

1 **Cardiac magnetic resonance in patients with ARVC and family members: the potential role of**  
2 **native T1 mapping**

3

4 **Brief title: Native T1 mapping in ARVC**

5 Georgios Georgiopoulos<sup>a</sup> MD, PhD\*, Mattia Zampieri<sup>b</sup> MD\*, Silvia Molaro<sup>b</sup> MD, Anna  
6 Chaloupka<sup>b</sup> MD, Alberto Aimo<sup>c,d</sup> MD, Barbara Barra<sup>b</sup> MD, Leema Roberts<sup>b</sup> MBBS, PhD, Laura  
7 Monje-Garcia<sup>b</sup> BsC, Colin Evans<sup>b</sup> BsC, Nabeel Sheikh<sup>a,b</sup> MBBS, PhD, Rachel Bastiaenen<sup>a,b</sup> MBBS,  
8 PhD, Michael Cooklin<sup>b</sup> MD, Pier-Giorgio Masci<sup>a</sup> MD, Gerald Carr-White<sup>a,b</sup> MD, PhD, Gherardo  
9 Finocchiaro<sup>a,b</sup> MD, PhD\*\*, Amedeo Chiribiri<sup>a,e</sup> MD, PhD\*\*

10 \* Equally contributed as first authors \*\* Equally contributed as senior authors

11

12 <sup>a</sup> Department of Cardiovascular Imaging, School of Biomedical Engineering and Imaging Sciences,  
13 Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom;

14 <sup>b</sup> Inherited Cardiac Conditions Service, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, London,  
15 United Kingdom;

16 <sup>c</sup> Institute of Life Sciences, Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna, Pisa, Italy;

17 <sup>d</sup> Cardiology Division, University Hospital of Pisa, Italy;

18 <sup>e</sup> Wellcome Trust Medical Engineering Centre, King's College London, United Kingdom.

19

20 **Corresponding Author:**

21 Alberto Aimo, MD

22 Cardiology Division, University Hospital of Pisa, and Institute of Life Sciences, Scuola Superiore  
23 Sant'Anna

24 Piazza Martiri della Libertà 33

25 Phone +39 3477084391

26 Email: [albertoaimo@libero.it](mailto:albertoaimo@libero.it), [a.aimo@santannapisa.it](mailto:a.aimo@santannapisa.it)

27

28

29

1 **List of authors' current email addresses**

2 Georgios Georgiopoulos: [georgios.georgiopoulos@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:georgios.georgiopoulos@kcl.ac.uk)

3 Mattia Zampieri: [mattiazampieri29@gmail.com](mailto:mattiazampieri29@gmail.com)

4 Silvia Molaro: [silvia.molaro@gstt.nhs.uk](mailto:silvia.molaro@gstt.nhs.uk)

5 Anna Chaloupka: [Anna.Chaloupka@gstt.nhs.uk](mailto:Anna.Chaloupka@gstt.nhs.uk)

6 Alberto Aimò: [a.aimo@santannapisa.it](mailto:a.aimo@santannapisa.it)

7 Barbara Barra: [barbara.barra@gstt.nhs.uk](mailto:barbara.barra@gstt.nhs.uk)

8 Leema Roberts: [leema.robert@gstt.nhs.uk](mailto:leema.robert@gstt.nhs.uk)

9 Laura Monje-Garcia: [Laura.monje-garcia@nhs.net](mailto:Laura.monje-garcia@nhs.net)

10 Colin Evans: [colin.evans@gstt.nhs.uk](mailto:colin.evans@gstt.nhs.uk)

11 Nabeel Sheikh: [nabeelsheikh99@yahoo.com](mailto:nabeelsheikh99@yahoo.com)

12 Rachel Bastiaenen: [rachel.bastiaenen@gstt.nhs.uk](mailto:rachel.bastiaenen@gstt.nhs.uk)

13 Michael Cooklin: [Michael.Cooklin@gstt.nhs.uk](mailto:Michael.Cooklin@gstt.nhs.uk)

14 Pier Giorgio Masci: [pier\\_giorgio.masci@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:pier_giorgio.masci@kcl.ac.uk)

15 Gerald Carr-White: [gerry.carr-white@gstt.nhs.uk](mailto:gerry.carr-white@gstt.nhs.uk)

16 Gherardo Finocchiaro: [gherardo.finocchiaro@nhs.net](mailto:gherardo.finocchiaro@nhs.net)

17 Amedeo Chiribiri: [amedeo.chiribiri@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:amedeo.chiribiri@kcl.ac.uk)

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Left ventricular (LV) involvement in patients with arrhythmogenic right ventricular  
3 cardiomyopathy (ARVC) is not evaluated in the revised Task Force Criteria, possibly leading to  
4 underdiagnosis. This study explored the diagnostic role of myocardial native T1 mapping in  
5 patients with ARVC and their first-degree relatives.

6 **Methods:** Thirty ARVC patients (47% males, mean age  $45 \pm 27$  years) and 59 first-degree  
7 relatives not meeting diagnostic criteria underwent CMR with native T1 mapping.

8 **Results:** CMR was abnormal in 26 (87%) patients with ARVC. The right ventricle was affected in  
9 isolation in 13 (43%) patients. Prior to T1 mapping assessment, 2 (7%) patients exhibited  
10 isolated LV involvement and 11 (36%) patients showed features of biventricular disease. Left  
11 ventricular involvement was manifest as detectable LV late gadolinium enhancement (LGE) in  
12 12 out of 13 cases. According to pre-specified inter-ventricular septal (IVS) T1 mapping  
13 thresholds, 11 (37%) patients revealed raised native T1 values including 5 out of the 17 patients  
14 who would otherwise have been classified as exhibiting a normal LV by conventional imaging  
15 parameters. Native septal T1 values were elevated in 22 (37%) of the 59 first-degree relatives  
16 included.

