Understanding the transition from paroxysmal to persistent atrial fibrillation
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Atrial fibrillation (AF) is the most common cardiac arrhythmia, characterised by the chaotic motion of electrical wavefronts in the atria. In clinical practice, AF is classified under two primary categories: paroxysmal AF, short intermittent episodes separated by periods of normal electrical activity, and persistent AF, longer uninterrupted episodes of chaotic electrical activity. However, the precise reasons why AF in a given patient is paroxysmal or persistent is poorly understood. Recently, we have introduced the percolation based Christensen-Manani-Peters (CMP) model of AF which naturally exhibits both paroxysmal and persistent AF, but precisely how these differences emerge in the model is unclear. In this paper, we dissect the CMP model to identify the cause of these different AF classifications. Starting from a mean-field model where we describe AF as a simple birth-death process, we add layers of complexity to the model and show that persistent AF arises from the formation of temporally stable structural re-entrant circuits that form from the interaction of wavefront collisions during paroxysmal AF. These results are compatible with recent findings suggesting that the formation of re-entrant drivers in fibrotic border zones perpetuates persistent AF.

I. INTRODUCTION

Atrial fibrillation (AF) is the most common cardiac arrhythmia with a growing prevalence worldwide \cite{1}. It is characterised by the rapid, irregular beating of the atria, caused by the chaotic motion of electrical wavefronts. This lack of coordinated contraction may allow blood to clot, making AF the leading cause of ischaemic stroke in the over 75s \cite{2}.

Despite over one hundred years of extensive research, the mechanisms underlying the initiation and maintenance of AF are still poorly understood \cite{3,8}. There are numerous controversies and conflicts in AF research, primary of which is the question of whether AF is driven and sustained by local sources of new fibrillatory waves, or whether AF is self-sustaining from the interaction and fragmentation of multiple meandering electrical wavelets in the atria \cite{4,6,8}. Although this dispute is yet to be resolved, recent evidence appears to strengthen the case for local drivers as the primary mechanism of AF \cite{5,9,18}.

Questions concerning the underlying mechanism of AF are of particular importance because they inform potential treatment strategies. Historically, treatment for AF has focused on mitigating potential symptoms and lowering the risk of stroke through the use of rate control, and anti-arrhythmic drugs \cite{19}. However, these treatments do not “cure” AF. Surgical ablation strategies have been developed to destroy, or isolate, the regions of atrial muscle thought to be responsible for initiating and sustaining AF \cite{8}. If local drivers are responsible for AF, ablating the focus of these drivers may terminate and prevent AF.

If meandering wavelets underlie AF, ablation strategies which minimise the space wavelets can move into may be preferable. Although the leading ablation strategy, pulmonary vein isolation \cite{20}, has a success rate of around 60%, ablation still fails in a large subset of patients and AF re-occurs in many patients who were initially free of AF after surgery.

One of the key factors determining the likelihood of ablation success is the fraction of time a patient spends in AF \cite{8}. Clinically, AF is defined as paroxysmal if episodes are short and self-terminating. Conversely, long, uninterrupted AF episodes are referred to as persistent. In general, patients are much more likely to be free of AF after ablative treatment if AF is paroxysmal. The success rate is around 60% for paroxysmal AF while it is 40% for persistent AF after a three year follow-up \cite{21}. Recurrence rates are also significantly higher for persistent AF after an initially successful treatment. However, why a patient exhibits paroxysmal or persistent AF is unclear. In many cases paroxysmal AF will develop into persistent AF, but reversion to paroxysmal AF after years of persistent AF has also been observed \cite{22}. Additionally, of the patients who initially exhibit paroxysmal AF, many develop persistent AF rapidly (after a few months), but others do not progress at all over several years \cite{23}.

The progression of AF from paroxysmal to persistent is often associated with the idea that “AF begets AF”, most notably in the goat model \cite{24}, but also with some evidence in human AF \cite{25}. During AF, the atria undergo electrophysiological and structural changes which promote the progression of AF. Amongst these changes, the accumulation of fibrosis is a key factor in determining a patient’s susceptibility to AF \cite{26,28}. Fibrosis is also
critical for the formation of re-entrant circuits that drive AF [14 16 27]. The emergence of a re-entrant circuit begins when the regular propagation of electrical wavefronts is disrupted by unidirectional blocks. These blocks leave an opening for the conduction to re-enter back from adjacent muscle fibres [14 29]. When the atria accumulates fibrosis, the distribution of gap junctions between fibres becomes highly anisotropic, that is, adjacent fibres become less and less coupled. In this scenario, the re-entering conduction is less likely to be obstructed by refractory atrial muscle cells (myocytes), finding the appropriate conditions for initiating a spatially-stable circuit conduction (i.e. a re-entrant circuit) which drives AF. However, the relationship between the absolute fibrosis burden in the atria and the persistence of AF is not clear – two patients with an equivalent fibrosis burden may have drastically different forms of AF (e.g. no AF vs. persistent AF) [23].

In this paper, our aim is to better understand the relationship between AF persistence and the atrial microstructure using computational modelling. Computer models are a well established tool in cardiac electrophysiology, allowing for a range of experimental investigations that are not possible in a clinical, or laboratory setting. There are a wide variety of model types pitched at different scales and levels of complexity [30]. Highly detailed, biophysically realistic models focus on precisely modelling the exchange of ions across cardiomyocyte gap junctions to study the propagation of action potentials across topologically realistic cardiac tissue. However, the resolution of these models is often not ideal and they typically assume continuous cardiac tissue. Conversely, simplified discrete models focus on understanding the microstructure of cardiac tissue and how this affects the propagation of electrical wavefronts. The former are typically preferable when studying what effect a prospective drug might have on AF [30 31], whereas the latter are most often used to study the effect of discontinuous tissue that might arise from the accumulation of fibrosis [29 32 33]. The latter also have the benefit that their simplicity allows for much larger simulations suited to a statistical analysis [18 34].

Previously, we have introduced the Christensen-Manani-Peters (CMP) model of AF, a simple percolation based model that investigates how the formation of re-entrant circuits is dependent on the decoupling of neighbouring muscle fibres, through the action of fibrosis or otherwise [29]. The model is not a fully realistic representation of the atria and it does not consider the precise evolution and propagation of action potentials across the atrial tissue. However, the model effectively demonstrates from basic principles how re-entrant circuits can form if fibrosis accumulates in sufficient quantities in a given local area. Additionally, adaptations of the CMP model to 3D [18] and to a realistic atrial topology based on a sheep heart [35 36] have been successful at explaining a number of key clinical results and have generated a number of new hypotheses. This includes the distribution of re-entrant circuits in the atria, notably in the pulmonary vein sleeves and the atrial appendages, the appearance of re-entrant circuits as both re-entrant and focal sources, and the increased probability of ablation failure as AF becomes more persistent. Machine learning has been applied to the model to test prospective methods for automated re-entrant circuit detection from electrogram data [34], and other models inspired by the CMP approach have been used to study the heart rhythm of patients following a heart transplant [33].

Consistent with clinical knowledge, the CMP model has shown that two tissues with the same total fibrosis burden may exhibit very different forms of AF [37] – at the same level of coupling, different simulations may exhibit sinus rhythm, paroxysmal AF, persistent AF, or persistent AF before reverting to paroxysmal AF. This is because the formation of re-entrant circuits appears to be dependent on the local distribution of fibrosis, not the total fibrosis burden across the atria [37] – this is in line with other computational studies on the effect of fibrosis on AF persistence [35]. Despite these intriguing results, it is so far unclear how the variability in AF persistence arises from the specific processes taking place at the microscopic scale in the CMP model. Hence, the aim of this paper is to dissect the CMP model into its constituent parts to understand which parts of the model microstructure are responsible for the progression from paroxysmal to persistent AF.

A detailed overview of the CMP model will be given in Section [1] however, the key constituent elements include the lattice representing the atrial tissue, nodes representing individual muscle cells (or a block of cells), locations susceptible to unidirectional conduction block (where the propagating signal has a small probability of extinguishing), and lattice bonds representing the electrical connections between neighbouring nodes. The re-entrant circuits that form in the CMP model are spatially stable, but temporally intermittent – they can turn on and off as a result of local conduction block. This has similarities to the self-regenerating renewal process proposed by others to explain cardiac fibrillation, where fibrillation is driven by the continuous birth and death of temporarily intermittent drivers [39].

To dissect the CMP model, we first remove all spatial elements of the model. We do this by deriving a mean-field (MF) model where AF is described by a set of particles, representing critical structures which, when active, correspond to re-entrant circuits, evolving as a simple birth-death process. Our results indicate that the MF model significantly underestimates the probability of inducing AF relative to the CMP model, and that the MF model does not explain the emergence of persistent AF.

