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ABSTRACT

Background: Enhanced beat-to-beat variability of repolarization (BVR) is strongly linked to arrhythmogenesis and is largely due to variation in ventricular action potential duration (APD). Previous studies in humans have relied on QT interval measurements; however, a direct relationship between beat-to-beat variability of APD and arrhythmogenesis in humans has yet to be demonstrated.

Objectives: This study aimed to explore the beat-to-beat repolarization dynamics within a heart failure population at the level of ventricular APD.

Methods: 43 patients with heart failure and implanted cardiac resynchronization therapy defibrillator devices were studied. Activation-recovery intervals (ARI) as a surrogate for APD were recorded from the left ventricular epicardial lead while pacing from the right ventricular lead to maintain constant cycle length.

Results: During mean follow-up of 23.6±13.6 months, 11 patients sustained VT/VF and received appropriate implantable cardioverter-defibrillator therapies (Anti-Tachycardia Pacing or shock therapy). ARI variability (ARIV) was significantly greater in patients with subsequent VT/VF vs. those without VT/VF (3.55±1.3 ms vs. 2.77±1.09 ms, p=0.047). Receiver operating characteristic curve analysis (AUC 0.71, p=0.046) suggested high and low risk ARIV groups for VT/VF. The Kaplan–Meier survival analysis demonstrated that the time until first appropriate therapy for VT/VF was significantly shorter in the high-risk ARIV group (p=0.028). ARIV was a predictor for VT/VF in the multivariate Cox model (HR, 1.623; 95% CI, 1.1 to 2.393; p=0.015).

Conclusions: Increased left ventricular ARIV is associated with an increased risk of VT/VF in patients with heart failure.
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INTRODUCTION

Accurate prediction of individuals at risk of ventricular arrhythmia (VA) and sudden cardiac death remains a major challenge. Exaggerated beat-to-beat variability (BBV) of repolarization (BVR) is known to be associated with arrhythmogenesis in animal models and humans and has been proposed as a potential risk marker.

The activation-recovery interval (ARI) is well validated. In vivo it can be obtained from pacing leads in ambulatory patients, invasively during electrophysiology studies, and more recently has been derived from non-invasive cardiac electrophysiology mapping techniques. As such it is readily available for the assessment of ventricular repolarization and therefore a potential adjunct in the prediction of patients at risk of VA. Recent animal studies have demonstrated significant increases in the BBV of ARI prior to the onset of Torsades de pointes and have highlighted its potential for integration into implantable cardiac devices to monitor arrhythmia risk.

In the present study, we have recorded left ventricular (LV) unipolar electrograms (UEGs), while pacing from the right ventricular (RV) lead to maintain a constant cycle length in patients with heart failure. From these electrograms we have calculated ARI variability (ARIV). We hypothesized that higher baseline ARIV would be seen in patients experiencing VA during follow-up.
METHODS

Ethical Approval

The study was approved by the local research ethics committee and conformed to the Declaration of Helsinki (latest revision: 64th WMA General Assembly) standard. Informed consent was obtained in writing from all subjects.

Study population and data acquisition

We retrospectively analyzed the prospectively collected data of 43 consecutive patients who underwent electrogram recordings to study basic ARI within a heart failure population. The study enrolled patients with St. Jude Medical cardiac resynchronization therapy defibrillator (CRT-D) devices for primary or secondary indications of sudden cardiac death (SCD). Patients of either sex, ≥18 years of age and undergoing CRT-D follow-up at our institution were eligible. During a routine follow-up visit LV UEG recordings were made via the device programmer (Merlin, St. Jude Medical Inc., St Paul, MN). Effects of heart rate variability on repolarization dynamics were removed by establishing fixed cycle length with steady-state pacing (DDD-RV for sinus rhythm or VVI-RV for atrial fibrillation). A constant rate of 10 beats above the patient’s intrinsic heart rate was chosen with a minimum adaptation period of 2 minutes. A 30 second recording of LV UEG was made using the device programmer at a sampling frequency of 512 Hz and extracted for off-line analysis. Figure 1 shows examples of raw digital UEGs. Occurrence of VA therapy with either ATP or shock therapy was assessed by CRT-D checks and served as the endpoint. Programming of the CRT-D device was based on clinical evaluation of the attending electrophysiologist. CRT-D interrogation data of recorded events was evaluated by an electrophysiologist blinded to the outcome of the LV UEG data.
Repolarization variability analysis

