

1 **Diagnostic performance of the fragmented QRS complex on electrocardiogram for**
2 **detecting myocardial scars assessed by 3.0 Tesla cardiac magnetic resonance imaging**

3

4 Kasin Viriyanukulvong, M.D.^{1,*},

5 Nonthikorn Theerasuwipakorn, M.D., M.Sc.^{1,2,*},

6 Wanwarang Wongcharoen, M.D.³,

7 Paisit Kosum, M.D., M.Sc.⁴,

8 Ronpichai Chokesuwattanaskul, M.D., M.Sc.^{1,5,**}

9

10 ¹ *Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine,*
11 *Chulalongkorn University, King Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand*

12 ² *Cardiac Center, King Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand*

13 ³ *Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Medicine, Chiang Mai University,*
14 *Chiang Mai, Thailand*

15 ⁴ *Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine,*
16 *Naresuan University, Phitsanulok, Thailand*

17 ⁵ *Center of Excellence in Arrhythmia Research, Cardiac Center, King Chulalongkorn*
18 *Memorial Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand*

19

20 *** These authors contribute equally.**

21

22 **** Corresponding author**

23 Ronpichai Chokesuwattanaskul

24 Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine,

25 Chulalongkorn University, and Center of Excellence in Arrhythmia Research, Cardiac

26 Center, King Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand

27 Email: Ronpichai.c@chula.ac.th; Phone: (+66)2 256 4000

28

29 **Author Contributions**

30 K.V. conducted the study, performed biostatistical analyses, prepared the tables and figures,

31 interpreted the data and drafted the manuscript. N.T. conducted the study, analyses the data,

32 and critical reviewed manuscript. P.K. provided the CMR data. W.W. revised manuscript and

33 provided feedback. R.C. supervised the study.

34 **ABSTRACT**

35 **Background:** Fragmented QRS complex (f-QRS) on a 12-lead electrocardiogram (EKG)
36 with a 0.15-100 or 150 Hz low-pass filter is known to be related to ischemic myocardial
37 scars. Cardiac magnetic resonance (CMR) imaging enhances tissue characterization
38 capability resulting in a better myocardial scar assessment over other noninvasive imaging
39 modalities. However, the diagnostic values of f-QRS on non-ischemic scars and f-QRS from
40 EKG with a 0.15-40 Hz low-pass filter (routine filter in clinical practice) are unknown. This
41 study aims to evaluate the diagnostic performance of f-QRS (from EKG with 0.15-40 and
42 0.15-100 Hz low-pass filters) for detecting any myocardial scars (both ischemic and non-
43 ischemic) assessed by 3.0 Tesla CMR.

44 **Methods:** This cross-sectional study included patients who underwent a 3.0 Tesla CMR scan
45 from May 2020 to May 2023. A 12-lead EKG with 0.15-40 and 0.15-100 Hz low-pass filters,
46 performed on the same day of the CMR scan, was assessed for the presence of f-QRS. The
47 ECG leads were divided into 3 categories (e.g., anterior leads V1-V4; lateral leads I, aVL,
48 V5-V6; and inferior leads II, III, aVF). The f-QRS was defined as the presence of R' wave or
49 notching in the nadir of the S wave in 2 contiguous leads. The primary outcome was the
50 diagnostic performance of f-QRS from EKG in myocardial scar detection in the
51 corresponding left ventricle (LV) segments. The secondary outcomes were to compare the
52 diagnostic performance of f-QRS in detecting ischemic scars and non-ischemic scars, the
53 diagnostic performance between f-QRS diagnosed from 0.15-40 and 0.15-100 Hz low-pass
54 filters, and the diagnostic performance of f-QRS presented in 2 consecutive leads and f-QRS
55 presented in solitary lead.

56 **Results:** The study involved 1,692 participants with a median age of 67 (IQR: 59-85) years
57 old and 52.5% males. Myocardial scars were found in 826 (49%) participants. Male, history
58 of CAD, and myocardial scars were significantly more frequent in the participants with f-
59 QRS (59.4% vs 46.0%, 26.4% vs 20.6%, and 48.9% vs 37.3%, respectively), while median
60 LVEF was lower (61%, IQR 47, 66 vs 62%, IQR 55, 68; $p < 0.001$). The sensitivity,
61 specificity, positive predictive value, negative predictive value, and AUC of f-QRS from
62 EKG with 0.15-100 Hz low-pass filter for detecting myocardial scars were 25.6%, 88.7%,
63 45.1%, 76.8%, and 0.57 for anterior segments; 22.1%, 91.5%, 36.8%, 84.1%, and 0.57 for
64 lateral segments; and 42.9%, 63.4%, 36.9, 68.9%, and 0.53 for inferior segments. The
65 sensitivity, PPV, and positive likelihood ratio (LR+) of f-QRS were higher for detecting non-
66 ischemic scars while specificity, NPV, negative likelihood ratio (LR-), and AUC were not
67 significantly different. The f-QRS from 0.15-100 Hz showed a higher sensitivity but lower
68 specificity, PPV, and LR+ for all LV segments. The f-QRS presented in the solitary lead
69 showed a higher sensitivity with a lower specificity, PPV, and LR+.

