types of heart condition Arrhythmia (ARR), Normal Sinus Rhythm (NSR), and Congestive Heart Failure (CHF). The original version of the dataset is available at PhysioNet [17] in three separate sections which are MIT-BIH Arrhythmia Database [18], MIT-BIH Normal Sinus Rhythm Database [3] and BIDMC Congestive Heart Failure Database [19]. The modified version of the dataset combines these three separate databases in a common format as shown in fig 2.

A common scaling factor was used to normalize the range of the magnitude followed by a sampling stage with a common sampling rate of 128Hz and number of samples equal to 65536. This allowed all signals to have the same length. Number of instances for ARR, NSR, and CHF class are respectively 96, 30, and 36 which equates to a total of 162 ECG recordings.

Table I: Training Parameters for Convolutional Neural Network

| Class       | Hidden Layer Activation | Dropout Rate | Initial Learning Rate | Shuffle Frequency | Optimizer | Base Architecture |
|-------------|-------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------|------------------|
| ARR         | Rectified Linear Unit   | 0.5          | 0.05                  | 200              | Adam      | VGG-16           |
| NSR         | Rectified Linear Unit   | Same         | 0.05                  | 200              | Adam      | MobileNet        |
| CHF         | Softmax Activation      | Same         | 0.05                  | 200              | Adam      | Xception         |

B. Dataset Preprocessing

Time series data is not compatible with CNN architecture. To make it compatible, CWT (Continuous Wavelet Transform) is utilized to convert the one-dimensional signal to a two-dimensional scalogram.

\[
C(a, b; f(t), \psi(t)) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t) \frac{1}{a} \psi^*(\frac{t - b}{a}) dt \tag{1}
\]

CWT is generally expressed by the equation shown in (1) defined by a scale parameter \( a > 0 \) and position parameter \( b \). This is used as an analyzing function to measure the similarity between the wavelet and the signal by equating the inner product between them. The CWT is defined as the sum of the signal multiplied by scaled and shifted versions of the wavelet function \( \psi(t) \) also known as the mother wavelet. A small value of \( a \) signifies a compressed wavelet which captures rapid changing details whereas a large value of \( a \) captures slowly changing details. Generated scalograms after CWT applied to 1D signals can be interpreted as a time-frequency representation of the time-series signal. Fig 4 shows sample scalogram images after applying CWT to three ECG classes. The generated scalograms are of dimension of \( 224 \times 224 \times 3 \) each.

C. Proposed Methods

Two different approaches are explored to correctly categorize the three classes. Firstly, a simple CNN architecture is used as a reference to classify the scalograms. In the second approach, we made use of both transfer learning and ensemble methods combining three different pre-trained deep CNN architectures. The following sections will give a detailed overview of these two approaches.

For the first approach, a CNN is constructed by stacking several repeated blocks as shown in fig 3. A single block consists
of a convolutional layer followed by a Batch Normalization layer. The purpose of the convolutional layer is to extract relevant features from the scalogram. Batch normalization layers significantly speed up the training process as it standardizes the input data for each batch. The next layer is a dropout layer whose purpose is to prevent overfitting by randomly turning off some learning parameter. The final layer in the block is a pooling layer which reduces the spatial size of the previous layer output. These repeated blocks are finally terminated with an additional dropout layer. After that, flattening is done to convert to dense layer which is required for classification. The output layer is activated by Softmax Activation Function. Hyper-parameters used for this model is summarized in Table I. They were fine-tuned after several test and trial to keep high accuracy and low loss.

The final layer is composed of three perceptions and activation function for this layer is softmax, which is a common practice for multi-class classification. Softmax generates a probability value between 0 to 1 based on the confidence of prediction. The model was trained for 4 min 36 sec with a batch size of 128.

In the second approach, prior to building the model, augmentation was performed to increase the quantity of training data and to incorporate variance into the dataset. The dataset’s size expanded from 162 to 486 as a result of the augmentation.

Two different state-of-the-art pre-trained CNN architectures are incorporated for the ensemble model which are, respectively, VGG-16 and InceptionResNetV2. A brief description about these two models are given in the following section.

