1 A NOVEL ELECTROCARDIOGRAPHIC PREDICTION MODEL FOR DIAGNOSING 2 CONCEALED BRUGADA SYNDROME: RESULTS FROM A CLINICAL TRIAL OF 3 AJMALINE PROVOCATION IN HEALTHY SUBJECTS

4

9

Bode Ensam¹ MBChB, Chiara Scrocco¹ MD, David Johnson¹ PhD, Yanushi D.
Wijeyeratne¹ PhD, Rachel Bastiaenen¹ PhD, Belinda Gray^{1,3}, Chris Miles¹ PhD, Yael
Ben-Haim¹ MD, Stathis Papatheodorou¹ MD, Sanjay Sharma¹ MD, Michael
Papadakis¹ MD, Brian Devine² MSc, Peter W. Macfarlane² DSc, Elijah R. Behr¹ MD.

10 Affiliations:

¹Cardiology Section and Cardiovascular Clinical Academic Group, St. George's
 University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK and Institute of Molecular
 and Clinical Sciences, St George's University of London, London, UK.

¹⁴ ²Electrocardiology Group, School of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow.

¹⁵ ³Faculty of Medicine and Health, University of Sydney, NSW, Australia

16

17 Funding:

This work is supported by The Robert Lancaster Memorial Fund sponsored by McColl's, Cardiac Risk in the Young UK, and the British Heart Foundation (PG/19/58/34581).

- 21 BG is the recipient of a NHMRC Early Career Fellowship (#1122330).
- 22

23 **Disclosures**:

24 The authors have no relevant conflicts of interest to disclose.

25

26 Acknowledgements:

27 Dr Velislav Batchvarov MD (posthumous), Cardiology Clinical Academic Group, St.

- 28 George's University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK and Institute of
- 29 Molecular and Clinical Sciences, St George's University of London, London, UK,
- 30

31 CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

- 32
- 33 Professor Elijah R. Behr
- 34 St. George's, University of London,
- 35 St. George's University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
- 36 Cranmer Terrace
- 37 Tooting
- 38 London
- 39 SW17 0RE
- 40 <u>ebehr@sgul.ac.uk</u>
- 41 +442087252994
- 42 Twitter @BehrElijah
- 43
- 44 Word Count: 3127 (text only)
- 45 Figures: 4
- 46 **Tables:** 7
- 47 Supplementary Figures: 2
- 48 **Supplementary Tables:** 2
- 49
- 50

51 Background

52

53 Clinical, electrocardiographic, and genomic factors have been associated with the 54 drug-induced type 1 Brugada pattern (DI-T1BP), in response to sodium channel blocker provocation (SCBP). However, prior analyses have been concerned with 55 prediction of the DI-T1BP rather than the validity of the diagnosis of concealed 56 57 Brugada syndrome (BrS). We sought to analyse and compare the ECG response to 58 SCBP with ajmaline in a cohort of healthy controls (HC) and a definite BrS group 59 (Def-BrS) to develop a diagnostic score.

60

61 Methods

62

63 Healthy controls (HC) were systematically recruited as part of a clinical trial. 64 Following comprehensive cardiovascular screening, eligible subjects underwent 65 SCBP with ajmaline. We identified a Def-BrS cohort, defined as a DI-T1BP and a Shanghai Score (SS) >3.5, from consecutive patients with suspected BrS 66 undergoing SCBP with aimaline using the identical protocol. Def-BrS and HC were 67 divided equally into discovery and validation cohorts. Digital ECG acquisition 68 facilitated automated measurement of ECG parameters. A multivariable analysis 69 70 compared ECG parameters between the HC and Def-BrS cohorts. A logistic regression analysis identified ECG characteristics that accurately predicted the 71 72 diagnosis of Def-BrS. This model was then assessed in the validation cohort.

73

74 Results

75

76 Two-hundred-and-forty-eight volunteers completed an online questionnaire, 103 77 accepted an invitation to undergo further screening and 100 were recruited into the 78 HC group. Three HCs developed a DI-T1BP. From 1241 patients undergoing SCBP, 79 166 were Def-BrS. There were no demographic differences between the HC 80 discovery and validation groups or between the Def-BrS discovery and validation 81 groups. Following multivariable logistic regression analysis, QRS duration, mean 82 anterior lead ST segment amplitude at baseline, maximum change in QRS duration, 83 anterior ST segment amplitude and QRS area after SCBP, were independently 84 associated with Def-BrS. The combined model was an excellent discriminator for 85 Def-BrS, with an area under the curve of 0.95 [95% confidence interval (CI) = 0.91286 - 0.989], P<0.001 in the discovery groups and 0.97 [95% CI = 0.948 - 0.998], 87 P<0.001 in the validation groups.

88

89 Conclusion

90

91 The yield of the DI-T1BP in HCs is 3%. However, there are distinct ECG parameters 92 at baseline and in response to SCBP that favour a definite diagnosis of BrS. These 93 observations permit the quantifiable refinement of the ECG diagnosis of concealed

94 BrS, avoiding the pitfalls of relying upon the DI-T1BP alone.

95 INTRODUCTION

96

97 The yield of the drug-induced type 1 Brugada pattern (DI-T1BP), across a spectrum 98 of clinical and experimental scenarios has been described previously ^{(1-4).} 99 Additionally, the clinical, electrocardiographic, and genomic factors associated with 100 the development of the DI-T1BP in response to sodium channel blocker provocation 101 (SCBP) have been investigated ⁽⁵⁾. However, these prior analyses have been 102 concerned with the prediction of the DI-T1BP rather than the strength or validity of 103 the diagnosis of Brugada syndrome (BrS).