At a second level of abstraction, we reintroduce the spatial components of the model, but carefully control the re-entrant circuits that form by inhibiting the interaction of multiple simultaneous conduction blocks. Like the MF model, this controlled version of the CMP model
(cCMP) also underestimates the probability of inducing AF and the time in AF. However, the cCMP model does spend more time in AF than the MF model, despite being equally likely to enter AF. We show that this excess is due to the emergence of persistent AF from the formation of a new type of spatially stable and temporally stable re-entrant circuit that can not form in sinus rhythm, but which can form from the interaction of colliding wavefronts. These secondary re-entrant circuits are not susceptible to conduction block and therefore, once formed, initiate persistent AF that is hard to revert.

Finally, we show that the difference in the probability of inducing AF and the persistence of AF between the cCMP and CMP models can be explained by a series of complex re-entrant circuits that can only form from a number of simultaneous conduction blocks.

In the remainder of the paper, we outline the CMP model and review key results including previous work on the persistence of AF. Subsequently, we introduce the MF model and the cCMP model and explain why both these models underestimate the time spent in AF and the persistence of AF relative to the original CMP model. Finally, we put our results into a wider context and discuss their potential clinical impact, the limitations of our approach, and outline proposals for future work.

II. THE CMP MODEL

A. Model Definition

The atrial muscle consists of tubiform cells (myocytes) of length \( \Delta x' \approx 100 \mu \text{m} \) and diameter \( \Delta y' = \Delta z' \approx 20 \mu \text{m} \). Myocytes are mainly connected longitudinally, composing discrete fibres that sporadically connect transversally. The Christensen-Manani-Peters (CMP) model condenses this branching network of anisotropic cells into an \( L \times L \) square lattice of nodes \([29]\). A node resembles a single (or multiple) atrial cell(s). Nodes are longitudinally connected to their neighbours with probability \( \nu_{\parallel} = 1 \) and transversally with probability \( 0 \leq \nu_{\perp} \leq 1 \). This creates long arrangements of nodes, mimicking the protracted, interlaced fibres in the real atrium. This simplified representation of the myocardial architecture captures the anisotropic distribution of gap junctions \([40]\). Furthermore, it also reproduces the dynamics of electrical impulses which mainly propagate longitudinally (along single muscle fibres) rather than transversally (across multiple fibres) \([34]\). A cylindrical topology is obtained by applying open boundary conditions longitudinally and periodic boundary conditions transversally.

Nodes follow a well defined electrical cycle characterized by three different states: resting (node that can be excited), excited or refractory (after exciting, the node cannot be excited for the next \( T \) time steps). This course mimics the membrane potential of real myocardial cells. At a given time \( t \), an excited node prompts the neighboring resting nodes to become excited at time \( t + 1 \). An excited node at time \( t \) enters into a refractory state at time \( t + 1 \). The duration of the refractory period is \( \tau \) time steps, see Fig. 1.

In the CMP model, nodes are susceptible to conduction block with probability \( \delta \). These nodes are identified at the beginning of a simulation and are fixed in space. The probability that nodes that are susceptible to conduction block fail to excite is arbitrarily set to \( \epsilon = 0.05 \) – the effect of varying this parameter is discussed in section III C. This leaves us with a very simple framework in which the fraction of transversal connections, \( \nu_{\perp} \), and the fraction of nodes that are susceptible to conduction block, \( \delta \), serve as control parameters. For simplicity, we set \( \delta = 0.01 \) and examine how the system behavior varies with \( \nu_{\perp} \). The effect of changing \( \delta \) is demonstrated in section IV and has been investigated in \([42]\).

The pacemaker (sinus node) is placed on the left side of the 2D sheet and nodes lying on this edge regularly excite every \( T \) time steps. The excitation propagates as a planar wavefront, mimicking the coordinated contraction of the real atrial muscle. The parameters of the CMP model reflect clinical observations of real human atrial tissues \([14, 40, 41, 43–45]\). Clinical measurements are translated into the model, followed by a coarse-graining procedure leading to a square lattice of size \( L = 200 \) nodes, pacemaker period of \( T = 220 \) time steps, and refractory pe-
FIG. 2. The formation of a re-entrant circuit in the CMP model. The node that is susceptible to conduction block is marked by a red square. (a) An incoming planar wavefront (green arrows) reaches the susceptible node. (b) The node fails to excite, blocking the progression of the wavefront in the lower fibre. The wavefront advances in the upper fibre, until it reaches a transversal connection to the lower fibre. This establishes a structural (i.e. spatially stable) re-entrant circuit in the region surrounded by the blue rectangular box. If the conduction blocking node fails to fire again, the re-entrant circuit is terminated.

period of a node of $\tau = 50$ time steps. This refractory period is relatively short and corresponds to what may be seen clinically during burst pacing. The dynamics of the model are maintained under changes of $\tau$, but the transition from sinus rhythm to fibrillation takes place at a different point in the coupling phase space. The longer (shorter) the refractory period, $\tau$, the smaller (larger) the coupling value, $\nu_{\perp}$, needs to be to induce AF.

The CMP model reveals that the emergence of re-entrant circuits is due to a combination of the electrical signal propagating on the branching structure of a heart muscle network, the three-state dynamics of nodes, and the occurrence of nodes susceptible to unidirectional conduction block. These latter nodes may fail to excite in response to an excited neighbour with small probability $\epsilon$, stopping the regular propagation of the wavefront. The wave of excitation proceeds forwards in the adjacent fibre until it reaches a transversal connection, leaking back through the fibre in which conduction has been previously blocked. For re-entrant circuits to emerge, the segment between the re-entry point and the node that has previously failed to excite must be long enough to prevent the backward propagating wave from being stopped by unresponsive refractory nodes. This happens when the probability of transverse connections decreases, for example, due to fibrosis. In the CMP model the formation of re-entrant circuits triggers AF. These activities survive until the circuital motion of the wavefront is annihilated by a subsequent conduction block occurring within the path of the circuit (i.e. self-termination) or by other waves spreading from the neighbouring regions, see Fig. 2. For full activation maps see [29].

Note, in the CMP model cells are coupled with probability $\nu_{\perp}$ across the whole tissue. However, in the real atrium only a small patch of fibrosis may be necessary to decouple fibres and induce a re-entrant circuit. Such small patches of fibrosis may be too small to see using current MRI technologies, inhibiting effective treatment.

B. Theoretical CMP model results

The CMP model allows us to analytically compute the risk of developing AF with respect to the fraction of transversal connections $\nu_{\perp}$. The risk is defined as the likelihood that the $L \times L$ grid has at least one region that can host a re-entrant circuit. The probability of having at least one transversal link on a given node is

$$p_{\nu_{\perp}} = 1 - (1 - \nu_{\perp})^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

Let $\ell$ be the distance (in number of nodes) between a node that is susceptible to conduction block and the first node to the right which has at least one transversal connection. By making use of Eq. (1), we find that the probability of $\ell$ being equal to $k$ nodes is

$$P(\ell = k) = (1 - p_{\nu_{\perp}})^k p_{\nu_{\perp}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

A given region cannot sustain a re-entrant circuit if $\ell$ is strictly smaller than $\tau/2$, see Fig. 2. The likelihood of this event can be calculated by summing over the probabilities of $\ell$ from 0 to $\tau/2 - 1$,

$$P(\ell < \tau/2) = \sum_{j=0}^{\tau/2-1} (1 - p_{\nu_{\perp}})j p_{\nu_{\perp}} = 1 - (1 - \nu_{\perp})^{\tau/2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

Because the average number of nodes that are susceptible to conduction block is $\delta L^2$, the risk of having at least one region that can host a re-entrant circuit $R$ is the complementary of the probability that the segments departing from each of these nodes are always shorter than $\tau/2$,

$$R = 1 - (P(\ell < \tau/2))^\delta L^2 = 1 - [1 - (1 - \nu_{\perp})^{\tau/2}]^\delta L^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

Equation (4) provides a simple analytical tool to estimate the risk of developing AF. The result indicates that the risk of AF increases as the tissue becomes more decoupled/fibrotic, in agreement with the current clinical understanding. Likewise, the theory predicts that...
sustained by conduction block fail simultaneously. Some re-entrant circuits may only activate if two nodes the architecture of the hosting region, see Fig. 3. Notably, re-entrant circuit varies across the lattice depending on the model. For instance, the probability of triggering a conduction blocking node. However, this assumption does not re-entrant circuits form from the failure of a single conduction blocking node (red squared border) and the first regular node to the right which has at least one transversal connection for the structure to sustain a re-entrant circuit. The wavefront direction is indicated by the green arrows. (a)-(b) Simple critical structures are triggered by a single block of the incoming planar wavefront originating from sinus rhythm. These structures might include multiple nodes that are susceptible of conduction block, increasing the probability of self-termination. (c)-(f) The activation of complex critical structures requires a sequence of conduction blocks of the planar wavefront or waves of excitation not originating from sinus rhythm. The probability of triggering these regions is much smaller than in (a)-(b). (c) The presence of at least one transversal connection departing from the conduction blocking node makes the activation more difficult as this node must fail to excite twice before prompting a re-entrant circuit. (d) This structure cannot be triggered from sinus rhythm but it can be triggered by a single block of a wave of excitation originating from elsewhere. (e)-(f) The activation of these structures requires multiple blocks of the planar wavefront to occur in different nodes.

the risk of fibrillation increases as the size of the atrial tissue increases, in agreement with clinical practice where left atrial volume is used as a predictor of the risk of developing AF [48].