1) Modified VGG-16: VGG-16 is a CNN Architecture that won the 2014 ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge (ILSVRC). The VGG-16 architecture is an enhancement to the AlexNet design. Instead of directly employing the VGG-16, we made some slight modification, but kept the feature extraction part of the model which consists of consecutive
includes residual connections. It was trained on millions of classification. The complete ensemble architecture is shown in convolutional and pooling layers. Instead of directly transitioning to fully connected layers, two intermediate layers, dropout and global average pooling are used. Fully connected layers are vulnerable to overfitting, limiting the entire network’s generalization capabilities. To avoid this, dropout is added as an intermediate layer for regularization. The reason behind using the global average pooling layer is it enforces a strong correspondence between the feature maps and categories. Finally, three fully connected dense layers are used, where the final layer is comprised of three perceptions for three categories.

2) Modified InceptionResnetV2: InceptionResNetV2 is a convolutional neural network that extends the Inception family but includes residual connections. It was trained on millions of images from the ImageNet Database. The architecture accepts data in a certain format. Because of this, a preprocessing layer is used to convert to that particular format. Dropout and global average pooling are used for the same reason mentioned above. Finally, a single dense layer with softmax activation is used for classification. The complete ensemble architecture is shown in Fig. 5.

Ensemble method combines multiple architectures or algorithms to make predictions by combining the outputs. For classification type problems there are two major ways to combine the outputs, one is voting and another is averaging. In our work, we implemented the latter approach. The averaging mechanism works by combining each model’s prediction equally. The hyperparameters for the ensemble model are summarized in Table III.

### III. Result Analysis

With the custom CNN approach, the accuracy value is not satisfactory enough. The reason behind such performance is mainly the dataset size. Such a small dataset is not suitable for machine learning models because they tend to overfit, meaning they perform really well on training data, but poorly on test data. Even though the training accuracy is nearly 100%, the validation accuracy is 59.38%. We tried several empirical methods to regularize the model, but the accuracy value did not improve.

Because of this, in the second approach we utilized data augmentation. Additionally, after analyzing prior studies, we came to the conclusion that transfer learning works well for scalograms and can achieve quite good accuracy which motivated us to incorporate transfer learning in ensemble methods.

\[
\text{Precision} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \tag{2}
\]

\[
\text{Recall} = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \tag{3}
\]

Fig 6 represents how the accuracy and loss value change with increase in epoch for the ensemble approach. From the curves, it is obvious that the validation performance of the model is almost as good as the training performance which means the model is able to generalize. To make sure the model did not
overfit, we performed k-fold cross validation for 20 epoch with $k = 5$ which resulted in around 99.98% accuracy.

![Fig. 6: Training and validation Evaluation Curves for Ensemble Architecture](image)

Along with accuracy, other evaluation metrics like loss, accuracy, precision, and recall are calculated.

**TABLE IV: Evaluation Metrics of the Validation data for the Ensemble model**

| Evaluation Metric | Value  |
|-------------------|--------|
| Loss              | 0.226  |
| Accuracy          | 1.0    |
| Precision         | 1.0    |
| Recall            | 1.0    |

**REFERENCES**

[1] M. Zihlmann, D. Perekrestenko, and M. Tschannen, “Convolutional recurrent neural networks for electrocardiogram classification,” in 2017 Computing in Cardiology (CinC). IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–4.

[2] A. Rajkumar, M. Ganesan, and R. Lavanya, “Arrhythmia classification on eeg using deep learning,” in 2019 5th International Conference on Advanced Computing & Communication Systems (ICACCS). IEEE, 2019, pp. 365–369.

[3] A. Goldberger, L. Amaral, L. Glass, J. Hausdorff, P. Ivanov, R. Mark, J. Mietus, G. OB, C. Peng, and H. Stanley, “The mit-bih normal sinus rhythm database,” Circulation, vol. 101, no. 23, pp. e215–e220, 2000.

[4] S. Syama, G. S. Sweta, P. Kavyasree, and K. J. M. Reddy, “Classification of eeg signal using machine learning techniques,” in 2019 2nd International Conference on Power and Embedded Drive Control (ICPEDC). IEEE, 2019, pp. 122–128.

[5] E. Essa and X. Xie, “An ensemble of deep learning-based multi-model for eeg heartbeats arrhythmia classification,” IEEE Access, vol. 9, pp. 103 452–103 464, 2021.

[6] M. Boussa, I. Atouf, M. Aitib, and A. Bennis, “Eeg signals classification using mfcc coefficients and ann classifier,” in 2018 International Conference on Electrical and Information Technologies (ICEIT). IEEE, 2016, pp. 480–484.