104

In response to a perceived higher than expected yield of the DI-T1BP in the clinical setting and an uncertainty regarding false positives, an international consensus document downgraded the response to SCBP from diagnostic to probabilistic. With the proposed Shanghai scoring system (SS), an isolated DI-T1BP is insufficient to make a diagnosis of "definite Brugada Syndrome ⁽⁶⁾." The scoring system is, however, based largely on expert opinion.

111

Furthermore, the response to SCBP is not binary, rather, several temporal ECG changes may be observed, and it is postulated to exacerbate a pre-existent impaired right ventricular outflow tract (RVOT) conduction reserve to unveil the DI-T1BP ⁽⁷⁾. The significance of baseline and dynamic ECG traits in affected and unaffected subjects is poorly understood but may provide a quantitative element to the druginduced BrS phenotype.

118

We sought to analyse and compare the ECG response to SCBP with ajmaline in a cohort of healthy subjects, Healthy Controls (HC), and clinical patients with a DI-T1BP, thus proposing a quantitative ECG model for the diagnosis of definite concealed BrS.

123

124 **METHODS**

125

126 **Recruitment**

Healthy Controls (HC): Subjects responded to online advertisements seeking
healthy volunteers as part of an interventional clinical trial, (*ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT02933437, EudraCT Number 2016-004277-41*), with ethical approval
from London - Southeast Research Ethics Committee, (16/LO/2173).

131

132 A comprehensive online medical questionnaire was used to identify eligible subjects 133 (supplementary data I). Those fulfilling the initial inclusion criteria (supplementary 134 data II), were invited to attend for further eligibility testing with a focused 135 cardiovascular examination, baseline resting 12 lead and high right precordial lead (HRPL) ECG with additional leads placed in the V1 and V2 position in the 2nd and 136 3rd 137 intercostal spaces, (supplementary data III). A baseline transthoracic 138 echocardiogram (TTE) was also performed. Those with any ECG or structural 139 abnormality outside of normal physiological range were excluded (supplementary 140 data II). Participants were compensated for their time.

141

Clinical cohort: From an existing clinical cohort of consecutive patients investigated
 at our centre for suspected BrS between 2010 – 2022, we identified those with DI-

144 T1BP and a definite diagnosis of BrS according to a SS \geq 3.5 (Def-BrS group). 145 Patients within the clinical cohort were evaluated in a dedicated clinic by experienced 146 clinicians following international recommendations and provided informed consent, 147 (NHS Research Ethics Committee reference 10/H0803/121). The indication for 148 SCBP included unexplained cardiac arrest (UCA) in the subject, or BrS, sudden 149 arrhythmic death (SADS) or UCA in a first-degree relative.

150

Study cohort: The HC and Def-BrS group were equally divided into discovery (HCDis and Def-BrS-Dis) and validation groups (HC-Val and Def-BrS-Val) groups
respectively.

154

Sodium channel blocker provocation: All subjects underwent SCBP with ajmaline according to a standardised protocol of 1mg/kg (maximum dose 100mg) administered intravenously over 5 minutes. The SCBP test was terminated early once the DI-T1BP was observed, if QRS prolongation increased \geq 150% of the baseline measurement, or if a ventricular arrhythmia was encountered. The DI-T1BP was defined as J point elevation \geq 0.2mV with coved ST elevation in a right precordial chest lead.

162

ECG acquisition and analysis: SCBP was undertaken using HRPL placement. A continuous ECG was acquired digitally using a CardioSoft resting digital recorder (GE Healthcare, Milwaukee, WI, USA) with a sampling rate of 500 samples/sec and 4.88μV amplitude resolution. The low pass filter was set at 150 Hz. From the continuous ECG recording a 10-second HRPL ECG was obtained at 1-minute intervals from the beginning of drug administration for a minimum of 10 minutes.

169 ECGs were stored in XML format and imported onto a secure ECG server for 170 analysis. Relevant and novel ECG parameters were measured using bespoke 171 ECG analysis software developed in automated partnership with the 172 Electrocardiology Group, School of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow. 173 Beats with excessive noise were excluded from analysis and a combination of lead-174 specific and global ECG parameters were analysed using single beats and a derived representative beat respectively. 175

176

Quantitative ECG parameters were measured at baseline (time 00:00 of ajmaline administration) and at peak drug effect, (denoted as maximum QRS duration (ms) from a representative beat), which were expressed as delta values (Δ = peak – baseline). See Table 1.0 and supplementary material IV for ECG parameters.

181

Shanghai Score: The clinical, familial, and genetic components of the SS were applied according to the recommended scoring system⁽⁶⁾. However, to investigate the significance of a baseline type 2/3 Brugada pattern (T2/3BP) as a categorical covariate in the prediction of Def-BrS, an ECG score of 2.0 was given to all who developed the T1BP irrespective of the presence of T2/3BP on the baseline ECG. If a spontaneous or fever induced T1BP was observed at any point during follow up the ECG score was adjusted accordingly.