17 **Conclusions:** Biventricular involvement is commonly observed in ARVC; native myocardial T1  
18 values are raised in more than one third of patients, including a significant proportion of cases  
19 that would have been otherwise classified as exhibiting a normal LV using conventional CMR  
20 techniques. The significance of abnormal T1 values in first-degree relatives at risk will need  
21 validation through longitudinal studies.

22

23 **Keywords:** ARVC; T1 mapping; late gadolinium enhancement; diagnosis.

24

25

1 **BACKGROUND**

2 Arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy (ARVC) is an inherited heart muscle disease  
3 characterized by progressive replacement of the ventricular myocardium by fibro-fatty tissue  
4 predisposing to life-threatening arrhythmias<sup>1</sup>. The diagnosis of ARVC is often complex and  
5 based on the revised Task Force Criteria (TFC) which require the presence of several clinical,  
6 structural, electrocardiographic, and histopathological changes<sup>2</sup>. The current TFC fail to address  
7 the issue of left ventricular (LV) involvement in the disease process, which is increasingly  
8 recognized and observed in up to 80% of relatives of sudden death victims diagnosed with  
9 ARVC on post-mortem examination<sup>3</sup>. **The recently proposed “Padua criteria” give the proper  
10 importance to tissue characterization by cardiovascular magnetic resonance (CMR), in the  
11 setting of a multidimensional evaluation<sup>4</sup> (Supplemental Table 1).**

12 CMR plays a central role in the diagnosis of ARVC because of its ability to accurately assess  
13 regional wall motion abnormalities, chamber volumes and systolic function. Late gadolinium  
14 enhancement (LGE) at CMR can be a sign of focal myocardial fibrosis, but subtle or diffuse  
15 fibrotic changes may be missed. Conversely, T1 mapping enables the detection of an increase in  
16 extracellular volume and diffuse myocardial fibrosis and has proved useful in differentiating  
17 between different cardiomyopathy subtypes characterized by left ventricular hypertrophy<sup>5,6</sup>. To  
18 date, there is limited data on the role of T1 mapping in ARVC<sup>7</sup>.

19 The aim of this study was to explore a possible diagnostic role of pre-contrast or native  
20 myocardial T1 mapping in patients with ARVC and in first-degree relatives, and to investigate  
21 the relationship between LV involvement on CMR and 12-lead electrocardiogram (ECG)  
22 abnormalities.

23  
24 **METHODS**

25  
26 **Study population**

27 Patients with arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy

28 Between 2012 and May 2019, 73 patients with ARVC according to TFC underwent CMR  
29 examination at the King’s College London department of cardiovascular imaging as part of their

1 assessment in the inherited cardiac conditions (ICC) clinic at Guy's and St Thomas' Hospital. All  
2 patients underwent comprehensive evaluation including personal and family history, clinical  
3 examination, 12-lead ECG, signal-averaged ECG, transthoracic echocardiogram, exercise  
4 tolerance test and 24-hour ECG Holter monitoring. Clinical data were retrospectively evaluated,  
5 and the final study population consisted of 30 patients with ARVC in whom pre-contrast T1  
6 mapping sequences had been acquired with image quality adequate for analysis. T1 mapping at  
7 our institution has been used consistently for patients who consented for their imaging data to  
8 be used for research purpose from early 2017; therefore, the majority of patients included in  
9 the final study cohort had been investigated between 2017 and 2019. Genetic testing was  
10 performed in 18/30 (60%) patients.

11

#### 12 First-degree relatives

13 During the same time-period, first-degree relatives of patients with ARVC were offered  
14 comprehensive diagnostic work-up, including a 12-lead ECG, transthoracic echocardiogram,  
15 exercise tolerance test, 24-hour Holter monitor and CMR. A total of 130 first-degree relatives  
16 were investigated. The current study comprised 59 first-degree relatives in whom T1 mapping  
17 sequences were acquired with image quality adequate for analysis. Genetic testing was  
18 performed in 15 individuals.

19 The study was approved by the institutional ethics committee and all patients with ARVC and  
20 first-degree relatives provided written informed consent prior to screening for the CMR images  
21 and related clinical data to be anonymously analyzed for research. Overall, the study was  
22 conducted in full compliance with the principles of Good Clinical Practice and the Declaration of  
23 Helsinki<sup>8</sup>.

24

#### 25 **12-lead Electrocardiogram**

26 Standard 12-lead ECGs were performed as described elsewhere<sup>9</sup>. Care was taken when  
27 measuring the extent of T-wave inversion (TWI) across the precordial leads and the maximum J-  
28 point elevation in the anterior leads (V1– V4) exhibiting TWI. The amplitude of the J-point was  
29 measured at the end of the QRS complex (the onset of the ST-segment) with reference to the