This theoretical result builds on the assumption that re-entrant circuits form from the failure of a single conduction blocking node. However, this assumption does not account for all instances in which AF is triggered in the model. For instance, the probability of triggering a re-entrant circuit varies across the lattice depending on the architecture of the hosting region, see Fig. 3. Notably, some re-entrant circuits may only activate if two nodes susceptible to conduction block fail simultaneously.

These details indicate that the CMP theory represents an ideal case for AF driven by simple re-entrant circuits only. The theory assumes that if a circuit exists, the tissue spends 100% of the time in AF. Therefore, the theory curve sets a limit on the maximum time the model can spend in AF due to simple circuits only.

C. Model Behavior

Local regions that are capable of hosting re-entrant circuits are called critical structures, see Fig. 2. A critical structure is active (inactive) when it hosts (does not host) a re-entrant circuit. In the CMP model, critical structures are classified according to the complexity of their activation and deactivation mechanisms. Structures which can activate from the failure of a single conduction blocking node from sinus rhythm are referred to as simple. This includes cases where a critical structure contains multiple conduction blocking nodes, but only one must fail to allow for the formation of a re-entrant circuit. All other configurations in which the planar wavefront from sinus rhythm requires multiple conduction blocks to form a re-entrant circuit are referred to as complex. Additionally, the latter class includes critical structures that are only triggered by waves of excitation not originating from sinus rhythm (proceeding from right to left on the lattice), see Fig 3(d).

For large values of $\nu_\perp$, the model is in sinus rhythm indefinitely. The high number of transversal connections excludes the presence of regions that are critical for AF initiation and preservation as there are no sections of length $\geq \tau/2$ without a transverse connection. When $\nu_\perp$ decreases, for example due to increasing fibrosis [49], we observe a more pronounced branching structure of the lattice which favours the spontaneous emergence of structures that can host re-entrant circuits. This increases the risk of developing AF.

When $\nu_\perp$ is sufficiently small, increasing $\delta$ extends the time the system spends in AF. This occurs because a larger fraction of nodes are susceptible to conduction block and this increases the number of regions that can host a re-entrant circuit. However, the sensitivity of the system to the fraction of conduction blocking cells, $\delta$, rapidly vanishes as $\nu_\perp$ increases, suggesting that weak branching prevents the formation of critical structures regardless the fraction of nodes that are susceptible of conduction block [42]. The probability that a conduction blocking node fails to excite, $\epsilon$, does not significantly influence the relationships between $\nu_\perp$ and the fraction of time the system spends in AF [42]. This implies that $\epsilon$ is mainly used to set the time scale of the model. The length of the refractory period, $\tau$, sets the minimum distance between the conduction blocking node and the first regular node to the right which has at least one transversal connection for the structure to sustain a re-entrant circuit, see Fig. 2 and Fig. 3. Given a fixed value of $\delta$, lowering $\tau$ increases the number of regions that can host re-entrant circuits, increasing the time the system spends
in AF.

In the CMP model, the system is defined to have entered AF if the number of active nodes per time step $a(t)$ exceeds $1.1 \times L$ (220) nodes for $T$ consecutive time steps,

$$p_{\text{CMP}}^\text{AF} = 1\{\min([a(t)\ldots a(t+T)])\geq 220\},$$

where $t = 1, \ldots, S - T$ and $S$ is the duration of the experiment (in time steps). We use Eq. (5) to study how the probability of inducing AF varies with the amount of coupling $\nu_\perp$ and compare this statistics with its theoretical estimations, see Eq. (4). Alternative definitions for when the model is in AF give comparable values as those derived from Eq. (5).

The probability of inducing AF in simulations of the CMP model is systematically higher than in the CMP theory, see Fig. 1. These findings are somewhat surprising since the CMP theory assumes the most favourable conditions for the emergence of AF from simple re-entrant circuits only, see Section II C. We assert that this excess could be explained by the fact that re-entrant circuits in the CMP model might have multiple mechanistic origins that are not accounted for in the CMP theory. Furthermore, the CMP theory assumes that re-entrant circuits are triggered by single unidirectional conduction blocks, that is, AF is exclusively driven by simple critical structures, see Fig. 3.

To better understand the discrepancy between theory and experiment, we look at the trace of the number of active cells in the model. AF is paroxysmal when this statistics exhibits large fluctuations which prevent it from stabilizing above the AF threshold, i.e. the number of active cells frequently falls below 220 nodes with only short periods of high frequency activity. AF is persistent when the number of active nodes consistently exceeds the AF threshold for extended periods of time. If AF in the model has a unique mechanistic origin, we would expect tissues at the same level of coupling to exhibit statistically similar behaviors in the number of the active nodes over time. However, we find that this is not the case – there is significant heterogeneity among systems characterized by the same parameters (e.g. amount of uncoupling, fraction of conduction blocking nodes, etc.). For instance, in Fig. 5 all tissues are generated using the same parameters. Tissue (a) remains mostly in sinus rhythm with very short paroxysmal episodes. Tissue (b) remains mostly in fibrillation, but with frequent, short sinus rhythm intervals (most likely characterised as paroxysmal AF). Tissue (c) remains mostly in fibrillation, but alternates between long periods of stable fibrillation ($> 10^6$ time steps, short persistent episodes) and periods with frequent reversions to sinus rhythm (paroxysmal AF). Finally, tissue (d) shows an initial period of paroxysmal AF before permanently shifting towards persistent AF. Note, the model parameters have not been changed to induce the shift to persistent AF.

The variability in the persistence of AF in the CMP model has been studied previously [37]. The authors focused on the relationship between the amount of uncoupling in the lattice (i.e. $\nu_\perp$) and the features of the developed AF in 32 independent experiments. In agreement with clinical observations [23,50], they report high degrees of heterogeneity in the progression to persistent AF and in the amount of uncoupling required for AF to emerge. Similarly to Fig. 5 they observe very different AF patterns across systems characterized by the same amount of uncoupling, asserting that the emergence of re-entrant circuits is subject to the local distribution of transversal connections, not the global amount of coupling (i.e. $\nu_\perp$). However, the authors do not satisfactorily explain how and why different AF patterns emerge from the microstructure of the CMP model.

The findings presented in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 provide two important evidences against the assumption that AF is exclusively driven by simple re-entrant circuits. First, they show that the probability of inducing AF is systematically higher in the CMP model than in the CMP theory, see Fig. 4. Second, they reveal different activation patterns do not appear consistent with simple structures activating and deactivating with fixed rates. This moti-
FIG. 5. The number of excited nodes per time step \( a(t) \) (black thin line) and its moving average \( \langle a(t) \rangle \) calculated over \( T = 220 \) successive time steps (red solid line) in four different simulations of the CMP model. The system is in AF when the number of excited nodes per time step exceed 220 (blue threshold line) for at least \( T \) time steps. Despite being generated at the same level of coupling, \( \nu \perp = 0.11 \), we observe a high degree of heterogeneity across the four experiments. (a) The system is predominantly in sinus rhythm with sporadic and short-lived AF episodes. (b) Large fluctuations in the number of excited nodes per time step are observed throughout the experiment, indicating that the system is dominated by paroxysmal AF. (c) The number of excited nodes per time step alternates between periods of limited fluctuations and periods of large fluctuations, suggesting that the system develops different types of AF (persistent and paroxysmal, respectively) from time to time. (d) The system exhibits paroxysmal AF (large fluctuations) before transitioning into persistent AF (limited fluctuations) with no reversion to sinus rhythm.

This allows us to assess whether different mechanistic origins of AF are effectively present in the CMP model and how they eventually relate with the progression to persistent AF from paroxysmal AF.

In the following sections, we take up these challenges by removing layers of complexity from the CMP model. This allows us to derive simpler frameworks in which we can examine whether re-entrant circuits have different mechanistic origins and how the features of these activation processes influence the development of AF.

In Section [II], we start with the simplest approach by removing all the spatial elements of the CMP model. This is done by condensing the CMP model into a mean-field (MF) model in which complex critical structures and interactions between re-entrant circuits (i.e., wave collisions) are neglected. This simple framework allows us to study AF under the assumption that fibrillation is exclusively driven by independently activated simple re-entrant circuits. We show that the MF model systematically underestimates the probability of inducing AF and the persistence of AF.