189

190 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

191

192 General Statistical Methods: Data were analysed with IBM ® SPSS ® Statistics
 193 version 29. Categorical variables are presented as frequencies (percentages) and

were compared using the χ^2 or Fishers exact test where appropriate. For continuous 194 195 variables, the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was used to test the distribution of data. The 196 Mann-Whitney test was performed to compare differences between non-normally distributed continuous variables, which are reported as median [1st quartile - 3rd 197 198 quartile]. Normally distributed continuous variables were analysed using an 199 independent sample T-test and are reported as mean + standard deviation (SD). A 200 value of P< 0.05 was considered significant in all cases. A paired intragroup analysis 201 of ECG characteristics was undertaken and is provided in supplementary data V.

202

203 Variable Filters and Model Development: Candidate variables from the univariate 204 analysis between the HC-Dis and Def-BrS-Dis groups with a statistical significance 205 of P<0.05 were included in a multivariate binomial logistic regression model. 206 Following this, variables that were independently associated with the diagnosis of 207 Def-BrS (odds ratio (OR) \geq 1.0 and P<0.05), were included in the predictive model. 208 To assess for overfitting, we used the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and 209 Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), and we assessed the performance of the 210 proposed model using the validation groups.

211

212 **RESULTS**

213

214 Demographic and clinical characteristics

Two hundred-and-forty-eight (248) prospective healthy subjects completed the online medical questionnaire, 68 applicants were excluded at this stage due to prior cardiac symptoms or suspicious family history. One-hundred-and-eighty were deemed suitable and were invited for further eligibility testing with 103 attending. Two

subjects were excluded because of baseline ECG abnormalities and one subject was excluded due to a borderline TTE abnormality. We did not observe a spontaneous T1BP or T2/3BP in any of the subjects undergoing screening. The final cohort of 100 healthy controls underwent SCBP (Figure 1.0).

223

From a clinical cohort of 1241 consecutive patients undergoing AP, 372 (30%) had a DI-T1BP. One hundred-and-sixty-six of these patients, 45% (166/372), had a SS of \geq 3.5 and comprised the Def-BrS cohort (Figure 1.0).

227

228 Table 2.0 highlights the demographic and clinical characteristics of the overall HC 229 and Def-BrS cohorts. Of note the HC cohort were significantly younger in age than 230 the Def-BrS cohort, median age 24.53 years (Q1 21.78 – Q3 29.04) vs. 42.50 (Q1 231 28.00 – Q3 59.21), P<0.01. Within the Def-BrS cohort, 31% (51/166) were BrS 232 probands and 33% (55/166) had a history of syncope prior to evaluation. During 233 follow-up 12% (20/166) were found to have a spontaneous T1BP on one or more 234 occasion and 4% (6/166) had spontaneous T1BP associated with fever. The 235 presence of a T1BP in a 1st or 2nd degree relative was the most frequent indication 236 for SCBP in the Def-BrS cohort, 60% (99/166). In the combined Def-BrS group, 10% 237 (17/166) had a baseline type 2/3 Brugada pattern (T2/3BP). However, no HC's had a 238 baseline T2/3BP (P= 0.02). A pathogenic variant in the SCN5A gene was identified 239 in 19% (31/166) Def-BrS subjects. The mean time to peak drug effect was 240 significantly earlier in the Def-BrS group compared to HC group 05min18secs 241 (±2min05secs) vs. 05min59secs (±01min20secs), P=0.01. Mean final SS in the Def-242 BrS group was 4.3 (± 0.75) vs. 0.06 (± 0.34) in the HC group.

243

244 Electrocardiographic Characteristics and Analyses

Overall, 3 subjects in the HC group developed the DI-T1BP during SCBP, 3/100 (3%) (Figure 2.0). At baseline, all 3 subjects had a partial right bundle branch block pattern (RBBB) with a sharp r' but without resting J-point elevation in at least one HRPL. In 2 of these 3 subjects, the DI-T1BP was observed in a single high-right precordial chest lead (HRPL) only, whilst in the remaining subject (subject 3), the DI-T1BP was seen in the 4th and 3rd intercostal spaces (ICS) and was borderline (<0.2mV J-point elevation) in the 2nd ICS.

252

The 100 HC and 166 Def-BrS subjects were equally and randomly divided into the respective discovery and validation groups. There were no significant demographic or clinical differences between the Def-BrS-Dis and Def-BrS-Val cohorts (Table 3.0). Similarly, there were no demographic differences between the HC-Dis and HC-Val cohorts (Table 4.0).

258

The independent sample univariable analysis of baseline ECG characteristics demonstrating a statistically significant difference between the discovery groups is highlighted in Table 5.0. Similarly, Table 6.0 highlights the univariable analysis of statistically significant \triangle ECG characteristics.

263

Following a combined multivariable analysis of baseline and Δ ECG characteristics significantly in favour of Def-BrS (OR >1.0 and P<0.05) in the discovery cohort, anterior ST amplitude (Adj. OR. 1.027 [95% Confidence Interval 1.005 – 1.046], P= 0.014) and QRS duration (Adj. OR. 1.096 [1.010 – 1.190], P=0.028) were independent baseline predictors of Def-BrS. The Δ Anterior ST amplitude (Adj.