1 onset of the QRS complex<sup>10,11</sup>. Sokolow-Lyon voltage criterion for LV hypertrophy was defined  
2 as the sum of the S-wave in V<sub>1</sub> and the R-wave in V<sub>5</sub> or V<sub>6</sub> (whichever was larger in amplitude)  
3 being  $\geq 0.35$  mV. The J-point amplitude was measured at the end of the QRS complex (the onset  
4 of the ST-segment) with reference to the onset of the QRS complex<sup>12</sup> and was considered  
5 elevated if  $\geq 0.1$  mV. The S-wave duration in leads V1-V3 was considered prolonged if  $> 55$  msec.  
6 ST-segment depression was considered significant if  $\geq -0.1$  mV in  $\geq 2$  contiguous leads. Biphasic  
7 T-wave inversion was considered abnormal if the negative deflection of the T-wave exceeded  
8  $\geq -0.1$  mV. T-wave inversion  $\geq 0.1$  mV in  $\geq 2$  contiguous leads was considered abnormal. Deep T-  
9 wave inversion was defined as a T-wave deflection  $\geq -0.2$  mV. An abnormal Q-wave was defined  
10 as a Q-wave with duration  $\geq 40$  msec or a Q/R ratio  $> 0.25$ . The normal frontal cardiac axis was  
11 defined as  $> -30^\circ$  and  $< 120^\circ$ . Left atrial (LA) enlargement was defined by a P-wave duration  $\geq$   
12 0.12s in the frontal plane associated with a terminal P negativity in lead V1 of duration  $\geq$   
13 40msec and depth  $\geq 0.1$  mV. Low ECG voltages were defined as QRS amplitude  $\leq 1.0$  mV in all of  
14 the precordial leads and/or QRS amplitude  $\leq 0.5$  mV in all of the limb leads<sup>13</sup>. T-wave inversion  
15 in V1-V3 was considered a normal juvenile ECG pattern in asymptomatic patients  $< 16$  years  
16 old<sup>14</sup>.

17

### 18 **Cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging**

19 Cardiovascular magnetic resonance studies were performed using 1.5T or 3T scanners (Achieva  
20 or Ingenia, Philips Healthcare; Aera, Siemens), using steady-state free precession (SSFP) breath-  
21 hold cines in long-axis planes and sequential 7mm short-axis slices from the atrioventricular  
22 ring to the apex<sup>15</sup>. Ventricular volumes and function and LV mass were measured using  
23 standard techniques<sup>16</sup>. Ventricular volumes and LV mass were indexed for age and body surface  
24 area (BSA)<sup>17</sup>. Right ventricular regional wall motion abnormalities (RWMA) were classified as  
25 akinesia, dyskinesia and aneurysms<sup>2</sup>. Late gadolinium enhancement images were acquired 10  
26 mins after an intravenous bolus injection of 0.1 mmol/Kg gadoterate meglumine (Dotarem) or  
27 0.15 mmol/Kg of Gadovist to identify regional fibrosis. Inversion times were adjusted to null  
28 normal myocardium and LGE images were phase swapped to exclude artifact when required.

1 We considered the CMR RV volume and ejection fraction threshold values proposed by the  
2 revised TFC as diagnostic for ARVC<sup>2</sup> (in combination with RV RWMA where relevant).

3

#### 4 T1 mapping

5 In 30 patients with ARVC and 59 first degree relatives who consented for research, balanced  
6 SSFP single breath-hold modified inversion recovery Look-Locker (MOLLI) sequences were used  
7 for T1 mapping in a single mid-ventricular short axis slice, prior to contrast administration.  
8 Among patients with ARVC, 18 were scanned on a 1.5T scanner and 12 on a 3T scanner  
9 (Supplemental Table 2). Among first-degree relatives, 42 were scanned on a 1.5T scanner and  
10 17 on a 3T scanner. Native T1 mapping was implemented according to the consensus statement  
11 by the Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance (SCMR) 2017, using cvi42 software  
12 (Circle Cardiovascular Imaging version 5.6.6, Calgary, Canada)<sup>5</sup>. Myocardial T1 mapping values  
13 were measured by placing a standardized region of interest (ROI) in the short axis slice within  
14 the mid inter-ventricular septum and in the mid lateral wall. Care was taken to avoid  
15 contamination with signal from the blood pool and areas of LGE. T1 mapping was only  
16 performed for the LV alone as the thin right ventricle (RV) wall renders T1 mapping susceptible  
17 to partial volume effects.

18 We used previously published reference values for native septal T1 values in healthy volunteers  
19 according to used scanner (1.5 or 3T)<sup>18</sup> and defined abnormally increased measurements as  
20 values exceeding mean  $\pm 3SD$  (i.e. >99<sup>th</sup> percentile of the normal distribution for native pre-  
21 contrast T1 values, respectively). Given the absence of reference values for the lateral wall in  
22 segmental T1 mapping, we did not adjudicate on native T1 values of the mid lateral segments<sup>18-</sup>  
23 <sup>20</sup>. Of interest, the T1-mapping sequence and imaging protocol for derivation of reference  
24 values has been standardized and validated at our CMR department at King's College London<sup>18</sup>.  
25 Two experienced researchers in CMR analyzed native T1 myocardial values blinded to patients'  
26 status (ARVC or 1<sup>st</sup> degree relatives).

27

28

29

1 **Statistical analysis**

2 Results are expressed as mean  $\pm$  SD for continuous variables and as absolute numbers and  
3 relative percentages for categorical variables. Comparison between groups was performed  
4 using Student's T-test for independent samples or the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test for  
5 continuous outcomes, and the chi-squared test or Fisher's exact test for categorical variables.  
6 Interobserver variability was assessed by selecting the T1 mapping sequences from all 30  
7 patients with ARVC as well as a random sample of 30 first-degree relatives, which were then  
8 blindly reanalyzed by the senior investigator. Intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) with 95%  
9 confidence interval was calculated to evaluate inter-operator reliability by using a two-way  
10 random-effects model. Intraclass correlation coefficient values  $>0.75$  were considered  
11 indicative of good reliability (and  $>0.9$  of excellent reliability)<sup>21</sup>. Statistical analysis was  
12 performed with STATA package, version 13.1 (StataCorp, College Station, Texas USA). All  
13 statistical tests were two-tailed and a two-tailed value of  $P<0.05$  was considered significant  
14 throughout.