Raw digital LV UEG traces were analysed off-line using custom built MATLAB software (MathWorks Inc, Mass). Recordings were separately low pass filtered at both 80 and 30 Hz for calculation of activation times (ATs) and repolarization times (RTs), respectively. The choice of two separate frequencies for AT and RT calculation allowed us to maintain the sharp activation gradients required to identify ATs, whilst also successfully preserving the morphology of the slower T-wave to identify RTs. Consecutive ARIs were calculated by identifying AT and RT for each beat using the Wyatt method.\textsuperscript{13,14,19,21,22} Automated identification of ATs and RTs removed any observer variability. Figure 1 shows examples of the identification of ATs and RTs and the resultant ARI across various morphologies of UEG. ARIV over the full 30s recording was then computed as.

\[
ARIV = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n \text{beats}} |AR_{i+1} - AR_{i}|}{(\sqrt{2} \times n \text{beats})}
\]

where \(n \text{beats}\) is the number of beats contained within the 30s period.\textsuperscript{23} To account for the possibility that the magnitude of beat-to-beat changes may depend on the intrinsic ARI duration we introduced the ARIV index. The ARIV index provides a normalized value of the ARIV relative to the mean ARI duration for each patient. The ARIV index was computed as.

\[
ARIV \text{ index} = \frac{1}{AR_{\text{mean}}} \times \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n \text{beats}} |AR_{i+1} - AR_{i}|}{(\sqrt{2} \times n \text{beats})} \quad \text{where} \quad AR_{\text{mean}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n \text{beats}} AR_{i}}{n \text{beats}}
\]

Statistical Analysis

Results are presented as mean±standard deviation for normally distributed variables and as median and interquartile range (IQR) for non-normally distributed variables. The independent-samples t-test was used to compare normally distributed continuous variables; otherwise the Mann-Whitney U test
was used. Categorical variables were compared using Fisher’s exact test. ROC analysis was performed using Youden’s index to determine the variable cut-off levels with optimal sensitivity and specificity for the endpoint. The estimated cutoff values were retrospectively used to reclassify and dichotomize the study subjects into high and low-risk categories. Kaplan-Meier survival analysis was used to address our hypothesis testing the association between increased ARIV and probability of first appropriate defibrillator therapy for VT/VF. Cox proportional hazards analyses were performed separately for each variable of interest (Mean ARI, ARIV and ARIV index). A $P$ value of <0.05 was considered to be statistically significant for all tests. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS (IBM Switzerland, Switzerland) and Prism (GraphPad Software Inc., California, USA).
RESULTS

Data eligibility

A total of 43 ambulatory heart failure patients underwent UEG recordings. Of these, 6 patients were excluded from the ARIV analysis: 2 due to a >15% ectopy burden during recordings, 3 due to significant electrogram fractionation (Figure 2A), 1 due to absence of a well-defined T-wave such that no positive gradient could be identified during repolarization (Figure 2B). ARIV analysis was performed in the remaining 37 patients. T-wave morphology remained constant and there were no AV conducted beats throughout the recordings. The median RV pacing rate used during LV UEG recordings was 85 bpm (IQR, 80 to 95). As expected, significant correlation was seen between the pacing rate and mean ARI ($r=-0.725$, $p<0.001$). However, there was no correlation between mean ARI and ARIV ($r=0.045$, $p=0.792$), nor the pacing rate and ARIV ($r=-0.150$, $p=0.377$).