In Section [IV], we dissect this discrepancy by reintroducing the spatial elements of the CMP model while carefully controlling the placement of nodes susceptible to conduction block. This prevents the formation of complex critical structures. The main advantage of this controlled CMP model (cCMP) over the simpler MF model is that it allows us to quantify how different activation mechanisms contribute to AF emergence and maintenance. Like the MF model, the cCMP model underestimates the probability of inducing AF and the persistence of AF with respect to the CMP model. However, the latter statistics is higher than in the MF model. We show that this excess is caused by temporally and spatially stable re-entrant circuits that can only form from colliding wavefronts during paroxysmal AF. This new type of AF driver, being anchored to regions that are not susceptible to conduction block, has a much smaller extinction rate, leading the system into persistent AF that is hard to revert.

Finally, we confirm that the difference in the probability of inducing AF and the persistence of AF between the CMP and cCMP models stems from the contribution of complex re-entrant circuits triggered by simultaneous conduction blocks. We demonstrate this by showing that as the probability that a node is susceptible to conduction block is lowered, the spatial density of conduction blocking nodes falls to the extent that multiple cells cannot fail simultaneously to form complex critical structures. As a result, the time the CMP and cCMP models spend in AF collapse onto a single curve. This indicates that no additional complex structures form in the CMP model beyond the simple re-entrant structures built into the cCMP model.

### III. MEAN-FIELD MODEL OF AF

In the CMP model, critical structures activate and deactivate to sustain AF. Initially, the system is in sinus rhythm as planar waves of excitation released from the sinus node (pacemaker) propagate on the lattice. The motion of the planar waves is disrupted now and then by conduction blocks occurring across the grid. At some point in time, a conduction block forms the initial re-entrant circuit. This re-entrant circuit cannot maintain AF indefinitely because it will either self-terminate or be terminated by waves spreading from the surrounding regions. However, its circuital motion intensifies the model activity, generating disorganized, high-frequency activation wavefronts that spread across the lattice. When the system enters this state, non-planar waves of excitation spreading from the active re-entrant circuit reach dormant critical structures at a much higher frequency than the pacemaker wave. This initiates a chain of asyn-
chronous activations and deactivations of different critical structures located across the lattice, protracting the current AF episode until the complete disappearance of re-entrant circuits brings the system back to sinus rhythm.

In the CMP model, it is unclear whether these interactions between simple critical structures are the only drivers of AF. In particular, the results discussed in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 motivate us to examine whether other activation mechanisms drive AF and how differences between paroxysmal and persistent AF emerge. The simplest approach to this problem is to derive a framework in which fibrillation is solely driven by independently activated simple re-entrant circuits and to compare AF-related statistics against the CMP model.

To do so, we translate the features of the CMP lattice into a simple mean-field (MF) model of AF in which N particles independently turn on and off. For a one-to-one comparison, the number of particles, N, is directly observed from the number of simple critical structures present in the CMP lattice. The fact that simple critical structures are characterized by a few well defined architectural features allows us to systematically inspect the grid and detect each region falling into this category.

In the MF model, the system is represented by a simple Markov chain. At a given time t, the state of the chain is the number of active particles N_a(t), such that t : N_a(t) = {0, 1, ..., N}. When N_a(t) = 0, the system reproduces the CMP sinus rhythm in which any critical structure has a chance to be triggered every T time steps (pacemaker frequency). On the other hand, N_a(t) ≥ 1 mirrors the AF dominated lattice. In this case, the length of active re-entrant circuits sets the frequency (in time steps) at which inactive critical structures can be triggered. For the sake of simplicity, we assume that particles have the same length ⟨ℓ⟩ corresponding to the average length (in number of nodes) of the simple critical structures tracked across the CMP lattice. At any time step, inactive particles activate with rate p and active particles deactivate with rate q, see Fig. 6.

Activation rates change depending on the state of the system, mimicking the fact that the presence of at least one re-entrant circuit significantly increases the frequency at which dormant critical structures can be triggered. It follows that p and q are given by:

\[
p = \begin{cases} \frac{\epsilon}{T}, & \text{if } N_a = 0, \\ \frac{\epsilon}{\langle \ell \rangle}, & \text{if } N_a > 0, \end{cases} \tag{6a}
\]

\[
q = \frac{\epsilon}{\langle \ell \rangle}. \tag{6b}
\]

The probability P_{i,j} of transitioning from i to j active particles is analytically derived,

\[
P_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=0}^{\min(i,N-i)} B(i,k,q)B(N-i,j-i+k,p) & \text{if } j \geq i \tag{7a} \\ \sum_{k=i-j}^{\min(i,N-i)} B(i,k,q)B(N-i,j-i+k,p) & \text{if } j < i \tag{7b} \end{cases}
\]

where B(N,n,p) = \binom{N}{k} p^k (1-p)^{N-k} is the binomial distribution yielding the probability of getting exactly k successes in N trials when the probability of success is p.

This simple model allows us to calculate the same AF-
related statistics that one can compute in simulations of the CMP model. For instance, we can easily adapt Eq. (5) to the MF model

$$p_{\text{MF}}^{\text{AF}} = \mathbb{1}(N_a(t) \geq 1)$$

(8)

where $t = 1, \ldots, S$ and $S$ is the duration of the experiment (in time steps). In addition, we are interested in measuring the time the system spends in AF as a function of the amount of coupling $\nu_\perp$. In the MF model, this statistic corresponds to the ratio between the number of time steps in which at least one particle is active and the duration of the experiment

$$T_{\text{MF}}^{\text{AF}} = S^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{S} \mathbb{1}(N_a(t) \geq 1).$$

(9)

By taking a continuous approximation and deriving a master equation, a full analytic solution can be derived for the fraction of time the model spends in AF,

$$T_{\text{CMP}}^{\text{AF}} = 1 - \tilde{p}(0) = \frac{2^N - 1}{2^N + p/p_0 - 1},$$

(10)

where $p_0$ is the probability of activating a particle when $N_a = 0$, and $\tilde{p}(0)$ is the probability that no particles are active. See appendix A for the derivation. Equation (10) indicates that the fraction of time spent in fibrillation only approaches 1 only when $N \to \infty$. However, for finite $N$, the fraction of time in AF is finite. Hence, the persistent AF observed in Fig. 5(d) is not explained by the simple birth-death like dynamics of simple re-entrant circuits underlying the continuous and discrete MF models.

For convenience, given the discrete nature of fibrillatory events and our interest in the probability of inducing fibrillation within a given time-frame, we choose to use the discrete version of the MF model as described above for the remainder of the paper.

In the MF model, the spatial elements of the CMP model are neglected to prevent the potential formation of re-entrant circuits from collisions between multiple waves of excitation. Furthermore, the correspondence between the numbers of simple critical structures and system particles excludes any eventual contribution from complex critical structures. The number of tracked simple critical structures reflects, to a good extent, the key architectural properties of the CMP lattice, namely, the amount of coupling (i.e. $\nu_\perp$) and the fraction of nodes that are susceptible to conduction block (i.e. $\delta$). Pegging the number of particles to the number of simple critical structures allows us to calibrate the MF model with the CMP model.

To compare the MF model with the CMP model, we define the time in AF for the CMP model equivalently to

$$T_{\text{CMP}}^{\text{AF}} = S^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{S} \mathbb{1}(a(t) \geq 220),$$

(11)

where $a(t)$ is the number of active nodes at time step $t$. The MF model spends significantly less time in AF than the CMP model, see Fig. 7. This result might have two different explanations. On the one hand, the neglected spatial features of critical structures, such as different lengths and asynchronous activation and deactivation, might have a significant role in AF emergence and maintenance. However, an enhanced version of the MF model, see appendix C reintroduces these omissions and indicates that these changes have no noticeable effect of the time the MF model spends in AF. On the other hand, AF in the CMP model might be driven by mechanisms other than simple re-entrant circuits, such as multiple conduction blocks, critical circuits that cannot be initiated from sinus rhythm, and collisions between wavefronts that significantly extend the duration and frequency of AF episodes by enabling a form of temporally stable functional re-entry. In appendix C we consider the case of the MF model with twice the number

FIG. 7. Phase diagram of the time in AF as a function of the fraction of transversal connections, $\nu_\perp$, for the CMP (black) and MF (blue) models. For each value of $\nu_\perp$ we perform 200 simulations of the CMP model and measure the time in AF over $S = 10^6$ time steps, see Eq. (11). We compute the sample average of this statistics across the 200 experiments (black squares). Error bars show the Gaussian 97.5% confidence intervals of the sample average. For each simulations of the CMP model we derive the associated MF model, see Fig. 6 and compute the time in AF according to Eq. (9). The time the system spends in AF is significantly higher in the CMP model (black) than in the MF model (blue). Sharp transitions in the time in AF occur around the threshold values $\nu_\perp^* \approx 0.11$ (CMP, black dashed line) and $\nu_\perp^* \approx 0.09$ (MF, blue dashed line).
of critical structures to simulate the effect that non-sinus rhythm re-entrant circuits might have on the time in AF. However, although these additional particles increase the time the MF model spends in AF, the total time in AF still falls below the CMP model. Hence, in the following sections we investigate the effect of temporally stable re-entrant circuits formed from wavefront collisions, and the effect multiple conduction blocks.