15

16 **RESULTS**

17 **Patients with ARVC**

18 Characteristics of patients with ARVC are shown on Table 1. The mean age was  $45 \pm 27$  years  
19 and 47% of the patients were male. Out of the 18 patients who underwent genetic testing, 9  
20 (50%) carried a pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant in the PKP2 (n=7, 39%) or the DSP (n=2,  
21 11%) genes. Eighteen out of 30 patients had a positive family history for ARVC. The ECG was  
22 abnormal in 22 (73%) patients. The most common abnormalities were anterior TWI in V1-V3 in  
23 16 patients (53%), lateral TWI in 4 patients (13%) and low QRS voltages in 4 (13%) patients  
24 (Table 1).

25

26 CMR in patients with ARVC

27 The CMR features of patients with ARVC are shown in Table 2. Cardiovascular magnetic  
28 resonance revealed structural or functional abnormalities in 26 (87%) patients. Patients (n=4)  
29 with unremarkable CMR fulfilled TFC according to abnormalities in other cardiac tests.



1 Isolated RV involvement was observed in 13 (43%) patients and isolated LV involvement in 2  
2 (7%) patients. Eleven (36%) patients exhibited biventricular abnormalities. The most common  
3 RV abnormality were RWMA, observed in 20 (67%) patients (predominantly affecting the free  
4 wall and the right ventricular outflow tract in 11 and 8 patients, respectively) (Table 2). Right  
5 ventricular dilatation fulfilling a major or minor volume TFC was found in 11 (37%) patients and  
6 impaired RV systolic function (ejection fraction  $\leq 45\%$ ) in 7 (23%) patients.  
7 The main LV abnormality was myocardial LGE (n=11; 36%), occurring mostly in the inferior or  
8 the lateral walls (8 out of 11 patients). A small proportion of patients exhibited LV RWMA (n=2;  
9 7%) or impaired (ejection fraction  $< 50\%$ ) systolic function (n=2; 7%) (Table 2). In total, LGE was  
10 detected in 15 (50%) patients as follows: 4 (13%) with RV LGE only, 7 (23%) with isolated LV LGE  
11 and 4 (13%) patients with biventricular LGE distribution.

### 13 T1 mapping in patients with ARVC

14 Native T1 values in patients with ARVC are shown in Table 2. According to pre-specified T1  
15 mapping thresholds at the level of the interventricular septum (IVS), 11 (37%) of patients with  
16 ARVC revealed elevated values. No difference was observed in IVS native T1 values between  
17 patients with and without LV LGE ( $983 \pm 14$  (group with LGE) vs  $971 \pm 11$  (group without LGE),  
18  $p=0.515$  and  $1196 \pm 45$  (group with LGE) vs  $1185 \pm 18$  (group without LGE),  $p=0.784$  for 1.5T and  
19 3T scanners, respectively). A similar proportion of patients with and without LGE exhibited  
20 elevated IVS native T1 values (50% vs 28% respectively,  $p=0.216$ ). Overall, myocardial T1 values  
21 were abnormal in 5 out of the 17 patients who would have been classified as exhibiting a  
22 normal LV by conventional imaging (Figure 1 and Figure 2).

23 No difference was observed with respect to ECG features between patients with normal and  
24 elevated myocardial T1 values ( $p > 0.05$  for all) (Table 3).

### 26 **First-degree relatives of patients with ARVC**

27 Table 4 shows the main demographic characteristics and CMR parameters in 59 first-degree  
28 relatives who did not fulfil TFC diagnostic of ARVC. None of the family members were  
29 diagnosed with any other cardiac condition, apart from 4 individuals who exhibited features of

1 hypertensive heart disease (i.e. increased LV mass or mild LV hypertrophy in the range of 12-15  
2 mm). Genetic analysis (n=16) revealed a pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant in the PKP2  
3 (n=7; 44%) and DSG (n=1; 6%) genes.

4 At least 1 CMR abnormality was found in 11 (19%) first-degree relatives (Figure 2). Isolated RV  
5 RWMA were found in 8 (14%) individuals and 1 individual fulfilled a single minor functional TFC  
6 (RVEF  $\leq$  45%). Two individuals fulfilled minor volume TFC for ARVC (RV end-diastolic volume  
7 between 100 and 110 ml/m<sup>2</sup>). Late gadolinium enhancement was present in 3 (5%) cases,  
8 predominantly the inferior wall (Table 4). In all the first-degree relatives exhibiting minor  
9 abnormalities at CMR, a comprehensive diagnostic work-up did not reveal any other feature  
10 suggestive of ARVC. Myocardial T1 values are shown in Table 4. Twenty-two (37%) first-degree  
11 relatives exhibited elevated septal T1 values according to scanner specific thresholds (Figure 3).  
12 No association was observed between LV hypertrophy suggestive of hypertensive heart disease  
13 and abnormal T1 values (P=0.106). Respectively, we did not find an association of genotype  
14 status and elevated T1 values (P=0.999).

15 Measurements of average native T1 values showed good inter-observer reproducibility  
16 (ICC=0.81, 95% CI 0.717-0.871).