269	OR.1.027 [1.012 - 1.043]), P<0.001, ∆QRS area (Adj. OR. 1.008 [1.004 - 1.013],
270	P<0.001 and \triangle QRS duration (Adj. OR. 1.127 [1.050 – 1.209], P<0.001) were SCBP
271	associated ECG characteristics independently predictive of Def-BrS (Table 7.0).
272	
273	The adjusted odds ratios per 10-unit increment for the final ECG characteristics in
274	the Def-BrS diagnostic ECG model are highlighted in Figure 3.0. The final ECG
275	model was 92.8% sensitive and 90.0% specific, with an overall accuracy of 91.7%
276	for Def-BrS and predicted the correct group membership in the 2 HC in the discovery
277	cohort with a DI-T1BP. With an area under the receiver operator curve (AUROC) of
278	0.95 [0.912 - 0.989], P<0.001, the combined model was an outstanding
279	discriminator for the diagnosis of Def-BrS. The optimal predictive probability from the
280	derived ECG model was 0.617 (with 0.00= healthy control and 1.00= definite BrS
281	syndrome) which corresponded with a sensitivity of 92.8% and specificity 96.0%
282	(Figure 4.0).

283

In the validation group, a similar performance was observed with an AUROC = 0.97 [0.948 – 0.998], P<0.001. Similar levels of sensitivity and specificity were observed 97.6% and 90.0% respectively with an overall accuracy of 94.7%. The optimal predictive probability was 0.502 which corresponded to a sensitivity of 97.6% and specificity of 99%. Again, the model predicted the correct group membership in the 1 HC in the validation group with a DI-T1BP

290

The AIC of the intercept only was 178.103 and 85.636 with the final model suggesting a good fit. Similarly, the BIC of the intercept only was 180.993 and 102.978 with the final model. The R^2 for the overall model was 0.732.

294

295

296 **DISCUSSION**

297

298 We report the first systematic assessment of diagnostic SCBP with ajmaline in a 299 large cohort of asymptomatic healthy Caucasian subjects without i) a family history 300 of sudden or unexplained death, ii) ECG or structural abnormalities. We identified 301 that the DI-T1BP may be observed in 3% of healthy individuals. In addition, baseline 302 anterior ST segment amplitude, baseline global QRS duration, Δ precordial QRS 303 area, Δ anterior ST amplitude and Δ global QRS duration were independently 304 associated with a diagnosis of *definite* concealed BrS. In combination, these ECG 305 characteristics were able to accurately distinguish between the healthy and those 306 with Def-BrS with a high level of specificity and sensitivity. Therefore, these 307 quantitative characteristics can enhance diagnostic certainty for BrS.

308

309 Comparison to previously reported yields

310 In clinical cohorts, the yield of the DI-T1BP with ajmaline is variable; in relatives of SADS victims a yield of 14-15% has been observed ^(1, 8). However, in survivors of 311 UCA, a vield of 20-22% has been reported ^(8, 9). Hasdemir *et al* observed a vield of 312 313 the DI-T1BP with a maline of 27.1% in cohort of Turkish patients with a diagnosis of 314 atrioventricular nodal re-entrant tachycardia (AVNRT) but without a baseline ECG 315 suspicious for BrS⁽⁴⁾. Of note, in those with AVNRT and a DI-T1BP who underwent 316 genetic testing, a variant in a gene related to sodium channel current was identified 317 in 76.5%. However, pathogenicity of these variants was uncertain and baseline 318 conduction intervals (PR, HV and QRS) were normal, rendering these variants

319 unlikely to be clinically relevant. Interestingly, in the study by Hasdemir et al, a DI-320 T1BP was observed in 4.5% of the control subjects who were unrelated and free 321 from any atrial and ventricular arrhythmia. In contrast to our study, neither family 322 history nor a history of syncope were used to screen controls. The false positive rate 323 of SCBP with ajmaline is therefore likely to be between 3.0-4.5% in individuals 324 without cardiovascular symptoms. However, the false positive rate may be higher in 325 those with a history of palpitations suggestive of AVNRT, and clinicians must be 326 aware of this prior to SCBP.

327

328 Baseline ECG characteristics

A T2/3BP was observed at baseline in 10% of patients with Def-BrS was not seen in any of the HCs, and whilst the odds ratio in the multivariable logistic regression analysis was exponential it was not a statistically significant independent predictor of the diagnosis of Def-BrS in the discovery cohort (OR $1x10^9$, P=0.99). The true significance of a baseline T2/3BP is therefore out of the scope of this study and must be assessed in a larger cohort of clinical patients, including those with low and intermediate diagnostic Shanghai scores.

336

In the high lead configuration right ventricular conduction delay or an incomplete right bundle branch pattern can be observed in healthy subjects ⁽¹⁰⁾. Several ECG features have been proposed to aid in the differentiation between a benign r' and a T2/3BP at baseline(11-14), including an assessment of the ß angle, which in clinical practice might be challenging to measure. In the combined predictive ECG model, we observed that baseline ST elevation in the precordial leads and QRS duration were independent predictors of the diagnosis of definite Brugada syndrome, with an

adjusted OR per 10μ V of 10.26 (95% CI 10.07 - 10.46), P= 0.007 and 10.76 (95% CI 10.18 - 11.37), P= 0.010. These parameters can be measured routinely with a consistent degree of reproducibility in clinical practice.