IV. COMPLEX CRITICAL STRUCTURES AND RE-ENTRANT CIRCUITS ORIGINATING FROM COLLISIONS BETWEEN MULTIPLE WAVES

The problem of detecting the variety of activation mechanisms and disentangling their roles in the patterns of AF can be approached in two ways. We may attempt to devise a detection algorithm to identify all simple and complex critical structures located across the lattice and assess their contribution to the phase diagrams in Fig. 7. However, the wide variation and complexity of these structures poses a significant challenge with no easy method to verify that all circuits have been detected.

A more straightforward approach involves deliberately constructing simple re-entrant circuits by controlling the placement of conduction blocking nodes across the lattice, referred to as the controlled CMP model (cCMP). For simplicity, we achieve this by identifying the isolated segments of length ≥τ/2 in the lattice and note which cells in the segment, if susceptible to conduction block, would form a simple re-entrant circuit consistent with those shown in Fig. 3. These cells are set to be susceptible to conduction block with probability δ. All other cells are not susceptible to conduction block. This leads to a special CMP lattice in which AF is driven by simple re-entrant circuits since conduction blocking nodes are only found in simple critical structures and not across the lattice as a whole.

To compare the cCMP and CMP models, we make a copy of the cCMP lattice and randomly place conduction blocking nodes across the lattice as a whole with probability δ – this model is equivalent to the regular CMP model. We simulate the two models and compare the probability of inducing AF and the time in AF. In this scenario, the eventual differences in AF related statistics quantify the contribution of complex critical structures to AF persistence and maintenance.

The probability of inducing AF and the time in AF are significantly higher in the CMP model than in the cCMP and MF models since the number of particles in the MF model is taken from the cCMP model. Hence, if the cCMP has at least one critical structure, the MF model also has at least one particle. For both the cCMP and MF models, the probability of a structure/particle activating approaches 1 as the simulation time is extended. Despite the exclusion of complex critical structures, the time in AF in the cCMP model is higher than in the MF model. Sharp transitions in the time in AF occur around the threshold values ν⊥ ≈ 0.11 (CMP, black dashed line), ν⊥ ≈ 0.10 (cCMP, red dashed line) and ν⊥ ≈ 0.09 (MF, blue dashed line).

FIG. 8. Phase diagrams of (a) the probability of inducing AF and (b) the time in AF as a function of the fraction of transversal connections, ν⊥, for the CMP (black), cCMP (red) and MF (blue) models. The probability of inducing AF is calculated according to Eq. (5) in the CMP and cCMP models and Eq. (8) in the MF model. The time in AF is calculated according to Eq. (9) in the CMP and cCMP models and Eq. (10) in the MF model. Both statistics are significantly higher in the CMP model than in the cCMP and MF models. The probability of inducing AF is the same in both the cCMP and MF models since the number of particles in the MF model is taken from the cCMP model. Hence, if the cCMP has at least one critical structure, the MF model also has at least one particle. For both the cCMP and MF models, the probability of a structure/particle activating approaches 1 as the simulation time is extended. Despite the exclusion of complex critical structures, the time in AF in the cCMP model is higher than in the MF model. Sharp transitions in the time in AF occur around the threshold values ν⊥ ≈ 0.11 (CMP, black dashed line), ν⊥ ≈ 0.10 (cCMP, red dashed line) and ν⊥ ≈ 0.09 (MF, blue dashed line).
structures. However, the major difference between these two frameworks lies in the fact that the cCMP model, modelling the atrial muscle as a lattice of nodes, reintroduces the spatial elements of the original CMP model. We hypothesise that the reintroduction of the spatial elements in the CMP model allows re-entrant circuits to form without the need for conduction blocking nodes, but from meandering wavefronts colliding between critical structures. These re-entrant circuits are temporally stable since they are not subject to conduction block, in contrast to the temporally intermittent re-entrant circuits that we expect from the structures shown in Fig. 3.

To investigate the existence of re-entrant circuits originating from colliding wavefronts, we first reflect on how the architecture of the hosting region affects the lifetime of an ongoing circuit. Critical structures require at least one conduction block to trigger a re-entrant circuit, while the termination of the re-entrant circuit can be caused by further conduction blocks (i.e. self-termination) or the interference of external waves of excitation spreading from the surrounding lattice.

However, colliding wavefronts might form circuitual activities in regions that do not structurally harbor a re-entrant circuit (i.e. they do to belong to any class presented in Fig. 3) as this activation does not require the presence of conduction blocking cells. When the hosting region is not susceptible to conduction block, the ongoing activity can only be terminated by waves of excitation spreading from the neighboring regions. The inhibition of one of the two extinction mechanisms implies that re-entrant circuits anchored to regions that are not susceptible to conduction block survive much longer than those hosted by critical structures, stabilizing the pattern of AF.

These considerations bring us to the different progressions of AF presented in Fig. 5. In particular, panel (d) displays a system in which AF starts as paroxysmal before turning into persistent. The most striking aspect of this pattern is that once AF becomes persistent the moving average of the number of active nodes per time steps $\langle a(t) \rangle$ exhibits very limited fluctuations, resembling the pattern presented in Fig. 5d. In particular, we slice the number of active cells, $\langle a(t) \rangle$, time series in partially overlapping segments of $10^5$ consecutive time steps and compute the distance $d = \max(\langle a(t) \rangle) - \min(\langle a(t) \rangle)$ between the minimum and maximum of each segment. If there is at least one segment in which $\langle a(t) \rangle$ always exceed 220 nodes (i.e. the system is in AF) and $d$ falls below an arbitrary threshold, we assume that AF has progressed to a stable, persistent state driven by re-entrant circuits hosted by regions that are not susceptible to conduction block. In this case, the experiment is excluded from the sample.

Neglecting experiments in which AF is stabilized by this new type of re-entrant circuit almost entirely eliminates the gap in the time in AF between the cCMP and the MF models, see Fig. 10. This suggests that these activities provide an important contribution to AF maintenance. The fraction of excluded experiments shown in Fig. 10 (inset) roughly corresponds to the fraction of experiments expected to enter persistent AF from paroxysmal AF as a function of the coupling frequency. Note, the model is more likely to enter persistent AF as the coupling level is reduced.

When the cCMP lattice does not include simple critical structures, the associated MF model never develops AF as fibrillation cannot be induced without particles. However, we can still assess whether AF may develop in the absence of critical structures in the cCMP model. In this scenario, re-entrant circuits could only emerge from colliding wavefronts caused by isolated conduction blocks that temporarily disrupt sinus rhythm. If these collisions were able to establish re-entrant circuits, we would have
FIG. 9. Formation of a functional re-entrant circuit from colliding wavefronts. (a) A wave of excitation enters the region from below, proceeding left and right in the lower fibre (green arrows). (b) The wavefront branches off in the upper fibre, initiating a left propagation that lags behind the wave of excitation proceeding in the lower fibre. (c) The leading wavefront (lower fibre) reaches the leftmost transversal connection, branching off to the upper fibre. At this point, the conduction branches again into two wavefronts proceeding left and right. The former continues its progression, trailing the wave of excitation in the lower fibre by 1 time step. The latter collides with and terminates the incoming wavefront. (d) A planar wave of excitation, proceeding from the left to right on the lattice, approaches the region. The wave can only advance in the lower fibre (green arrow) as the second leftmost node located in the upper fibre is 1 time step away from leaving the refractory state (red cross). This occurs because the events in (a)-(c) have previously delayed the excitation of nodes in the upper fibre. (e) The wave of excitation reaches the rightmost node of the region where it proceeds both longitudinally and transversally. This initiates a retrograde propagation in the upper fibre. (f) If the length of the blue path (in terms of number of nodes) exceeds the refractory period $\tau$, the retrograde propagation triggers a functional re-entrant circuit that is temporally stable since the path of the circuit does not contain conduction blocking nodes.

observed an excess in the probability of inducing AF displayed in Fig. 8(a). As the probabilities of inducing AF in the cCMP and MF models are perfectly compatible, we conclude that temporally and spatially stable re-entrant circuits triggered by collisions between waves of excitation cannot emerge in sinus rhythm, but only drive AF from a paroxysmal state induced by critical structures to a stable, persistent state that is hard to revert.

Finally, we have also observed that this new type of re-entrant circuit is more likely to emerge in systems characterized by high amounts of uncoupling, see inset of Fig. 10. This result is not surprising, as very pronounced branching structures, being characterized by a high number of critical structures, are more likely to develop paroxysmal AF, which is required for this new class of re-entrant circuits to emerge. These findings are also compatible with clinical modelling suggesting that the formation of re-entrant drivers in fibrotic border zones perpetuate persistent AF [38].

