

**Table S1.** Literature cohort comparison.

	<b>Kanmanthareddy et al.</b> (J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol 2015;26:385-389)	<b>Fink et al.</b> (Pacing Clin Electrophysiol 2020;43:1115-1125)	<b>This study</b>
Number of patients	15	19	20
Mean age	63 ± 7	66 ± 10	64 ± 10
Females	0%	53%	40%
<b>Type of AF</b>			
Paroxysmal	53%	47%	65%
Persistent	47%	42%	35%
Longstanding persistent	-	11%	-
LVEF	53% ± 5%	>55% (100% of pts)	57% ± 7.1%
<b>Energy source for PVI</b>			
RF, manual	100%	68%	65%
RF, robotic	0%	5%	0%
Cryoablation	0%	21%	35%
HIFU	0%	5%	0%
<b>Procedural data</b>			
Procedural time	200 ± 33	127.4 ± 48.4	135 ± 76.2
Fluoroscopy time	79 ± 21	17.3 ± 9.2	20.1 ± 17.8
Adverse events	2 (13%)	1 (5%)	0
<b>Follow-up data</b>			
Duration of follow-up (days)	No follow-up available	268 (185; 1024)	891 (450 – 1470)
Patients with arrhythmia recurrence	-	63%	35%

AF: atrial fibrillation; LVEF: left ventricle ejection fraction; PVI: pulmonary vein isolation; HIFU: high intensity focused ultrasound