347

348 Ajmaline Provoked ECG characteristics

349 The change in global QRS duration with a maline was significantly greater in the Def-350 BrS-Dis group compared to the HC-Dis group. However, ΔPR interval and ΔP wave 351 duration were significantly greater in the healthy controls. In our study, as with most 352 SCBP protocols, intravenous administration stopped once the DI-T1BP was 353 observed. As a result, the mean actual dose given in the Def-BrS-Dis cohort was 354 78% of the target dose, while the mean actual dose given in the HC-Dis subjects 355 was 100% of the target dose (P<0.01). This might suggest that mechanistically, the 356 observed differences in the ΔPR interval and ΔP wave duration may be dose 357 dependent, whilst the effects on QRS duration and S wave duration in lead II are 358 disease dependent.

359

360 SCBP resulted in a significant increase in ST segment amplitude in the anterior 361 leads in the Def-BrS-Dis group compared to the HC-Dis group. The mean baseline 362 anterior ST amplitude in the Def-BrS-Dis group was $73.87 \mu V$ (±65.87), and at peak 363 drug effect was 208.86μ V, above the threshold required for a DI-T1BP (>0.2mV). 364 This would suggest that in a proportion of the Def-BrS-Dis group, the DI-T1BP was 365 observed prior to peak drug effect, which in the Def-BrS-Dis group was 04m59s 366 (±02m19s). This is suggestive of a lesser capacity of the RVOT in Def-BrS to 367 withstand the insult of SCBP and therefore less RVOT conduction reserve ⁽⁷⁾.

368 However, the numbers of HCs with a DI-T1BP were too small to conder this a 369 reliable co-variate.

370

371 Predictive ECG model

372 In a combined model, the baseline and ΔECG characteristics that were 373 independently associated with the Def-BrS group (Figure 3.0) predicted group 374 membership with a high level of specificity and sensitivity in the discovery cohort, 375 AUC 0.95, P<0.01. The optimal cut-off value for Def-BrS had 92.8% sensitivity and 376 96.0% specificity. In the validation cohort a similarly high level of accuracy was 377 observed. These findings suggest that a quantitative refinement on the ECG score 378 will enhance the diagnostic power of ajmaline provocation from the binary 379 assessment that currently exists, enabling the identification of those with a firm 380 diagnosis even in the absence of clinical or genetic characteristics that were not 381 incorporated in this study.

382

383 While an external validation of the predictive model in a similar clinical cohort of 384 patients with a DI-T1BP and SS \geq 3.5 is desirable, an assessment of the model's 385 performance in a cohort of patients with a DI-T1BP with low or intermediate 386 diagnostic certainty is necessary to determine whether a diagnosis could be 387 "upgraded" or "downgraded" based on the quantitative ECG score. Finally, an 388 assessment of the association between the ECG model and clinical variables, such 389 as family history, symptoms and genetic information may determine whether these 390 findings can become a 'gold standard' for the diagnosis of concealed BrS.

391

392 Clinical impact of this study

393 For the first time in a large cohort of systematically screened Caucasian 'super-394 healthy' subjects, we have determined that a DI-T1BP can be observed in 3%. In 395 clinical practice, clinicians will be guided by this observation to better inform their 396 patients when considering whether to undertake SCBP with ajmaline. The ECG traits 397 in favour of the diagnosis of definite BrS are readily measurable but the accuracy is 398 greatly enhanced by the ability to acquire the ECG digitally and perform a 399 subsequent automated analysis. This should be considered the ideal method for 400 ECG acquisition when performing SCBP.

401

402 Limitations

403 Our study used ajmaline, but whether these findings can be extrapolated to other 404 sodium channel blockers is uncertain and should be addressed using a comparative 405 and collaborative approach. Eighty six percent (86%) of the discovery cohort in the 406 study were Caucasian and thus whether the model can be applied to other 407 ethnicities is also uncertain.

408

409 **CONCLUSIONS**

410

By leveraging a novel clinical trial of ajmaline in the healthy, we have identified disease-specific ECG changes that are present at baseline and with SCBP that may enhance the diagnostic certainty of a DI-T1BP, and thus lay the groundwork for a gold standard for the diagnosis of concealed Brugada syndrome. We also demonstrated that changes in healthy subjects are observed with ajmaline, including the development of a DI-T1BP in 3%, that may indicate physiological variation in RVOT conduction reserve that is likely to be more impaired in true BrS.

418 FIGURES AND TABLES



419

420

421 Figure 1.0 Cohort recruitment flow diagram.

422 A – Healthy controls, B – Clinical cohort.

423 SCBP = Sodium Channel Provocation, HC = healthy controls, Def-BrS = definite

- 424 Brugada syndrome, Def-BrS-Dis = definite Brugada syndrome discovery, Def-BrS-
- 425 Val = definite Brugada syndrome validation, HC-Dis = healthy control discovery
- 426 group, HC-Val = healthy control validation group.



427 Figure 2.0 ECGs for the three healthy controls subjects in which the DI-T1BP

428 was observed during ajmaline provocation.