The formation of temporally stable, functional re-
entrant circuits explains the emergence of persistent AF in the cCMP and CMP models. However, these circuits do not explain why the CMP model is significantly more likely to enter AF than the cCMP model. As noted previously, the CMP model differs from the cCMP model in that nodes susceptible to conduction block can be placed at random throughout the tissue, not just in locations capable of forming a simple re-entrant circuit. If, in a given local region of the lattice, two or more conduction blocking nodes are positioned in a manner consistent with the complex structures listed in Fig. 3, then complex structures may plausibly explain the excess in the probability of entering AF in the CMP model relative to the cCMP model.

To investigate the contribution of complex structures to the probability of inducing AF, we simulate multiple instances of the CMP and cCMP models at various values of $\delta$, see Fig. 11. The probability of placing a single conduction blocking node in a given region, a requirement for the formation of a simple re-entrant circuit, scales as $\delta$. Conversely, the probability of placing two conduction blocking nodes in a given region, a requirement for the formation of complex re-entrant circuits, scales as $\delta^2$. Hence, as $\delta \to 0$, the probability of forming a complex re-entrant circuit should decay faster than the probability of forming a simple re-entrant circuit.

Figure 11 shows that, as expected, the probability of entering AF at high $\delta$ is higher in the CMP model than in the cCMP model. However, as $\delta$ is lowered towards 0, the risk of entering AF in the CMP and cCMP models collapse onto a single curve. This indicates that only simple re-entrant circuits can form at low $\delta$, and additionally, no other mechanisms for the formation of re-entrant circuits are present in the CMP model that are not present in the cCMP model. This indicates that a high density of conduction blocking nodes is crucial for the formation of complex re-entrant circuits.

V. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION & OUTLOOK

The persistence of AF is one of the key factors determining the likelihood of a successful ablation [8]. However, at a microstructural level, it is not clear what determines whether a patient will exhibit paroxysmal or persistent AF [22, 23]. Better understanding the causes of persistent AF may, in the future, improve the success rate of ablation or inspire new potential treatment methods.

The CMP model is a simple, percolation based model of AF where re-entrant circuits form when adjacent muscle fibres decouple [29]. The model is not a fully realistic representation of atrial electrophysiology. However, the model, and its extensions, have been used to explain a number of key observations from clinical AF research. This includes the diversity of AF persistence at comparable levels of fibrosis [37], the distribution of re-entrant circuits in the left and right atria [35], and the observation that re-entrant circuits preferentially form near the endocardium (inner heart wall) than the epicardium (outer heart wall) in paroxysmal AF [14, 18]. Additionally, the 3D extension of the CMP model naturally explains the lowering success rate of ablation as AF becomes more persistent [35]. Despite these successes, the precise dynamics at the microscopic level of the CMP model were not fully elucidated – until now it was not clear how the model is capable of showing the full diversity of AF persistence.

In this paper, we have focused on better understanding the microscopic dynamics of the CMP model, specifically with the aim to understanding which microscopic inter-
actions are responsible for the emergence of persistent AF. By disecting the model into its constituent parts, we have shown how the interaction of spatially stable but temporally intermittent re-entrant circuits, which drive paroxysmal AF, can generate new secondary re-entrant circuits which are temporally stable. These stable secondary re-entrant circuits do not self-terminate because the re-entrant pathway is not susceptible to unidirectional conduction block. Hence, once activated, these drivers remain active indefinitely, transitioning the model from paroxysmal to persistent AF.

To identify the emergence of secondary persistent re-entrant circuits, we first derived a mean-field model of AF, neglecting the spatial components of the model and interactions between coexisting drivers. Mean-field approaches are well established in physics for simplifying the study of high dimensional random processes [31]. These models have been used extensively across numerous interdisciplinary field including in the study of epilepsy in neuroscience [52–54]. Given the qualitative similarities between epilepsy and cardiac fibrillation, it is surprising that mean-field models are not widely used in computational cardiac electrophysiology.

Our mean-field model demonstrates that the essential features of AF remain if spatial structure and driver interactions are neglected. However, the mean-field model significantly underestimates the time spent in fibrillation and it does not explain the emergence of persistent AF. Only by reintroducing spatial structure can these observations be explained.

Re-introducing spatial structure in the controlled CMP model where we carefully control the initiation of simple re-entrant circuits, we have shown that the density of conduction blocking cells plays a key role in the time the CMP model spends in AF. At high densities, the CMP model spends significantly more time in AF than the cCMP model. However, as the density of conduction blocking cells is reduced only simple structures, like those found in the cCMP model, can form in the CMP. As a result, the time in AF converges for the cCMP and CMP models.

It is important to stress that the results presented here are for a highly simplified physics model of AF. The scope of the CMP model is highly specific, focusing on the emergence of re-entrant circuits from the accumulation of fibrosis in the atria. We use cellular automata in our modelling approach which limits the realism of the dynamics in our model, but which recent research has suggested are preferable to detailed continuous models when studying the effects of local heterogeneity in the cardiac microstructure [32], e.g. due to fibrosis. The model is both structurally and topologically simplified - we do not account for variation in fibre orientation (as in [18]), nor do we consider the real topology of the atria (as in [55]). Additionally, we do not consider variations in the action potential which are present in models which study the ionic currents across gap junctions [30].

However, the value of such a simple model should not be underestimated. Cellular automata are very computationally efficient, allowing for a statistical analysis not easily achieved in more complex models. Likewise, the model has very few key parameters, with re-entrant circuits emerging, and the diversity of AF persistence being explained, by the variation in a single coupling parameter, $\nu_L$. This gives clarity to any results, avoiding ambiguity as to which model features are responsible for the emergence and maintenance of AF. Finally, although the CMP model itself may not represent a fully realistic atrial electrophysiology, the extensions of the CMP model to 3D and to a real topology are bringing the model closer to clinical relevance. However, naturally, these adaptations complicate model analysis. Hence, understanding the dynamics of simple models is essential to fully understanding the behaviour of the more complicated adaptations for which the CMP model is the precursor. Models such as ours have significant potential in hypothesis generation and will play an increasingly important role in bridging the gap between clinical and computational electrophysiology – such work is already going on in our ElectroCardioMaths centre, as well as in other groups.

Given that “AF begets AF”, finding ways to treat and prevent persistent AF is a key priority in AF research. In this paper, we have studied the microstructural basis for the emergence of persistent AF in the Christensen-Manani-Peters model. We have shown that persistent AF can arise from the interaction of spatially stable, but temporally intermittent re-entrant circuits. These interactions induce the formation of secondary re-entrant drivers which are not subject to unidirectional conduction block, and hence, do not self-terminate. We have shown that the probability of forming these secondary re-entrant circuits (and equivalently the probability of persistent AF) increases as the total level of coupling in the model decreases. This is in line with clinical modelling suggesting that the formation of re-entrant drivers in fibrotic border zones perpetuate persistent AF [38].

Future work should focus on validating the results obtained here in structurally realistic models of AF, derived from experimentally acquired fibre maps. If successful, this approach may suggest the regions of the atria most susceptible to the formation of persistent re-entrant circuits, and hence, may suggest suitable targets for ablation in persistent AF.
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Appendix A: Mean-Field Model of AF in Continuous Time

The MF model can be extended to the continuous time case (cMF), providing us with a framework in which the time in fibrillation can be computed analytically. Let $\tilde{p}(k, t)$ be the probability of observing $k$ active simple re-entrant circuits at time $t$. When the interval between two consecutive time steps $\Delta t$ is sufficiently small (i.e. $\Delta t \to 0$), we have at most one event (activation or de-activation) per interval. In these settings, the dynamics of $\tilde{p}(k, t)$ are described by the following master equation

$$
\frac{d\tilde{p}(k, t)}{dt} = p(N - k + 1)\tilde{p}(k - 1, t) - p(N - k)\tilde{p}(k, t) + q(k + 1)\tilde{p}(k + 1, t) - qk\tilde{p}(k, t) \quad \text{for } k > 1 \quad (A1a)
$$

where the first two terms are associated with $k - 1 \mapsto k$ and $k \mapsto k + 1$ transitions, respectively, while the last two are associated with $k + 1 \mapsto k$ and $k \mapsto k - 1$ transitions, respectively. Because the activation rate is different when the system has no active particles, see Eq. (A2), we need to take special care of the $k = 1$ and $k = 0$ cases. If the term $p_0$ represents the activation rate when the system has no active particles, then

$$
\frac{d\tilde{p}(1, t)}{dt} = p_0 N \tilde{p}(0, t) - p(N - 1)\tilde{p}(1, t) + 2q\tilde{p}(2, t) - q\tilde{p}(1, t) \quad \text{for } k = 1, 
$$

(A1b)

$$
\frac{d\tilde{p}(0, t)}{dt} = -p_0 N \tilde{p}(0, t) + q\tilde{p}(1, t) \quad \text{for } k = 0. 
$$

(A1c)

We enforce the boundary conditions that $\tilde{p}(k, t) = 0$ for $k < 0$ and $k > N$. We will find the steady state solution $\tilde{p}(k) = \lim_{t \to \infty} \tilde{p}(k, t)$ where the derivatives on the left-hand side of Eq. (A1) are zero by the ansatz

$$
\tilde{p}(k) = \begin{cases} 
A \binom{N}{k} \left( \frac{2}{p} \right)^{N-k} & \text{for } k = 0, 1, \ldots, N \\
0 & \text{for } k < 0 \text{ or } k > N 
\end{cases} 
$$

(A2)

where $\delta_{i,j}$ is the Kronecker delta function. By inserting the ansatz into Eq. (A1a), we confirm that it solves the steady state equation for $k > 1$. However, in our case it simplifies further as $p = q = \epsilon/\langle \ell \rangle$, see Eq. (6a), so $q/p = 1$.