17

## 18 **DISCUSSION**

19 Arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy is increasingly recognised as a biventricular  
20 disease<sup>22,23</sup>. In this context, CMR is a powerful tool to detect structural and functional  
21 abnormalities, including RWMA, RV and/or LV systolic dysfunction and focal myocardial fibrosis  
22 through LGE imaging. Tissue characterization provides important clinical information beyond  
23 assessment of biventricular size and function. Our study shows that pre-contrast (or native)  
24 myocardial T1 values are often higher than normal in both patients with ARVC and first-degree  
25 relatives of patients with ARVC. Left ventricular involvement consisting of RWMA and LGE was  
26 observed in 43% of our patients with ARVC. Interestingly, native T1 mapping revealed elevated  
27 myocardial T1 values in a significant proportion of cases who would otherwise have been  
28 regarded as free of LV involvement by standard CMR techniques. In addition, over one-third  
29 (37%) of first-degree relatives not fulfilling current diagnostic criteria for ARVC revealed

1 abnormal septal T1 values. No relationship was observed between potential LV involvement  
2 indicated by abnormal T1 values and ECG changes. It is possible that T1 changes are not  
3 reflected on the ECG because they represent a phase of very early LV involvement which does  
4 not find yet an electrical correlate.

5

#### 6 **CMR features in ARVC**

7 Structural RV changes based on CMR were incorporated into the revised diagnostic TFC  
8 published in 2010<sup>2</sup>. However, despite being initially considered a disease of the RV in isolation,  
9 recent studies have demonstrated that LV involvement is relatively common in ARVC<sup>3,24,25</sup>.

10 Myocardial T1 mapping offers the opportunity to detect an increase in the extracellular space  
11 which may be due to diffuse fibrosis or myocardial infiltration<sup>26</sup>. Indeed, T1 mapping has been  
12 shown to be a useful technique in differentiating between specific cardiomyopathies  
13 characterized by left ventricular hypertrophy<sup>27</sup>.

14 Our study shows that in addition to almost half of patients with ARVC exhibiting structural LV  
15 abnormalities and/or focal LV fibrosis, myocardial T1 values were abnormal in 5 of 17 patients  
16 in whom potential LV involvement would have otherwise remained undetected using  
17 conventional CMR imaging. In our cohort, we found that myocardial T1 was abnormal in 37% of  
18 patients, suggesting that T1 mapping may play a role in the detection of early or subtle LV  
19 involvement and may be complementary to other CMR sequences.

20

#### 21 **CMR features in first-degree relatives**

22 A diagnosis of ARVC has significant implications for first-degree relatives. Since sudden cardiac  
23 death may be the first and only manifestation of disease, comprehensive evaluation of first-  
24 degree relatives is strongly recommended. The diagnostic work-up should include CMR, which  
25 can reveal abnormalities that may not be evident on other imaging techniques such as  
26 echocardiography.

27 Out of 59 first-degree relatives, 19% showed isolated CMR abnormalities which were not  
28 sufficient to provide a diagnosis of ARVC per se. Interestingly, 37% exhibited abnormally  
29 elevated septal T1 values. Although this finding suggests that CMR has the potential to detect

1 early signs of LV disease in family members, results should be interpreted with caution and as  
2 merely descriptive. Several variables must be considered when T1 mapping analysis is  
3 performed including age, gender, comorbidities such as hypertension which may alter T1  
4 values<sup>27,28</sup>. Only 4 first-degree relatives showed features of mild hypertensive heart disease in  
5 our study and an association between increased T1 values and left ventricular hypertrophy was  
6 not observed.

7 The significance of abnormal septal T1 values in first-degree relatives remains uncertain. These  
8 findings will need to be corroborated by longitudinal studies aimed at demonstrating whether  
9 subtle changes revealed by T1 mapping predict the development of an overt phenotype in first-  
10 degree relatives at risk.

11 Our study has some limitations. This was a retrospective study and the sample size was  
12 relatively small. Although abnormal T1 values were derived from measurements at the level of  
13 the interventricular septum, we also analyzed T1 values at the level of the lateral LV wall where  
14 normal values have not yet been clearly established<sup>29</sup>. Finally, we used a ROI localized in the  
15 mid IVS and mid-lateral wall only, meaning that focal fibrosis or fat replacement elsewhere may  
16 have been missed. The choice of a specific ROI in the cohort studied was motivated by the need  
17 to have an analogous comparison with healthy individuals and therefore the methods used to  
18 assess normality in a previous study were followed<sup>18</sup>.

19

## 20 **CONCLUSIONS**

21 Patients with ARVC often exhibit LV involvement on CMR (43% of the cases in our study cohort).  
22 Native myocardial T1 values were higher than normal in 37% of patients, including a significant  
23 proportion of patients who would have been otherwise classified as exhibiting a normal LV  
24 using conventional CMR techniques. Abnormally elevated T1 values were also observed in  
25 more than one third of first-degree relatives who did not exhibit a cardiomyopathy phenotype  
26 after comprehensive investigations following a diagnosis of ARVC in their family members. The  
27 significance of abnormal septal T1 values in first-degree relatives remains uncertain and will  
28 require to be substantiated by future longitudinal studies.

