



OPEN ACCESS

APPROVED BY
Frontiers Editorial Office,
Frontiers Media SA, Switzerland

*CORRESPONDENCE
Frontiers Production Office
✉ production.office@frontiersin.org

RECEIVED 05 March 2024
ACCEPTED 05 March 2024
PUBLISHED 14 March 2024

CITATION

Frontiers Production Office (2024) Erratum:
Convolutional neural network (CNN)-enabled
electrocardiogram (ECG) analysis: a
comparison between standard twelve-lead
and single-lead setups.
Front. Cardiovasc. Med. 11:1396396.
doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2024.1396396

COPYRIGHT

© 2024 Frontiers Production Office. This is an
open-access article distributed under the
terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution
License \(CC BY\)](#). The use, distribution or
reproduction in other forums is permitted,
provided the original author(s) and the
copyright owner(s) are credited and that the
original publication in this journal is cited, in
accordance with accepted academic practice.
No use, distribution or reproduction is
permitted which does not comply with these
terms.

Erratum: Convolutional neural network (CNN)-enabled electrocardiogram (ECG) analysis: a comparison between standard twelve-lead and single-lead setups

Frontiers Production Office*

Frontiers Media SA, Lausanne, Switzerland

KEYWORDS

artificial intelligence, deep learning, electrocardiogram, single-lead, screening

An Erratum on:

Convolutional neural network (CNN)-enabled electrocardiogram (ECG) analysis: a comparison between standard twelve-lead and single-lead setups

By Saglietto A, Baccega D, Esposito R, Anselmino M, Dusi V, Fiandrotti A and De Ferrari GM (2024). Front. Cardiovasc. Med. 11:1327179. doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2024.1327179

Due to a production error, the first sentence of the Results paragraph in the abstract was incorrectly given as “The CNN based on single-lead ECG (D1) outperformed the one based on the standard 12-lead framework [with an average percentage difference of the area under the curve (AUC) of -8.7%].”.

This has been corrected to “The CNN based on single-lead ECG (D1) achieved satisfactory performance compared to the standard 12-lead framework (average percentage AUC difference: -8.7%).”

The publisher apologizes for this mistake. The original version of this article has been updated.