Study population

Of those eligible for ARIV analysis (Table 1), 30 were men (81.1%) and 7 women (18.9%) who had undergone CRT-D implantation for primary (29 patients, 78.4%) or secondary (8 patients, 21.6%) prevention of SCD. The patients were enrolled in the study in median time 6.9 months after CRT-D implantation (range, 5.3 to 31.9 months). At the time of data acquisition, no patients had decompenated heart failure. All patients had electrolytes within ranges unexpected to disturb repolarization prior to UEG recordings (sodium 138.1±3.2 mEq/L, potassium 4.7±0.5 mEq/L). During follow-up no patients were initiated on class I or III antiarrhythmic agents, nor underwent coronary intervention/VT ablation prior to meeting the study endpoint or before conclusion of study follow-up.
Comparing patients with ischemic and non-ischemic cardiomyopathy, there was no difference in mean ARI \(257.69\pm 26.6\text{ ms vs. } 251.21\pm 35.27\text{ ms, } p=0.554\), ARIV \(3.44\pm 1.32\text{ ms vs. } 2.67\pm 0.98\text{ ms, } p=0.055\), nor the ARIV index \(1.37\pm 0.6\%\) vs. \(1.07\pm 0.36\%, p=0.115\). LV ejection fraction (LVEF) showed no correlation with mean ARI \(r_s=0.021, p=0.901\), ARIV \(r_s=0.020, p=0.907\) nor the ARIV index \(r_s=0.039, p=0.818\). Between patients with primary and secondary prevention indications for CRT-D there was no difference in mean ARI \(257.34\pm 32.35\text{ ms vs. } 241.97\pm 26.99\text{ ms, } p=0.207\). Differences in ARIV approached significance \(2.83\pm 1.21\text{ ms vs. } 3.62\pm 0.94\text{ ms, } p=0.051\), and a significantly higher ARIV index was seen in the secondary prevention group \(1.12\pm 0.5\%\) vs. \(1.49\pm 0.34\%, p=0.021\). 23 of the patients were CRT responders and 14 non-responders (a CRT responder was defined as a $\geq 5\%$ improvement in LVEF from pre-implant). Between responders and non-responders there was no observed difference in mean ARI \(253.26\pm 35.24\text{ ms vs. } 255.26\pm 25.61\text{ ms, } p=0.865\), ARIV \(2.94\pm 1.14\text{ ms vs. } 3.11\pm 1.3\text{ ms, } p=0.699\) nor ARIV index \(1.18\pm 0.48\%\) vs. \(1.23\pm 0.53\%, p=0.817\).

161 Implantable cardioverter-defibrillator therapy

Following LV UEG recordings a mean follow-up of 23.6±13.6 months took place. During follow-up 11 patients of 37 reached the endpoint of appropriate ICD therapy for VT/VF. ATP was attempted and successful in 9 patients with VT. One patient with VT had successful rescue shock therapy. One patient experienced VF with successful shock therapy. One patient died from heart failure before reaching the endpoint. Table 1 shows a comparison of clinical characteristic of patients with and without subsequent appropriate ICD therapy for VT/VF.

ARIV was significantly greater in patients with subsequent VT/VF events vs. those without VT/VF events \(3.55\pm 1.3\text{ ms vs. } 2.77\pm 1.09\text{ ms, } p=0.047\). The ARIV index was also significantly greater in
patients with subsequent VT/VF events vs. those without VT/VF events (1.43±0.5% vs. 1.1±0.47%, 
\( p=0.036 \)). No observed difference between groups was found in mean ARI (249.34±27.91% vs. 
256±33.31%, \( p=0.618 \)). Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analysis (Figure 3) suggested 
cut-off levels for ARIV of \( \geq 2.52 \) ms with 82% sensitivity (95% CI, 48-98%) and 58% specificity (95% CI, 
37-77%) (AUC 0.71; 95% CI, 0.53-0.89; \( p=0.046 \)) and ARIV index of \( \geq 1.14 \) with 64% sensitivity (95% 
CI, 31-89%) and 65% specificity (95% CI, 44-83%) (AUC 0.72; 95% CI, 0.55-0.9; \( p=0.036 \)) to 
dichotomize into high/low risk for the endpoint of appropriate ICD therapy.