29

1 **ABBREVIATIONS:**

2 ARVC; Arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy

3 TFC; Task Force Criteria

4 LV; Left ventricular

5 CMR; Cardiovascular magnetic resonance

6 LGE Late gadolinium enhancement

7 ECG; Electrocardiogram

8 TWI; T-wave inversion

9 LA; Left atrial

10 SSFP; Steady-state free precession

11 BSA; Body surface area

12 RWMA; Right ventricular regional wall motion abnormalities

13 ROI; Region of interest

14

15 **DECLARATIONS**

16 **Ethics approval and consent to participate:** The study was approved by the institutional ethics  
17 committee (School of Biomedical Engineering and Imaging Sciences, King’s College London) and  
18 all patients with ARVC and first-degree relatives provided written informed consent prior to  
19 screening for the CMR images and related clinical data to be anonymously analyzed for  
20 research.

21 **Consent for publication:** Not Applicable.

22 **Availability of data and materials:** The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current  
23 study are not publicly available but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable  
24 request.

25 **Competing interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

26 **Funding:** None related to this study.

27 **Contributions:** GG – study design, data collection, data interpret, quality control, statistical  
28 analysis, manuscript preparation and revision. MZ – data collection and manuscript revision. SM  
29 –manuscript preparation. AC – quality control. AA- quality control and manuscript revision. BB-

1 quality control and manuscript revision. LR- quality control and manuscript revision. LMG-  
2 quality control and manuscript revision. CE- quality control and manuscript revision. NS- quality  
3 control and manuscript revision. RB- data collection, quality control and manuscript revision.  
4 MC- quality control and manuscript revision. PGM- quality control and manuscript revision.  
5 GCW- quality control and manuscript revision. GF: study design, data collection, data interpret,  
6 quality control, statistical analysis, manuscript preparation and revision. AC- quality control,  
7 manuscript preparation and revision. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.  
8 **Acknowledgement:** Dr Georgiopoulos was supported by a research fellowship from the  
9 European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging and a postdoctoral grant from the Alexander S.  
10 Onassis Foundation  
11

1 **REFERENCES**

2

3 1. Corrado D, Link MS, Calkins H. Arrhythmogenic Right Ventricular Cardiomyopathy. *N Engl*  
4 *J Med* 2017; 376: 61–72.

5 2. Marcus FI, McKenna WJ, Sherrill D, et al. Diagnosis of Arrhythmogenic Right Ventricular  
6 Cardiomyopathy/Dysplasia. *Circulation* 2010; 121: 1533–1541.

7 3. Miles C, Finocchiaro G, Papadakis M, et al. Sudden Death and Left Ventricular  
8 Involvement in Arrhythmogenic Cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 2019; 139: 1786–1797.

9 4. Corrado D, Perazzolo Marra M, Zorzi A, et al. Diagnosis of arrhythmogenic cardiomyopathy:  
10 The Padua criteria. *Int J Cardiol.* 2020; 319: 106-114.

11 5. Messroghli DR, Moon JC, Ferreira VM, et al. Clinical recommendations for cardiovascular  
12 magnetic resonance mapping of T1, T2, T2\* and extracellular volume: A consensus  
13 statement by the Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance (SCMR) endorsed by the  
14 European Association for Cardiovascular Imagi. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson* 2017; 19: 75.

15 6. Sado DM, White SK, Piechnik SK, et al. Identification and Assessment of Anderson-Fabry  
16 Disease by Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance Noncontrast Myocardial T1 Mapping. *Circ*  
17 *Cardiovasc Imaging* 2013; 6: 392–398.

18 7. Bourfiss M, Prakken NHJ, van der Heijden JF, et al. Diagnostic Value of Native T1 Mapping  
19 in Arrhythmogenic Right Ventricular Cardiomyopathy. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging* 2019; 12:  
20 1580–1582.

21 8. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki. *JAMA* 2013; 310: 2191.

22 9. Clementy J, Bergere P, Bricaud H. Electrocardiography and vectocardiography in the  
23 evaluation of left ventricular hypertrophy due to pressure overload. *Eur Heart J* 1982; 3  
24 Suppl A: 37–47.

25 10. Macfarlane PW, Antzelevitch C, Haissaguerre M, et al. The Early Repolarization Pattern: A  
26 Consensus Paper. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2015; 66: 470–7.

27 11. Calore C, Zorzi A, Sheikh N, et al. Electrocardiographic anterior T-wave inversion in  
28 athletes of different ethnicities: differential diagnosis between athlete’s heart and  
29 cardiomyopathy. *Eur Heart J* 2016; 37: 2515–2527.

- 1 12. Malhotra A, Dhutia H, Gati S, et al. Anterior T-Wave Inversion in Young White Athletes  
2 and Nonathletes. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2017; 69: 1–9.
- 3 13. Finocchiaro G, Pinamonti B, Merlo M, et al. Focus on cardiac amyloidosis. *J Cardiovasc*  
4 *Med* 2013; 14: 281–288.
- 5 14. Sharma S, Drezner JA, Baggish A, et al. International recommendations for  
6 electrocardiographic interpretation in athletes. *Eur Heart J* 2018; 39: 1466–1480.
- 7 15. Kramer CM, Barkhausen J, Flamm SD, et al. Standardized cardiovascular magnetic  
8 resonance (CMR) protocols 2013 update. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson* 2013; 15: 1–10.
- 9 16. Grothues F, Moon JC, Bellenger NG, et al. Interstudy reproducibility of right ventricular  
10 volumes, function, and mass with cardiovascular magnetic resonance. *Am Heart J* 2004;  
11 147: 218–223.
- 12 17. Kawel-Boehm N, Maceira A, Valsangiacomo-Buechel ER, et al. Normal values for  
13 cardiovascular magnetic resonance in adults and children. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson* 2015;  
14 17: 29.
- 15 18. Dabir D, Child N, Kalra A, et al. Reference values for healthy human myocardium using a  
16 T1 mapping methodology: results from the International T1 Multicenter cardiovascular  
17 magnetic resonance study. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson* 2014; 16: 69.
- 18 19. von Knobelsdorff-Brenkenhoff F, Prothmann M, Dieringer MA, et al. Myocardial T1 and T2  
19 mapping at 3 T: reference values, influencing factors and implications. *J Cardiovasc Magn*  
20 *Reson* 2013;15:53.
- 21 20. Rosmini S, Bulluck H, Captur G, et al. Myocardial native T1 and extracellular volume with  
22 healthy ageing and gender. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging* 2018;19:615-621.
- 23 21. Melnick ME. Foundations of Clinical Research: Applications to Practice. Portney LG, Wat  
24 kins MP, Norwalk, CT, Appleton & Lange, 1993, hardback, 722 pp, ill its, \$48.95. *J*  
25 *Phys Ther Educ* 1994; 8: 46.
- 26 22. Corrado D, van Tintelen PJ, McKenna WJ, et al. Arrhythmogenic right ventricular  
27 cardiomyopathy: evaluation of the current diagnostic criteria and differential diagnosis.  
28 *Eur Heart J* 2020; 41: 1414–1429.
- 29 23. Aquaro GD, De Luca A, Cappelletto C, et al. Prognostic Value of Magnetic Resonance



