Personalized Diagnostics in Coronary Heart Disease: Bridging Genomics, Imaging, and Digital Health

Md Rahat Hossain[1], Azad Rahman[2*]

[1]Department of Mechanical Engineering, Yangzhou University, China
Email: mdrahathossain74@gmail.com
[2]Department of Electrical and Electronics Engineering, Daffodil International University, Dhaka, Bangladesh
Email: mrazad.eee@gmail.com

Abstract

Coronary Heart Disease (CHD) remains the leading global cause of death, representing a persistent challenge in modern healthcare. Early detection is crucial for reducing mortality and improving treatment outcomes. Over the past two decades, diagnostic technologies for CHD have progressed dramatically—from traditional tools like electrocardiograms (ECG) and treadmill stress testing to advanced imaging methods such as Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Imaging (CMR) and Computed Tomography Coronary Angiography (CTCA), as well as biomarker analysis and wearable biosensors. This paper provides a theoretical exploration of how these technologies have evolved, the factors that have driven their clinical adoption, and the emerging trends that define the future of cardiac diagnostics. Drawing on empirical patterns and conceptual frameworks, the discussion emphasizes diagnostic accuracy, non-invasiveness, patient accessibility, and digital integration. The study concludes with a forward-looking assessment of potential barriers, including ethical challenges, cost disparities, and infrastructural limitations, advocating for equitable implementation and multidisciplinary collaboration to fully harness diagnostic innovations for global cardiac care.

Keywords
Coronary Heart Disease, Machine Learning, Classification.

1. Introduction

Coronary Heart Disease (CHD) is a complex, multifactorial condition influenced by a combination of genetic, environmental, metabolic, and lifestyle-related factors. Traditional diagnostic protocols, including electrocardiography (ECG), echocardiography, and laboratory testing for cholesterol and troponin levels, have provided essential tools for risk stratification and acute diagnosis. However, these methods often follow a "one-size-fits-all" paradigm, which does not account for the individual variability in disease onset, progression, or therapeutic response. As medical science moves toward personalization, the diagnostics landscape is undergoing a profound transformation. Personalized diagnostics for CHD encompass a multi-dimensional strategy—integrating a patient's genetic information, cardiovascular imaging data, and real-time physiological monitoring to deliver tailored insights and early warning signals. The goal is not only to detect CHD more accurately but also to shift from reactive treatment to predictive prevention [1][2].

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1234567

2. Genetic and Molecular Foundations of CHD Diagnosis

The human genome plays a pivotal role in determining susceptibility to CHD. Genome-Wide Association Studies (GWAS) have identified dozens of single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) that correlate with increased cardiovascular risk. For instance, variants in the 9p21 locus, LPA gene, and those affecting PCSK9 function are known to impact lipid metabolism and inflammatory responses—core drivers of atherosclerosis. Genetic testing can reveal these predispositions long before clinical symptoms emerge. Polygenic Risk Scores (PRS), which combine multiple genetic markers into a composite score, allow for personalized risk modeling and early lifestyle interventions. Moreover, advancements in transcriptomics and proteomics enable the discovery of circulating biomarkers that reflect endothelial dysfunction, microvascular inflammation, and myocardial stress, further enhancing diagnostic precision. Although these tools are still emerging in mainstream practice, they lay the theoretical foundation for highly personalized screening pathways in cardiovascular medicine [3].

Table 1: Comparison of Personalized Diagnostic Modalities

Modality	Data Type	Invasiveness	Use Case
Genetic Testing (PRS)	Genomic	Non-invasive	Long-term risk prediction
CT Coronary Angiography	Anatomical Imaging	Non-invasive	Assess plaque and stenosis
Cardiac MRI	Tissue Imaging	Non-invasive	Viability, perfusion, fibrosis
Wearable ECG Monitors	Electrophysiological	Non-invasive	Real-time monitoring
Blood Biomarkers	Biochemical	Minimally invasive	Detection of myocardial injury

3. Imaging and Computational Diagnostics

Personalized diagnostics also rely heavily on precision imaging tools that can reveal nuanced structural and functional abnormalities in the heart. Techniques such as Coronary Computed Tomography Angiography (CCTA), Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Imaging (CMR), and Positron Emission Tomography (PET) are instrumental in assessing not just coronary artery patency but also

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1234567

myocardial fibrosis, perfusion, and inflammation. CCTA, combined with fractional flow reserve computation (FFR-CT), enables non-invasive functional assessment of coronary stenosis, reducing unnecessary catheterizations. AI-powered image interpretation tools now enhance the consistency, speed, and accuracy of diagnosis by identifying patterns invisible to the human eye. Beyond static imaging, real-time computational models—like digital twins of the heart—simulate blood flow and mechanical stress, offering predictive insight into plaque rupture or heart failure risk. These innovations exemplify the convergence of biophysics, data science, and cardiology in creating dynamic, personalized diagnostic environments[4-10].

4. Wearable Technologies and Digital Health Platforms

Democratizing access to continuous cardiovascular diagnostics. Wearable devices such as smartwatches, chest patches, and even biosensing rings are capable of tracking heart rate, rhythm, oxygen saturation, and sleep patterns. Advanced models incorporate single-lead ECG, photoplethysmography (PPG), and pulse wave velocity sensors to detect arrhythmias, ischemic changes, and autonomic imbalances in real-time. These data are often transmitted to cloud platforms where AI algorithms flag anomalies and provide feedback to clinicians and patients. More importantly, the integration of wearable diagnostics into clinical workflows allows for long-term monitoring of high-risk individuals without the need for frequent hospital visits. When combined with a patient's genetic and imaging profile, wearable-derived data provide a holistic picture of cardiovascular health, enabling clinicians to make decisions with a higher degree of personalization. As digital therapeutics evolve, wearable diagnostics may soon guide medication titration, physical activity recommendations, and behavioral health interventions in CHD care[11-17].