Figure 3.0 Forrest Plot of final ECG characteristics and corresponding
 adjusted odds ratios per 10unit increment in value. [§]Net area.





434

435 Figure 4.0 ROC curve for the Def-BrS predictive ECG discovery model.
436 AUC=Area under the curve.

Lead Measures	Abbreviation	Units			
Global Representative Beat Data					
QRS Duration	gQRSDur	ms			
T wave Duration	gTDur	ms			
PR Interval	gPR	ms			
QT Interval	gQT	ms			
P wave Duration	gPDur	ms			
⁺ Precordial Lead Data					
QRS Duration	QRS_Dur	ms			
T peak to T end interval	Tpe_Int	ms			
T wave Duration	T_Dur	ms			
Anterior ST amplitude	antSTJ_Amp	μV			
[§] QRS Area	QRS_Area	mV/ms			
[§] T wave area	TW_Area	mV/ms			
[§] QRST Area (QRS onset to T wave termination)	QRST_Area	mV/ms			
[§] ST-J point to Tpeak Area (QRS termination to T wave peak)	STj-Tpeak_Area	mV/ms			
$^{\$}$ Tpeak to Tend Area (T wave peak to T wave termination)	Tpe_Tend_Area	mV/ms			
Additional Lead Data					
S wave duration in lead I	S_Dur	ms			
S wave amplitude in lead I	S_Amp	μV			
 * Precordial lead data = sum of precordial leads / no. precordial leads § Net area ms = milliseconds, uV = microvolts, mV/ms = millivolts per millisecond 					

439 Table 1.0 ECG parameters – abbreviations and units of measure

	HC N = 100	Def-BrS N = 166	P value		
	Demog				
Modian Ago (voars) (01 03)	24.53	42.50	~0.01		
Mediali Age (years) (QT - QS)	(21.78 – 29.04)	(28.00 – 59.21)	NO.01		
Male Gender	52 (52%)	72 (43%)	0.14		
Caucasian Ethnicity	100 (100%)	133 (80%)	<0.01		
BrS Proband	-	51 (31%)	<0.01		
Syncope	-	55 (33%)			
Baseline T2/3 Brugada pattern	0 (0%)	17 (10%)	0.02		
	Ajmaline	Indication			
Healthy Control	100 (100%)	0 (0%)			
SADS/UCA relative	-	39 (24%)	-		
T1BP in a relative	-	99 (60%)			
UCA survivor	-	11 (7%)			
	Family His	tory Score			
0	100 (100%)	30 (18%)			
0.5	-	12 (7%)	_		
1	-	17 (10%)	_		
2	-	107 (65%)			
Mean (SD)	0	1.44 (0.81)			
	Clinical His	Clinical History Score			
0	100 (100%)	109 (66%)			
0.5	-	2 (1%)			
1	-	28 (17%)	-		
2	-	10 (6%)			
3	-	17 (10%)			
Mean (SD)	0	0.60 (0.98)			
	ECG	Score			
0	97 (97%)	0 (0%)			
2	3 (3%)	140 (84%)	_		
3	-	6 (4%)	_		
3.5	-	20 (12%)			
Mean (SD)	0.06 (0.34)	2.22 (0.51)			
	Geneti				
0.5	0 (0%)	31 (19%)	-		
Mean (SD)	0	0.09 (0.20)			
	Ajmaline P				
Pre - ajmaline SS (SD)	0	2.1 (0.80)	<0.01		
Final SS (SD)	0.06 (0.34)	4.3 (0.75)	<0.01		
Time to Peak Drug Effect (SD)	5m59s (1m20s)	5m18s (2m05s)	0.01		
Final dose:Target dose	1.00 (0.00)	0.78 (0.22)	<0.01		

440

442 Controls. Def-BrS=Definite Brugada Syndrome

⁴⁴¹ Table 2.0 Overall cohort demographic and clinical characteristics. HC=Healthy

	Def-BrS-Dis N = 83	Def-BrS-Val	P value
		-	
	Demog		
Median Age (years)	42.5	42.49	0.51
Male Gender	37 (45%)	34 (41.%)	0.64
Caucasian Ethnicity	64 (77%)	69 (83%)	0.33
BrS Proband	24 (29%)	27 (33%)	0.61
Syncope	27 (33%)	28 (34%)	1.00
Baseline T2/3 Brugada pattern	9 (11%)	8 (10%)	0.89
	Ajmaline	Indication	
SADS/UCA relative	20 (24%)	19 (23%)	0.82
T1BP in a relative	50 (60%)	49 (59%)	
UCA survivor	4 (5%)	7 (8%)	
	Family His	story Score	
0	15 (18%)	14 (17%)	0.93
0.5	7 (8%)	5 (6%)	
1	8 (10%)	9 (11%)	
2	53 (64%)	54 (66%)	
Mean (SD)	1.42 (0.82)	1.46 (0.80)	0.74
	Clinical Hi		
0	54 (65%)	55 (66%)	0.10
0.5	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	
1	11 (13%)	17 (21%)	
2	9 (11%)	1 (1%)	
3	8 (10%)	9 (11%)	
Mean (SD)	64 (1.02)	0.56 (0.96)	0.58
	ECG	Score	
0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0.47
2	69 (83%)	71 (86%)	
3	2 (2%)	4 (5%)	
3.5	12 (15%)	8 (10%)	
Mean (SD)	2.24 (0.54)	2.19 (0.48)	0.55
	Geneti		
0.5	16 (19%)	15 (18%)	0.84
Mean (SD)	0.10 (0.20)	0.10 (0.19)	0.84
	Ajmaline F	Provocation	
Pre - ajmaline SS (SD)	2.16 (0.81)	2.09 (0.75)	0.59
Final SS (SD)	4.40 (0.85)	4.30 (0.63)	0.33
Time to Peak Drug Effect (SD)	04m59s (02:19)	05m05s (01:22)	0.08
Final dose:Target dose (SD)	0.77 (0.23)	0.79 (0.21)	0.65