- 1 Phenotype in Patients With Arrhythmogenic Right Ventricular Cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll*  
2 *Cardiol* 2020; 75: 2753–2765.
- 3 24. Sen-Chowdhry S, Syrris P, Prasad SK, et al. Left-Dominant Arrhythmogenic  
4 Cardiomyopathy. An Under-Recognized Clinical Entity. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2008; 52: 2175–  
5 2187.
- 6 25. Rizzo S, Pilichou K, Thiene G, et al. The changing spectrum of arrhythmogenic (right  
7 ventricular) cardiomyopathy. *Cell Tissue Res* 2012; 348: 319–323.
- 8 26. Banyersad SM, Sado DM, Flett AS, et al. Quantification of myocardial extracellular  
9 volume fraction in systemic AL amyloidosis: An equilibrium contrast cardiovascular  
10 magnetic resonance study. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging* 2013; 6: 34–39.
- 11 27. Haaf P, Garg P, Messroghli DR, et al. Cardiac T1 Mapping and Extracellular Volume (ECV)  
12 in clinical practice: a comprehensive review. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson* 2017; 18: 89.
- 13 28. Radenkovic D, Weingärtner S, Ricketts L, et al. T1 mapping in cardiac MRI. *Heart Fail Rev*  
14 2017; 22: 415–430.
- 15 29. Moon JC, Messroghli DR, Kellman P, et al. Myocardial T1 mapping and extracellular  
16 volume quantification: a Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance (SCMR) and CMR  
17 Working Group of the European Society of Cardiology consensus statement. *J Cardiovasc*  
18 *Magn Reson* 2013; 15: 92.
- 19  
20

1 **Table 1.** Demographic characteristics and ECG indices in 30 patients with ARVC.

<b>Demographics</b>	
Male, n (%)	14 (47%)
Age (years)	45 ± 27
<b>ECG</b>	
SR, n (%)	28 (93%)
HR, median (IQR) [bpm]	67 (55-75)
QRS duration, median (IQR) [ms]	86 (82-94)
QRS duration>120 ms, n (%)	3 (10%)
RBBB, n (%)	2 (6%)
LBBB, n (%)	/
Low voltages precordial/limb leads*, n (%)	4 (13%)
Q waves, n (%)	1 (3%)
TWI V1–V3, n (%)	16 (53%)
Lateral TWI, n (%)	4 (13%)
Ventricular Ectopic beats ≥1, n (%)	4(15%)
Epsilon wave, n (%)	/

2

3 \* QRS amplitude ≤1.0 mV in all of the precordial leads and/or QRS amplitude ≤0.5 mV in all of  
4 the limb leads

5 **Abbreviations:** ECG, electrocardiogram; HR, heart rate; IQR, inter-quartile range; LBBB, left  
6 bundle branch block; RBBB, right bundle branch block; SD, standard deviation; SR, sinus  
7 rhythm; TWI, T waves inversion; VEs, ventricular ectopic beats

8

9

10

11 **Table 2.** Main CMR features and T1 values in 30 patients with ARVC.

<b>CMR features</b>	
LVEDV/BSA, median (IQR) [ml/m <sup>2</sup> ]	79 (69-86)
LVEF, median (IQR) [%]	60 (57-64)
RVEDV, median (IQR) [ml]	178 (143-215)
RVEDV/BSA, median (IQR) [ml/m <sup>2</sup> ]	94 (83-108)

RVESV/BSA, median (IQR) [ml/m <sup>2</sup> ]	53 (44-59)	
CMR major volume criteria*, n (%)	9 (30%)	
CMR minor volume criteria*, n (%)	2 (7%)	
RVEF, median (IQR) [%]	53 (44-59)	
CMR major function criteria*, n (%)	4 (13%)	
CMR minor function criteria*, n (%)	3 (10%)	
RV RWMA, n (%)	20 (67%)	
LGE, n (%)	15 (50%)	
LV involvement, n (%)	13 (43%)	
<b>Native T1 mapping</b>		
	<b>1.5T (N= 18)</b>	<b>3T (N=12)</b>
IVS ROI area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	0.9 ± 0.3	1.2 ± 0.3
IVS mean value (ms)	977 ± 39 (n.v. 950 ± 21)	1189 ± 102 (n.v. 1052 ± 23)
Lateral ROI area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	0.8 ± 0.3	0.9 ± 0.3
Lateral mean value (ms)	970 ± 73	1129 ± 44
Abnormal IVS native T1, n (%)	3 (17%)	8 (67%)

1 \* According to the Revised Task Force Criteria for the diagnosis of ARVC.