[7] A. Y. Hanun, P. Rajpurkar, M. Haghpanahi, G. H. Tison, C. Bourn, M. P. Turakhia, and A. Y. Ng, “Cardiologist-level arrhythmia detection and classification in ambulatory electrocardiograms using a deep neural network,” Nature medicine, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 65–69, 2019.

[8] S. Y. SGN and N. OZKURT, “Eeg arrhythmia classification by using convolutional neural network and spectrogram,” in 2019 Innovations in Intelligent Systems and Applications Conference (ASTU). IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–6.

[9] A. Ullah, S. M. Anwar, M. Bilal, and R. M. Mehmood, “Classification of arrhythmia by using deep learning with 2-d eeg spectral image representation,” Remote Sensing, vol. 12, no. 10, p. 1685, 2020.

[10] C. Cordos, L. Mihail, P. Paragö, and S. Hintea, “Eeg signal classification using convolutional neural networks for biometric identification,” in 2021 44th International Conference on Telecommunications and Signal Processing (TSP), 2021, pp. 167–170.

[11] M. K. Gajendran, M. Z. Khan, and M. A. K. Khattak, “Eeg classification using deep transfer learning,” in 2021 4th International Conference on Information and Computer Technologies (ICICT). IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–5.

[12] N. Rahaja and S. V. Balwarkar, “A deep neural network approach to automatic multi-class classification of electrocardiogram signals,” in 2021 International Conference on Intelligent Technologies (CONF). IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–4.

[13] A. Demiroren and G. M. Mirsky, “Automated classification of electrocardiograms using weavelt analysis and deep learning,” in 2020 Comput- ing in Cardiology. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–4.

[14] W. Zhang, L. Yu, L. Ye, W. Zhuang, and P. Ma, “Eeg signal classification with deep learning for heart disease identification,” in 2018 International Conference on Big Data and Artificial Intelligence (BDAI). IEEE, 2018, pp. 47–51.

[15] M. A. Ahamed, K. A. Hasan, K. F. Monowar, N. Mashnoor, and M. A. Hossain, “Eeg heartbeat classification using ensemble of efficient machine learning approaches on imbalanced datasets,” in 2020 2nd International Conference on Advanced Information and Communication Technology (ICAICT). IEEE, 2020, pp. 140–145.

[16] J. S. Huang, B.-Q. Chen, N.-Y. Zeng, X.-C. Cao, and Y. Li, “Accurate classification of eeg arrhythmia using n2wp enhanced fast compression deep learning networks,” Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing, pp. 1–18, 2020.
| Year | Reference          | Dataset  | Method                        | Performance (Accuracy) |
|------|--------------------|----------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| 2018 | Zhang et al. [14]  | MIT-BIH  | 12-layer 1-d CNN             | 97.70%                 |
| 2019 | Syama et al. [4]   | MIT-BIH  | MLPNN                         | 94.00%                 |
| 2020 | Huang et al. [16]  | MIT-BIH  | FCRResNet using MOWPT        | 98.79%                 |
| 2020 | Ahamed et al. [15] | MIT-BIH  | KNN                           | 97.64%                 |
|      |                    |          | Decision Tree                 | 96.11%                 |
|      |                    |          | ANN                           | 98.06%                 |
|      |                    |          | Support Vector Machine        | 97.58%                 |
|      |                    |          | LSTM                          | 95.53%                 |
|      |                    |          | Ensemble Approach             | 97.78%                 |
| 2021 | Cordos et al. [10] | Fantasia | Transfer Learning with Inception-v3 | 99.5%                 |
| 2022 | Ours [17]          | Physionet| Transfer Learning based Ensemble with Data Augmentation | 99.98% |

[17] A. L. Goldberger, L. A. Amaral, L. Glass, J. M. Hausdorff, P. C. Ivanov, R. G. Mark, J. E. Mietus, G. B. Moody, C.-K. Peng, and H. E. Stanley, “Physiobank, physiotoolkit, and physionet: components of a new research resource for complex physiologic signals,” *circulation*, vol. 101, no. 23, pp. e215–e220, 2000.

[18] G. B. Moody and R. G. Mark, “The impact of the mit-bih arrhythmia database,” *IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Magazine*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 45–50, 2001.

[19] D. S. Baim, W. S. Colucci, E. S. Monrad, H. S. Smith, R. F. Wright, A. Lanoue, D. F. Gauthier, B. J. Ransil, W. Grossman, and E. Braunwald, “Survival of patients with severe congestive heart failure treated with oral milrinone,” *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 661–670, 1986.