We can determine the two constants $A$ and $B$ by requiring that Eq. (A2) solves Eqs. (A1b), (A1c) together with the normalization constraint: inserting the ansatz into Eq. (A1c), recalling $p = q$, we find

$$
0 = -p_0 A N - p_0 B N + q A N \quad (A3)
$$

implying that

$$
B = A \left( \frac{p}{p_0} - 1 \right). \quad (A4a)
$$

Note that $p = p_0 \Rightarrow B = 0$, that is, $\tilde{p}(0)$ does not have a special status but when $p \neq p_0 \Rightarrow B \neq 0$, and $B$ is an extra contribution to $\tilde{p}(0)$, see Eq. (A2). We now require normalization, that is,

$$
1 = \sum_{k=0}^{N} \tilde{p}(k) = A 2^N + B. \quad (A4b)
$$

Solving Eqs. (A4) for $A$ and $B$ we find

$$
A = \frac{1}{2^N + p/p_0 - 1}, \quad (A5a)
$$

$$
B = \frac{p/p_0 - 1}{2^N + p/p_0 - 1}, \quad (A5b)
$$

yielding

$$
\tilde{p}(0) = \frac{p/p_0}{2^N + p/p_0 - 1}. \quad (A6)
$$

Having obtained the analytical solutions, the fraction of time the system spends in AF for the cMF model is given

![Figure 12. Phase diagram of the time in AF as a function of the fraction of transversal connections $\nu_\perp$ for the CMP (black), the MF (blue) and the cMF (green) models. We use the parameters of the CMP model (i.e. $N, \epsilon$ and $\langle \ell \rangle$) to calibrate the cMF model and calculate the time in AF according to Eq. (A5). The phase diagrams for the MF and the cMF models are perfectly compatible. Both models significantly underestimate the time in AF with respect to the CMP model. Sharp transitions in the time in AF occur around the threshold values $\nu_\perp^* \approx 0.11$ (CMP, black dashed line), $\nu_\perp^* \approx 0.09$ (MF, blue dashed line) and $\nu_\perp^* \approx 0.09$ (cMF, green dashed line).]
The phase diagrams discussed in Fig. 7 reveal significant differences between the CMP and MF models as the latter underestimates the time in AF. One may assert that this discrepancy stems from a poor replication of the interactions between re-entrant circuits, and in particular from the exclusion of the non-spatial features of critical structures (e.g., particles are assumed to have the same length) from the MF model. In this section, we provide further evidence against this hypothesis by showing that modelling various non-spatial features of critical structures does not mitigate the differences between the CMP and MF models. To do so, we introduce an enhanced version of the MF model (eMF) in which each particle retains the length of the associated critical structure and changes its state at specific time steps, depending on the overall configuration of the system. The purpose of the eMF is to indicate that the non-spatial simplifications in the MF model are not responsible for the discrepancy in the time in AF between the MF model and the CMP model.

In the eMF model, the system is represented by the state vector \( P(t) = (p_1(t), \ldots, p_N(t)) \), where \( p_j(t) \in \{0, 1\} \), \( j = 1, \ldots, N \) is the state of the \( j \)-th particle at time \( t \) and \( N \) is the number of particles corresponding to the simple critical structures found across the CMP lattice. When \( p_j(t) = 1 \) (\( p_j(t) = 0 \)), the \( j \)-th particle is active (inactive) at time \( t \). The number of active particles at time \( t \) is

\[
N_a(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} p_j(t) \quad (B1)
\]

In line with the original MF model, the system is in sinus rhythm when \( N_a(t) = 0 \) and in AF when \( N_a(t) > 0 \). The \( j \)-th particle \( p_j(t) \) can change its state at a specific time \( t_j^* \). We set the first switching time for each particle as \( t_j^* \rightarrow U_j \), where \( U_j, j = 1, \ldots, N \) is a uniformly distributed integer random variable in \([1, L]\). This mimics the first planar wave front released from the pacemaker reaching critical regions at different time steps due to their different locations. As soon as the simulation time \( t \) matches \( t_j^* \), the \( j \)-th particle changes its state with probability \( \epsilon \). Independently of whether the \( j \)-th has changed its state or not, its next switching time \( t_j^* \) is updated

\[
t_j^* \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
  t_j^* + \min_{p/p(t+dt)=1} \ell_p, & \text{if } N_a(t+dt) > 0 \text{ and } p_j(t+dt) = 0, \\
  t_j^* + \ell_j, & \text{if } N_a(t+dt) > 0 \text{ and } p_j(t+dt) = 1, \\
  t_j^* + T, & \text{if } N_a(t+dt) = 0.
\end{cases} \quad (B2)
\]

where \( t + dt \) indicates that the update is based on the characteristics of the system observed immediately after the eventual state change of the \( j \)-th particle. When \( N_a(t+dt) = 0 \), the \( j \)-th particle will attempt to switch its state in \( T \) time steps. This mimics sinus rhythm in the CMP model where the planar wave front released from the sinus nodes reaches a critical structure every \( T \) time steps. When \( N_a(t+dt) > 0 \), particles try to switch their states more frequently. This reflects the intense activity (e.g. number of active nodes per time step) observed in AF episodes occurring in the CMP lattice.

In the eMF model, the length of the shortest active particles dictates the period between two consecutive attempts of activating a dormant region. For instance, the \( j \)-th particle that turns (or remains) off at time \( t_j^* = t \) will attempt to activate again at time

\[
t_j^* = t_j^* + \min_{p/p(t+dt)=1} \ell_p, \quad (B3)
\]

where the final term is the length of the shortest active particles at time \( t + dt \). This mimics the fact that in the CMP model the length of a re-entrant circuit determines the frequency at which nodes forming the hosting critical structure emit waves.

The eMF model enhances the replication of the interactions between simple critical structures by capturing potentially important spatial features that have been excluded from the original MF model. The goal of this framework is to assess the contribution of the non-spatial features of critical structures to the significant discrepancies between the CMP and the MF models, see Fig. 7. We find that the phase diagram of the time in AF in the eMF model is perfectly compatible with the one derived from the MF model, see Fig. 13. This suggests that adding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \frac{p}{p_0} )</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>∞</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I. Time in AF in the cMF model for different combinations of \( p/p_0 \) and \( N \). We observe that for small \( N \) the time in AF is significantly higher when the ratio \( p/p_0 \) is small. These differences vanish as \( N \) increases.

by

\[
1 - \tilde{p}(0) = \frac{2^N - 1}{2^N + p/p_0 - 1}. \quad (A7)
\]

It is interesting to contrast this result with a simple birth-death process where \( p = p_0 \). The time in AF is shown for the simple birth-death process and for the cMF calibrated to the CMP model, \( p/p_0 = T/\tau = 4.4 \), in Table I. The results indicate that for \( N = 0 \), neither model enters AF. As \( N \) is increased, the time in AF is initially much higher in the birth-death process than the cMF, but this difference vanishes as \( N \) becomes large. Only when \( N \rightarrow \infty \) does the model spend 100% of the time in AF. Since \( N \) must be finite in the CMP model, this indicates that the cMF cannot explain persistent AF.

Appendix B: An Enhanced Mean-Field Model of AF

The phase diagrams discussed in Fig. 7 reveal significant differences between the CMP and MF models as the latter underestimates the time in AF. One may assert that this discrepancy stems from a poor replication of the interactions between re-entrant circuits, and in particular from the exclusion of the non-spatial features of critical structures (e.g. particles are assumed to have the same length) from the MF model. In this section, we provide further evidence against this hypothesis by showing that modelling various non-spatial features of critical structures does not mitigate the differences between the CMP and MF models. To do so, we introduce an enhanced version of the MF model (eMF) in which each particle retains the length of the associated critical structure and changes its state at specific time steps, depending on the overall configuration of the system. The purpose of the eMF is to indicate that the non-spatial simplifications in the MF model are not responsible for the discrepancy in the time in AF between the MF model and the CMP model.