Table 2 shows the clinical characteristics of patients with ARIV dichotomized at high and low risk of 
VT/VF. When comparing subjects in the high-risk group for ARIV, 45% experienced an episode of 
VT/VF by 3 years, compared with 11.8% in the low-risk group. Figure 4A demonstrates the 
separation of the Kaplan-Meier curves at the variable cut-off for ARIV (Mantel-Cox log-rank test, 
\( p=0.028 \)). When comparing subjects in the high-risk group for ARIV index, 43.8% experienced an 
episode of VT/VF by 3 years, compared with 19.0% in the low-risk group. Figure 4B demonstrates 
the separation of the Kaplan-Meier curves at the variable cut-off for ARIV index (Mantel-Cox log-rank 
test, \( p=0.079 \)).

Mean ARI, ARIV and the ARIV index were tested separately in the multivariate Cox proportional- 
hazards regression model for all VT/VF events, with the significant clinical covariate LVEF. Low LVEF 
remained a significant predictor of appropriate ICD therapy for VT/VF in all models tested. Mean ARI 
was not predictive (HR, 0.997; 95% CI, 0.977-1.017; \( p=0.758 \)). ARIV (HR, 1.623; 95% CI, 1.1-2.393; 
\( p=0.015 \)) and the ARIV index (HR, 3.256; 95% CI, 1.222-8.676; \( p=0.018 \)) were independent predictors 
of VT/VF (Figure 5). After exclusion of patients with secondary indications for ICD therapy both ARIV 
(HR, 1.518; 95% CI, 1.009-2.285; \( p=0.045 \)) and the ARIV index (HR, 2.87; 95% CI, 1.033-7.975; 
\( p=0.043 \)) remained independent predictors of VT/VF. After exclusion of patients on amiodarone both
ARIV (HR, 1.625; 95% CI, 1.114-2.371; p=0.012) and the ARIV index (HR, 3.259; 95% CI, 1.262-8.411; p=0.015) remained independent predictors of VT/VF.
DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the first study to demonstrate an association between VA risk and increased LV BVR. The main findings were: 1) increased ARIV was associated with an independent risk for VT/VF; 2) increased ARIV index (ARIV normalized to mean ARI) remained an independent predictor for VT/VF; 3) there was no association between mean ARI and VT/VF risk.

Relation to prior work on repolarization variability

The potential for stratification of individuals at risk of VA by means of repolarization instability has been demonstrated with QT intervals from the surface ECG and RV intracardiac electrograms. Our findings of higher values of BBV of ARI in heart failure patients experiencing VT/VF extends these observations to the level of the ventricular APD and to the assessment of LV BVR. The ROC analysis found ARIV to be more sensitive than the ARIV index in the prediction of ICD therapies. This was highlighted again in the Kaplan-Meier analysis showing less separation in the curves for ARIV index when compared to ARIV. These results would suggest that use of BBV of ARI to assess risk of VT/VF is more reliable without adjustment for basic ARI.

A major component of QTV is heart rate variability and both the QT interval and APD are strongly cycle length dependent. As the majority of QTV studies occurred in the absence of controlled cycle length it is technically challenging to separate heart rate driven QTV from actual fluctuations in the QT interval. RV pacing to obtain cycle length control as employed in our study removes the component of BVR due to heart rate variability.
It is accepted that the QT interval in a given ECG lead measures the interval between the earliest depolarization and latest repolarization as projected onto the axis of that lead. Given its spatial heterogeneity the use of multi-lead ECG recordings to assess QTV has been suggested but warrants further investigation. The in vivo dispersion of ARIV and correlations to various body surface ECG repolarization indices should be studied and could be invaluable in our understanding of both QTV and ARIV.

**Relation to prior work on basic APD and QT interval measurements**

In the present study, basic ARI in heart failure patients was not predictive of VT/VF events. This is consistent with several studies reporting QT variability as a stronger predictor of arrhythmia than QT prolongation. These findings pointing to instability of repolarization as a key factor would be in keeping with a cellular mechanism such as proposed by Johnson et al, who also observed dissociation between APD variability and basic APD under certain conditions.