2 **Abbreviations:** BSA: body surface area; CMR: Cardiovascular magnetic resonance; IQR, inter-  
3 quartile range; IVS: inter-ventricular septal; LGE: late gadolinium enhancement; LV: left ventricle;  
4 LVEDV: left ventricular end-diastolic volume; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction; n.v: normal  
5 values; ROI, region of interest; RV: right ventricle; RVEDV: right ventricular end-diastolic volume,  
6 RVEF: right ventricular ejection fraction, RVESV: right ventricular end-systolic volume, RVOT: right  
7 ventricular outflow tract, RWMA: regional wall motion abnormalities; SD, standard deviation.

8  
9 **Table 3.** Differences in electrocardiographic features of patients with ARVC according to normal  
10 or abnormal myocardial T1 mapping. Data on ventricular tachycardia were based on ECG and  
11 ambulatory monitoring.

	<b>Normal T1 (n=19)</b>	<b>Abnormal T1 (n=11)</b>	<b>P-value</b>
<b>TWI V1–V3, n (%)</b>	10 (59%)	6 (55%)	0.823
<b>Lateral TWI, n (%)</b>	3 (16%)	1 (9%)	0.603
<b>QRS duration&gt;120msec, n (%)</b>	1 (5%)	1 (9%)	0.685

<b>Low voltages precordial/limb leads, n (%)</b>	2 (12%)	2 (20%)	0.581
<b>RBBB, n (%)</b>	2 (12%)	0 (0%)	0.206
<b>Ventricular ectopic beats<math>\geq</math>1</b>	3 (16%)	1 (9%)	0.603
<b>Ventricular tachycardia (LBBB pattern and superior axis)</b>	7 (36.8%)	5 (45.5%)	0.656
<b>Ventricular tachycardia (RVOT origin)</b>	3 (15.8%)	2 (18.2%)	0.350

1 **Abbreviations:** LBBB: left bundle branch block; RBBB, right bundle branch block; RVOT: right  
2 ventricle outflow tract; TWI: T-wave inversion.

3

4

1 **Table 4.** Demographic characteristics, CMR indices and myocardial T1 values in 59 first-degree  
 2 relatives of patients with ARVC.

<b>Demographics</b>		
Male, n (%)	24 (41)	
Age, mean ± SD [years]	42±19	
Hypertensive heart disease, n (%)	4 (7%)	
<b>CMR features</b>		
LVEDV/BSA, median (IQR) [ml/m <sup>2</sup> ]	77 (69-88)	
LVEF, median (IQR) [%]	61 (59-64)	
RVEDV, median (IQR) [ml]	145 (121-180)	
RVEDV/BSA, median (IQR) [ml/m <sup>2</sup> ]	77 (67-94)	
RVESV/BSA, median (IQR) [ml/m <sup>2</sup> ]	35 (26-41)	
CMR major volume criteria, n (%)	/	
CMR minor volume criteria, n (%)	2 (3%)	
RVEF, median (IQR) [%]	56 (53-61)	
CMR major function criteria, n (%)	/	
CMR minor function criteria, n (%)	1 (2%)	
RV RWMA, n (%)	8 (14%)	
RV apical RWMA, n (%)	1 (2%)	
RV free wall RWMA, n (%)	3 (5%)	
RV anterior wall/RVOT RWMA, n (%)	1 (2%)	
RV inferior RWMA, n (%)	3 (5%)	
LGE, n (%)	3 (5%)	
LGE LV only, n (%)	3 (5%)	
LGE infero-lateral, n (%)	1 (2%)	
LGE inferior, n (%)	2 (3%)	
<b>Native T1 mapping</b>		
	<b>1.5T (N= 42)</b>	<b>3T (N=17)</b>
IVS ROI area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	0.732 ± 0.204	0.808±0.172
IVS mean value (ms)	992 ± 66.1 (n.v. 950 ± 21)	1155 ± 108 (n.v. 1052 ± 23)
Lateral ROI area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	0.779±0.186	0.843±0.215
Lateral mean value (ms)	997±49	1122 ±169
Abnormal IVS native T1, n (%)	10 (24%)	12 (71%)

3

4 **Abbreviations:** as per table 1 and 2.

5

1 **Figure legends:**

2 **Figure 1.** Flow chart and main characteristics of the patients with arrhythmogenic right  
3 ventricular cardiomyopathy (ARVC).

4 Abbreviations: CMR: Cardiovascular magnetic resonance; LGE: late gadolinium enhancement,  
5 LV: left ventricle; LVH: left ventricular hypertrophy; RWMA: regional wall motion abnormalities

6

7 **Figure 2.** Abnormal findings by conventional cardiac magnetic resonance (CMR) imaging and  
8 native T1 mapping imaging.

9 Abbreviation: ARVC, arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy.

10

11 **Figure 3.** Flow chart and main characteristics of first-degree relatives of patients with ARVC.

12 Abbreviations: CMR: Cardiovascular magnetic resonance; LGE: late gadolinium enhancement,

13 LV: left ventricle; LVH: left ventricular hypertrophy; RV: right ventricle; RVEF: right ventricle

14 ejection fraction; RWMA: regional wall motion abnormalities.