In the eMF model, the system is represented by the state vector \( P(t) = (p_1(t), \ldots, p_N(t)) \), where \( p_j(t) \in \{0, 1\} \), \( j = 1, \ldots, N \) is the state of the \( j \)-th particle at time \( t \) and \( N \) is the number of particles corresponding to the simple critical structures found across the CMP lattice. When \( p_j(t) = 1 \) (\( p_j(t) = 0 \)), the \( j \)-th particle is active (inactive) at time \( t \). The number of active particles at time \( t \) is

\[
N_a(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} p_j(t) \quad (B1)
\]

In line with the original MF model, the system is in sinus rhythm when \( N_a(t) = 0 \) and in AF when \( N_a(t) > 0 \). The \( j \)-th particle \( p_j(t) \) can change its state at a specific time \( t_j^* \). We set the first switching time for each particle as \( t_j^* \rightarrow U_j \), where \( U_j, j = 1, \ldots, N \) is a uniformly distributed integer random variable in \([1, L]\). This mimics the first planar wave front released from the pacemaker reaching critical regions at different time steps due to their different locations. As soon as the simulation time \( t \) matches \( t_j^* \), the \( j \)-th particle changes its state with probability \( \epsilon \). Independently of whether the \( j \)-th has changed its state or not, its next switching time \( t_j^* \) is updated

\[
t_j^* \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
  t_j^* + \min_{p/p(t+dt)=1} \ell_p, & \text{if } N_a(t+dt) > 0 \text{ and } p_j(t+dt) = 0, \\
  t_j^* + \ell_j, & \text{if } N_a(t+dt) > 0 \text{ and } p_j(t+dt) = 1, \\
  t_j^* + T, & \text{if } N_a(t+dt) = 0.
\end{cases} \quad (B2)
\]

where \( t + dt \) indicates that the update is based on the characteristics of the system observed immediately after the eventual state change of the \( j \)-th particle. When \( N_a(t+dt) = 0 \), the \( j \)-th particle will attempt to switch its state in \( T \) time steps. This mimics sinus rhythm in the CMP model where the planar wave front released from the sinus nodes reaches a critical structure every \( T \) time steps. When \( N_a(t+dt) > 0 \), particles try to switch their states more frequently. This reflects the intense activity (e.g. number of active nodes per time step) observed in AF episodes occurring in the CMP lattice.

In the eMF model, the length of the shortest active particles dictates the period between two consecutive attempts of activating a dormant region. For instance, the \( j \)-th particle that turns (or remains) off at time \( t_j^* = t \) will attempt to activate again at time

\[
t_j^* = t_j^* + \min_{p/p(t+dt)=1} \ell_p, \quad (B3)
\]

where the final term is the length of the shortest active particles at time \( t + dt \). This mimics the fact that in the CMP model the length of a re-entrant circuit determines the frequency at which nodes forming the hosting critical structure emit waves.

The eMF model enhances the replication of the interactions between simple critical structures by capturing potentially important spatial features that have been excluded from the original MF model. The goal of this framework is to assess the contribution of the non-spatial features of critical structures to the significant discrepancies between the CMP and the MF models, see Fig. 7. We find that the phase diagram of the time in AF in the eMF model is perfectly compatible with the one derived from the MF model, see Fig. 13. This suggests that adding
FIG. 13. Phase diagram of the time in AF as a function of the fraction of transversal connections $\nu_\perp$ for the CMP (black), MF (blue) and eMF (orange) models. We use the parameters of the CMP model (i.e. $N$, $\epsilon$, and $\langle \ell \rangle$) and the lengths of the tracked simple critical structures (i.e. $\ell_p, \ldots, \ell_{pN}$) to calibrate the MF and eMF models. The phase diagrams of the MF and eMF models are perfectly compatible. Both models significantly underestimate the time in AF with respect to the CMP model. These results suggest that the spatial structure of the CMP model is responsible for the excess time the CMP model spends in AF compared to the MF model, and not the non-spatial simplifications of the MF model. Sharp transitions in the time in AF occur around the threshold values $\nu^*_\perp \approx 0.11$ (CMP, black dashed line), $\nu^*_\perp \approx 0.09$ (MF, blue dashed line) and $\nu^*_\perp \approx 0.09$ (eMF, orange dashed line).

FIG. 14. Phase diagram of the time in AF as a function of the fraction of transversal connections $\nu_\perp$ for the CMP model (black), MF model (blue) and the MF model with twice the number of particles (2MF, brown). We use the parameters of the CMP model (i.e. $N$, $\epsilon$, and $\langle \ell \rangle$) to calibrate the MF and 2MF models. Doubling the number of particles in the MF model increases the time the system spends in AF. However, the 2MF model still underestimates the time in AF with respect to the CMP model. This suggests that complex structures belonging to the class presented in Fig. 3 (f) cannot explain the discrepancy between the MF and CMP models alone, hinting at the concurrent contribution of other forms of activation. Sharp transitions in the time in AF occur around the threshold values $\nu^*_\perp \approx 0.11$ (CMP, black dashed line), $\nu^*_\perp \approx 0.09$ (MF, blue dashed line) and $\nu^*_\perp \approx 0.10$ (2MF, brown dashed line).

Further layers of complexity to capture every feature of the interactions between simple critical structures is unlikely to reconcile the statistics obtained from the CMP and MF models. Instead, these results provide additional support to the hypothesis that the higher statistics observed in the CMP phase diagram stems from the additional contribution of different activation mechanisms (e.g. complex critical structures and re-entrant circuits originating from colliding waves of excitation) that are not considered in the MF model.

Appendix C: The Mean-Field Model of AF with $2N$

In the cCMP and MF models, the number of critical structures, $N$, is found by assessing how many simple structures are present in the CMP model that are compatible with those listed in Fig. 3a & (b) for a given set of model parameters. These simple structures exclude structures which would be simple if the model is paced from right to left, but which cannot be activated from sinus-rhythm. Since the CMP model lattice is statistically symmetric when viewed from left to right as opposed to right to left, we approximate the number of simple structures that can be activated from the right as $N$. That gives a total of $2N$ simple structures that can be activated from left to right (sinus rhythm) or from right to left.

To ensure the discrepancy in the time in AF between the MF and CMP models is not due to the omission of these simple structures that cannot be activated from sinus rhythm, we rerun the MF model replacing $N$ by $2N$, see Fig. 14 With $2N$, the time in AF is increased, exceeding the result for the simple MF model where we input $N$ critical structures. However, the $2N$ result still falls below the result for the CMP model. Note additionally that $2N$ is likely an overestimate of the number of critical structures that can be activated in any given time step in the cCMP model since the excitation waves spreading across the lattice can only cross a given region in one direction. Hence, only about half the critical structures across the lattice should be able to activate in any given time step. Hence, these non-sinus-rhythm simple structures do not explain the excess time in AF in the CMP model.
FIG. 15. Formation of a functional re-entrant circuit in a region \((x \in [0, 27], y \in [16, 17])\) that is not susceptible to conduction block. Events have been recorded from the experiment presented in Fig. 5(d) around the transition from paroxysmal to persistent AF \((t \in [197510, 197624])\). (a) Waves of excitation proceed from the right to the left of the region. The waves are not planar since they are propagating from an active re-entrant circuit in another part of the lattice. (b) The wavefront in the lower fibre leaks back in the upper fibre, colliding with the incoming wavefront. The contact terminates both waves. (c) A planar wave of excitation (red vertical line) released from the sinus node \((x = 0)\) can only proceed in the lower fibre as the left-most nodes in the upper fibre are still in the refractory state. (d) The wave reaches the rightmost node of the lower fibre \((x = 27)\) where it proceeds both longitudinally and transversally, initiating a retrograde propagation in the upper fibre. (e) The nodes that were unresponsive in (c) have already left the refractory state by the time the backward propagating wave reaches them. This allows the wave to turn in on itself again and proceed from left to right in the lower fibre, initiating a functional re-entrant circuit. The absence of nodes that are susceptible to conduction block drastically reduces the probability of extinguishing the ongoing re-entrant circuit which survives until the end of the experiment.

**Appendix D: Videos**

A close-up video of the formation of a re-entrant circuit from collisions between waves of excitation is provided in the supplementary materials. The key moments of the process are described in the caption of Fig. 15. Events have been recorded from a simulation of the standard CMP model performed under the following settings: \(L = 200, T = 220, \tau = 50, \delta = 0.01, \epsilon = 0.05\) and \(\nu_{\perp} = 0.11\). The duration of the experiment is \(10^6\) time steps. The clinical pattern of AF (i.e. number of active nodes per time step) observed throughout this experiment is displayed in Fig. 5(d).