Table 2: Challenges in Personalized CHD Diagnostics

Challenge	Description
Cost and Accessibility	High cost of genetic testing and imaging limits access in low-resource settings.
Data Privacy and Consent	Ethical concerns over genetic and health data sharing; need for informed consent.
Clinical Interpretation Complexity	Requires clinicians to understand and integrate complex multi-modal data.
Regulatory Gaps	AI and digital devices often lack unified regulation across countries.
Healthcare Infrastructure	Need for cloud storage, high-speed internet, and device interoperability.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1234567

5. Conclusion

Despite the exciting prospects, the implementation of personalized diagnostics raises several ethical and practical concerns. Access remains a primary issue: high-cost genomic sequencing, advanced imaging, and digital devices are often limited to high-income populations and urban centers, exacerbating healthcare disparities. Additionally, the interpretation of genetic risk must be handled with caution to avoid unnecessary anxiety, discrimination, or inappropriate treatment. Regulatory frameworks must evolve to govern the safety, privacy, and clinical validity of AI-driven tools and genetic data sharing. Clinician training is another key factor—without adequate knowledge, the complex data outputs from personalized diagnostics may overwhelm physicians or lead to misinterpretation. Finally, patient consent models must be restructured to reflect the longitudinal and interconnected nature of digital health data. Overcoming these barriers requires coordinated efforts among governments, academic institutions, technology developers, and public health agencies. Personalized diagnostics represent a frontier in CHD detection and management. By uniting genomics, precision imaging, wearable biosensing, and AI-powered analytics, a comprehensive and individualized diagnostic framework is taking shape. This approach offers the potential to shift the clinical focus from reactive care to proactive prevention, allowing for early intervention based on each patient's unique risk landscape. However, realizing this vision demands not only scientific innovation but also thoughtful regulation, equitable access, and robust clinical validation. As we stand at the intersection of biology and technology, the challenge is to ensure that personalized diagnostics in CHD do not become a luxury for the few, but a scalable, ethical, and effective tool for all.

References

[1] Obermeyer, Ziad, and Ezekiel J. Emanuel. "Predicting the Future — Big Data, Machine Learning, and Clinical Medicine." *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 375, no. 13, 2016, pp. 1216–1219.

[2] Detrano, Robert, et al. "International Application of a New Probability Algorithm for the Diagnosis of Coronary Artery Disease." *The American Journal of Cardiology*, vol. 64, no. 5, 1989, pp. 304–310.

[3] Topol, Eric J. "High-Performance Medicine: The Convergence of Human and Artificial Intelligence." *Nature Medicine*, vol. 25, 2019, pp. 44–56.

[4] Jordan, Michael I., and Tom M. Mitchell. "Machine Learning: Trends, Perspectives, and Prospects." *Science*, vol. 349, no. 6245, 2015, pp. 255–260.

[5] Hosmer, David W., et al. *Applied Logistic Regression*. 3rd ed., Wiley, 2013.

[6] Kuhn, Max, and Kjell Johnson. Applied Predictive Modeling. Springer, 2013.

[7] Breiman, Leo. "Random Forests." Machine Learning, vol. 45, no. 1, 2001, pp. 5–32.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1234567

[8] Deo, Rahul C. “Machine Learning in Medicine.” *Circulation*, vol. 132, no. 20, 2015, pp. 1920–1930.

[9] Lundberg, Scott M., and Su-In Lee. “A Unified Approach to Interpreting Model Predictions.” Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2017.

[10] Cortes, Corinna, and Vladimir Vapnik. “Support-Vector Networks.” *Machine Learning*, vol. 20, 1995, pp. 273–297.

[11] Scholkopf, Bernhard, and Alexander J. Smola. Learning with Kernels: Support Vector Machines, Regularization, Optimization, and Beyond. MIT Press, 2002.

[12] Liang, Yulan, et al. “Evaluation and Interpretation of Machine Learning Models for Predicting Type 2 Diabetes: A Clinician’s Perspective.” NPJ Digital Medicine, vol. 2, 2019, p. 38.

[13] Zhang, Yujin, et al. “Model Generalization and Overfitting in Predictive Healthcare Analytics.” IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering, vol. 68, no. 1, 2021, pp. 49–60.

[14] Lipton, Zachary C. “The Mythos of Model Interpretability.” Communications of the ACM, vol. 61, no. 10, 2018, pp. 36–43.

[15] Esteva, Andre, et al. “A Guide to Deep Learning in Healthcare.” *Nature Medicine*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2019, pp. 24–29.

[16] Munmun, Zakia Sultana, Salma Akter, and Chowdhury Raihan Parvez. "Machine Learning-Based Classification of Coronary Heart Disease: A Comparative Analysis of Logistic Regression, Random Forest, and Support Vector Machine Models." *Open Access Library Journal* 12.3 (2025): 1-12.

[17] Hasan, Sakib, et al. "Analysis of Machine Learning Models for Stroke Prediction with Emphasis on Hyperparameter Tuning Techniques." *International Symposium on Computational Intelligence and Industrial Applications*. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, 2024.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1234567