443

444 Table 3.0 Comparison between Discovery and Validation Def-BrS cohorts.

445

	HC-Dis N=50	HC-Val N=50	P value
Median Age in years (Q1-Q3)	22.99 (22.91 - 30.38)	23.26 (20.86 - 26.79)	0.03
Mean age in years (SD)	27.85 (7.45)	25.83 (8.46)	0.21
Male Gender N (%)	26 (52%)	26 (52%)	0.58
Weight in Kg (SD)	74.98 (13.30)	75.49 (11.52)	0.84
Time to peak effect (mm:ss) (SD)	05:51 (01:28)	06:08 (01:10)	0.30
Drug-induced Type 1 Brugada Pattern	4% (2/50)	2% (1/50)	1.00

- 447 Table 4.0 Comparison between Discovery and Validation HC cohorts. Def-BrS-
- 448 **Dis= Definite Brugada Syndrome discovery group.**

	Def-BrS-Dis		HC-Dis N=50		P Value	95% Confidence
						Interval of the
	N	=83				Difference
	M	ean	Me	ean		
QRS duration in ms (SD)	99.49	(19.53)	90.56	(9.66)	<0.01	3.08 - 14.79
T wave duration in ms (SD)	192.94	(33.73)	206.44	(25.76)	0.02	-24.482.53
PR interval in ms (SD)	169.18	(27.22)	151.48	(20.14)	<0.01	8.91 - 26.49
QT interval in ms (SD)	390.39	(32.38)	404.28	(29.37)	0.01	-24.972.81
P wave duration in ms (SD)	113.57	(15.83)	103.00	(9.89)	<0.01	5.64 - 15.49
S wave duration II in ms (SD)	27.45	(20.19)	18.40	(14.98)	<0.01	2.52 - 15.57
S wave amplitude I in μ V (SD)	-129.16	(157.76)	-191.62	(174.73)	0.04	4.27 - 120.65
Precordial lead QRS duration in ms (SD)	94.00	(18.15)	85.87	(9.09)	<0.01	2.68 - 13.59
Anterior lead ST Amplitude in µV (SD)	73.87	(65.87)	44.43	(32.34)	<0.01	9.70 - 49.18
Precordial lead T wave duration in ms (SD)	159.72	(34.77)	171.40	(27.76)	0.05	-23.130.23
[§] Precordial lead QRS Area in mV/ms (SD)	-283.15	(339.23)	-392.47	(264.15)	0.05	-1.63 - 220.25
[§] Precordial lead STj_Tp Area in mV/ms (SD)	353.17	(215.65)	483.14	(244.65)	<0.01	-210.3449.60
Baseline Type 2/3 pattern N (%)	9	(10.84%)	0	(0%)	0.02	-

449

450 Table 5.0 Univariable analysis of statistically significant baseline ECG

451 characteristics between the discovery groups. §Net area

	Def-BrS-Dis N=83		HC-Dis N=50		Р	95% Confidence
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Value	Difference
QRS duration (ms)	36.27	(19.26)	26.80	(12.87)	<0.01	3.39 - 15.54
PR interval (ms)	19.45	(31.80)	42.08	(16.48)	<0.01	13.03 – 32.23
P wave duration (ms)	8.82	(25.22)	19.12	(12.50)	<0.01	-17.872.73
S wave duration lead II (ms)	26.27	(21.11)	16.36	(15.67)	<0.01	3.09 - 16.72
Anterior ST amplitude (μV)	134.99	(114.85)	26.55	(27.76)	<0.01	52.95 - 123.94
Precordial lead QRS Area (mV/ms) [§]	124.43	(297.36)	-186.80	(187.76)	<0.01	218.52 - 403.94

453

Table 6.0 Univariable analysis of statistically significant AECG characteristics

455 between the discovery groups. § Net Area

	Adjusted Odds Ratio*	P Value	95% Confidence Interval
Baseline Type 2/3 Brugada Pattern	1x10 ⁹	0.999	000
Baseline QRS duration (ms)	1.096	0.028	1.010 - 1.190
Baseline P wave duration (ms)	1.054	0.910	0.992 - 1.120
Baseline S wave duration lead II (ms)	0.969	0.179	0.925 - 1.015
Baseline Anterior lead ST Amplitude (uV)	1.026	0.014	1.005 - 1.046
Baseline precordial QRS area (mV/ms) $^{\$}$	1.000	0.916	0.997 – 1.003
Δ QRS duration (ms)	1.127	<0.001	1.050 – 1.209
$\Delta \mathbf{S}$ wave duration lead II (ms)	0.967	0.232	0.916 – 1.021
∆Anterior lead ST Amplitude (uV)	1.027	<0.001	1.012 – 1.043
Δ Precordial lead QRS area (mV/ms) $^{\$}$	1.008	<0.001	1.004 – 1.013