Shortening of basic APD occurs in responders to CRT, whilst lengthening of basic APD occurs in non-responders. In vivo electrical remodelling in heart failure at the level of BBV-APD needs to be studied prospectively and may offer insight into the impact of CRT on VAs.

**Mechanisms of beat-to-beat variability of repolarization**

Several mechanisms have been proposed for the cellular basis of BBV-APD. Its apparently random nature suggests the involvement of a stochastic process. Stochastic variation of fast sodium current ($I_{Na}$), L-type calcium current ($I_{CaL}$), transient outward current ($I_{to}$), rapid delayed rectifier ($I_{Kr}$) and slow delayed rectifier ($I_{ks}$) potassium currents has been shown to influence BBV-APD with considerable interdependence between individual channels. Spontaneous calcium release from the
sarcoplasmic reticulum exhibits BBV and in the presence of calcium overload has been shown experimentally and in silico to generate BBV-APD. This mechanism was due to spontaneous calcium release from the sarcoplasmic reticulum in late diastole reducing the subsequent calcium transient and hence reducing \( I_{\text{CaL}} \) deactivation and prolonging the APD. However, the extent to which these effects seen in isolated cells may be operative in the whole heart where cells are well coupled is uncertain due to electrotonic interaction between cells. Nevertheless under conditions of calcium overload or reduced repolarization reserve, the effect of stochasticity on channel behavior may be enhanced suggesting that these effects may become operative in pathological conditions. BBV-APD may be arrhythmogenic either by the development of early or delayed afterdepolarizations or by enhanced dispersion of repolarization facilitating re-entry.

Clinical implications and future work

Risk stratification of patients at high risk of sudden cardiac death remains a major challenge. In view of the multiple mechanisms involved it is unlikely that a single test would prove sufficient and that a combination of clinical characteristics with a selection of stratification tools may be more appropriate. In this context, our study builds on the body of evidence highlighting the potential for assessment of baseline BVR to form part of the risk stratification tool.

Wijers et al have highlighted the significance of the temporal behavior of ARI prior to the onset of VA in dogs. Furthermore, this work demonstrated comparable short-term variability of ARI between RV and LV. The potential for automated continuous real-time monitoring of ARIV offers a novel future application for ICDs. However, the optimal recording location is unknown and further work is needed to compare ARIV across multiple simultaneous recording sites within the heart. Paroxysmal
atrial arrhythmias may result in variable ventricular filling in BiV paced patients and as such their influence on the ventricular ARI within a CRT population should be studied.

Limitations

The study population was relatively small and as a single tertiary centre study the patient group may not be representative of the usual CRT-D population. These results should be validated in a larger multicenter prospective study of a primary prevention ICD indication cohort. As ischemia testing was not conducted as part of the protocol we are unable to determine the influence of ischemia on BBV of ARI. Our observations are confined to a single LV epicardial site. Regional variation of the electrophysiological properties throughout the ventricular myocardium makes it possible that other regions may have demonstrated differing results. Short and long-term variation in ARIV should be studied in order to determine the optimal duration and frequency of recordings for its use as a predictor of VA. Whilst strategies to analyze fractionated electrograms have been proposed, a clear consensus in their interpretation does not exist. In the context of the assessment of BVR this could prove a challenge. Furthermore, the presence of a high ectopy burden or the lack of a gradient to define repolarization time could exclude some patients altogether. In our study 14.0% of patients were excluded due to these limitations thus highlighting an area for future work.

Conclusion

In patients with heart failure, increased ARIV is associated with increased risk of spontaneous VT/VF. These results accord with observations in QTV and extend observations to assessment of left ventricular BVR and specifically to the level of ventricular APD. Our findings are supportive of the possible utility of BVR as an adjunct to risk stratification of patients at risk of ventricular arrhythmia.
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Table 1. Baseline characteristics of patients with and without subsequent appropriate ICD therapy for VT/VF. NYHA, New York Heart Association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No VT/VF event (n=26)</th>
<th>VT/VF events at follow-up (n=11)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (IQR), years</td>
<td>68 (63-77)</td>
<td>63 (52-66.5)</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, n (%)</td>
<td>19 (73.1)</td>
<td>11 (100)</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ischemic cardiomyopathy, n (%)</td>
<td>12 (46.2)</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejection fraction ±SD, %</td>
<td>38.9 ± 11.7</td>
<td>26 ± 11.2</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHA class ≥ 2, n (%)</td>
<td>16 (61.5)</td>
<td>9 (81.8)</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary prevention ICD, n (%)</td>
<td>6 (23.1)</td>
<td>2 (18.2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus, n (%)</td>
<td>8 (30.8)</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension, n (%)</td>
<td>8 (30.8)</td>
<td>5 (45.5)</td>
<td>0.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrial fibrillation, n (%)</td>
<td>6 (23.1)</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>0.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta-blockade, n (%)</td>
<td>21 (80.8)</td>
<td>11 (100)</td>
<td>0.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE inhibitor, n (%)</td>
<td>24 (92.3)</td>
<td>11 (100)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldosterone antagonists, n (%)</td>
<td>15 (57.7)</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>0.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digoxin, n (%)</td>
<td>4 (15.4)</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiodarone, n (%)</td>
<td>3 (11.5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biventricular pacing percentage (IQR), %</td>
<td>99 (97-99)</td>
<td>98 (94-99)</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing rate for EGM recording (IQR), bpm</td>
<td>80 (80-95)</td>
<td>90 (82.5-92.5)</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Clinical characteristics of patients with ARIV dichotomized as per ROC suggested optimal cut-off values. NYHA, New York Heart Association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>ARIV low-risk (n=17)</th>
<th>ARIV high-risk (n=20)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (IQR), years</td>
<td>68 (62-76)</td>
<td>66 (56-75)</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, n (%)</td>
<td>12 (70.6)</td>
<td>18 (90)</td>
<td>0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ischemic cardiomyopathy, n (%)</td>
<td>5 (29.4)</td>
<td>11 (55)</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejection fraction ±SD, %</td>
<td>35.5 ± 13.6</td>
<td>34.8 ± 12.5</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHA class ≥ 2, n (%)</td>
<td>10 (58.8)</td>
<td>15 (75)</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary prevention ICD, n (%)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
<td>7 (35)</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus, n (%)</td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
<td>5 (25)</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension, n (%)</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td>11 (55)</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrial fibrillation, n (%)</td>
<td>6 (35.3)</td>
<td>4 (20)</td>
<td>0.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta-blockade, n (%)</td>
<td>14 (82.4)</td>
<td>18 (90)</td>
<td>0.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE inhibitor, n (%)</td>
<td>16 (94.1)</td>
<td>19 (95)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldosterone antagonists, n (%)</td>
<td>11 (64.7)</td>
<td>8 (40)</td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digoxin, n (%)</td>
<td>5 (29.4)</td>
<td>2 (10)</td>
<td>0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiodarone, n (%)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biventricular pacing percentage ±SD, %</td>
<td>99 (98-99)</td>
<td>98 (94-99)</td>
<td>0.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing rate for EGM recording ±SD, bpm</td>
<td>90 (80-100)</td>
<td>80 (80-90)</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Unipolar electrograms recorded from the left ventricular lead of 3 separate patients demonstrating local activation (star) and repolarization (square).
Figure 2. Two pitfalls of ARIV analysis: (A) fractionation, (B) neutral gradient during repolarization.
Figure 3. Receiver operating characteristic analysis for (A) ARIV and (B) ARIV index to predict VT/VF.

Optimal cut-off levels determined by Youden's index.
Figure 4. Kaplan-Meier curves for freedom from VT/VF events in patients dichotomized by ROC derived optimal cut-off values for (A) ARIV and (B) ARIV index.
Figure 5. Hazard ratios (adjusted for LVEF) for the association of mean ARI, ARIV and ARIV index with appropriate ICD therapy for VT/VF.
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