457

458 Table 7.0 Combined multivariable analysis of baseline & \triangle ECG characteristics 459 between the discovery groups. *Per 1 unit increase in variable for quantitative 460 traits. [§]Net area

462 SUPPLEMENTARY PUBLICATION MATERIAL

- 463
- 464 I ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE
- 465
- 466 II INCLUSION/EXCLUSION CRITERIA
- 467
- 468 III HIGH RIGHT PRECORDIAL ECG PLACEMENT
- 469
- 470 IV ECG FIGURES
- 471
- 472 V PAIRED ANALYSIS

473 **REFERENCES**

474

475 1. Papadakis M, Papatheodorou E, Mellor G, Raju H, Bastiaenen R, Wijeveratne Y, et 476 al. The Diagnostic Yield of Brugada Syndrome After Sudden Death With Normal Autopsy. J 477 Am Coll Cardiol. 2018;71(11):1204-14. 478 Krahn AD, Healey JS, Chauhan V, Birnie DH, Simpson CS, Champagne J, et al. 2. 479 Systematic assessment of patients with unexplained cardiac arrest: Cardiac Arrest Survivors 480 With Preserved Ejection Fraction Registry (CASPER). Circulation. 2009;120(4):278-85. 481 3. Somani R, Krahn AD, Healey JS, Chauhan VS, Birnie DH, Champagne J, et al. 482 Procainamide infusion in the evaluation of unexplained cardiac arrest: from the Cardiac 483 Arrest Survivors with Preserved Ejection Fraction Registry (CASPER). Heart Rhythm. 484 2014;11(6):1047-54. 485 4. Hasdemir C, Payzin S, Kocabas U, Sahin H, Yildirim N, Alp A, et al. High 486 prevalence of concealed Brugada syndrome in patients with atrioventricular nodal reentrant 487 tachycardia. Heart Rhythm. 2015;12(7):1584-94. 488 Tadros R, Tan HL, El Mathari S, Kors JA, Postema PG, Lahrouchi N, et al. Predicting 5. 489 cardiac electrical response to sodium-channel blockade and Brugada syndrome using 490 polygenic risk scores. Eur Heart J. 2019;40(37):3097-107. 491 Antzelevitch C, Yan GX, Ackerman MJ, Borggrefe M, Corrado D, Guo J, et al. J-6. 492 Wave syndromes expert consensus conference report: Emerging concepts and gaps in 493 knowledge. J Arrhythm. 2016;32(5):315-39. 494 Behr ER, Ben-Haim Y, Ackerman MJ, Krahn AD, Wilde AAM. Brugada syndrome 7. 495 and reduced right ventricular outflow tract conduction reserve: a final common pathway? Eur 496 Heart J. 2021;42(11):1073-81. 497 Tadros R, Nannenberg EA, Lieve KV, Škorić-Milosavljević D, Lahrouchi N, Lekanne 8. 498 Deprez RH, et al. Yield and Pitfalls of Ajmaline Testing in the Evaluation of Unexplained 499 Cardiac Arrest and Sudden Unexplained Death: Single-Center Experience With 482 Families. 500 JACC Clin Electrophysiol. 2017;3(12):1400-8. 501 9. Ensam B, Cheung CC, Almehmadi F, Gregers Winkel B, Scrocco C, Brennan P, et al. 502 The Utility of Sodium Channel Provocation in Unexplained Cardiac Arrest Survivors and 503 Electrocardiographic Predictors of Ventricular Fibrillation Recurrence. Circ Arrhythm 504 Electrophysiol. 2022;15(12):e011263. 505 Peritz DC, Chung EH. Criteria for evaluating rSr' patterns due to high precordial ECG 10. 506 lead placement accurately confirm absence of a Brugada ECG pattern. J Electrocardiol. 507 2016;49(2):182-6. 508 Ohkubo K, Watanabe I, Okumura Y, Ashino S, Kofune M, Nagashima K, et al. A 11. 509 new criteria differentiating type 2 and 3 Brugada patterns from ordinary incomplete right 510 bundle branch block. Int Heart J. 2011;52(3):159-63. 511 12. Chevallier S, Forclaz A, Tenkorang J, Ahmad Y, Faouzi M, Graf D, et al. New 512 electrocardiographic criteria for discriminating between Brugada types 2 and 3 patterns and 513 incomplete right bundle branch block. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2011;58(22):2290-8. 514 13. Serra G, Baranchuk A, Bayés-De-Luna A, Brugada J, Goldwasser D, Capulzini L, et 515 al. New electrocardiographic criteria to differentiate the Type-2 Brugada pattern from 516 electrocardiogram of healthy athletes with r'-wave in leads V1/V2. Europace. 517 2014;16(11):1639-45. 518 Sugrue A. New electrocardiographic criteria to differentiate the type-2 Brugada 14. 519 pattern from electrocardiogram of healthy athletes with r'-wave in leads V1/V2. Europace. 520 2015;17(3):504-5. 521