70 **Conclusion:** This study demonstrates a high specificity and negative predictive value of f-
71 QRS from a 12-lead EKG with 0.15-40 and 0.15-100 Hz low-pass filters in diagnosing
72 myocardial scars when correlated to the corresponding LV segments.

73

74 **Keywords:** Fragmented QRS; electrocardiogram; cardiac magnetic resonance; myocardial
75 scar; low-pass filter

76 INTRODUCTION

77 The 12-lead electrocardiogram (EKG) is a fundamental tool in diagnosing various
78 cardiac conditions and is universally available. (1) Abnormal electrical conduction through
79 areas of fibrosing myocardium (e.g., myocardial scars) can lead to the expression of the
80 fragmented QRS complex (f-QRS) on the EKG waveform. (2, 3) In 2006, Das and colleagues
81 established a correlation between f-QRS and myocardial scars detected by single photon
82 emission computed tomography (SPECT) in patients with coronary artery disease (CAD).
83 Their study demonstrated higher sensitivity and negative predictive value (NPV) of f-QRS
84 compared to Q waves. (4) Moreover, the presence of f-QRS correlated with adverse clinical
85 outcomes such as mortality, CAD, and heart failure. (5, 6) However, previous publications
86 primarily focused on the scars assessed by nuclear imaging, limiting data from cardiac
87 magnetic resonance (CMR) imaging which is considered the gold standard noninvasive
88 imaging modality for assessing myocardial scars. (7) Furthermore, the diagnostic
89 performance of f-QRS in detecting myocardial scars other than ischemic scars was still
90 unknown. To enhance f-QRS detection sensitivity, previous studies typically set a low-pass
91 filter between 0.15-100 and 0.15-150 Hz which was not routinely used in clinical practice. (8)

92 Therefore, we aim to assess the diagnostic performance of f-QRS for detecting any
93 myocardial scars (both ischemic and non-ischemic) assessed by CMR. In addition, this study
94 also compares the performance of f-QRS from each filter range (0.15-40 and 0.15-100 Hz
95 low-pass filters) and 2 consecutive leads vs solitary lead.

96

97 MATERIALS AND METHODS

98 This cross-sectional study enrolled patients aged 18 years or older who underwent a
99 3.0 Tesla CMR scan with perfusion protocol from May 2020 to May 2023 at King
100 Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand. The key exclusion criteria were
101 patients with (i) a recent myocardial infarction within 30 days, (ii) pre-excitation syndrome,
102 (iii) uninterpretable EKG, and (iv) inadequate CMR image quality for scar assessment. The
103 baseline characteristics of the participants were retrieved from medical electronic databases.
104 The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Research Committee,
105 Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University (IRB No. 0660/66).

106

107 **Electrocardiogram collection and interpretation**

108 A surface 12-lead EKG with 0.15-40 and 0.15-100 Hz low-pass filters was performed
109 on the same day of the CMR scan using a digital machine, the PageWriter TC 70 (Philips,
110 Eindhoven, the Netherlands). The EKG was run with a paper speed of 25 mm/s and an
111 amplitude of 10 mm/mV. The EKG waveforms were electrically transmitted to the
112 Tracemaster system and analyzed on automatic analysis software (IntelliSpace ECG, Philips,
113 Eindhoven, The Netherlands) with manual correction. EKG with each filter range was
114 assessed independently for f-QRS by two cardiologists (K.V. and R.C.) blinded to the CMR
115 results. An electrophysiologist (W.W.) adjudicated the EKG findings in case of discordancy.
116 The f-QRS is defined as the presence of an additional R wave (R') or notching in the nadir of
117 the S wave in 2 contiguous leads (4, 9). The f-QRS in a solitary lead was also gathered owing
118 to the discrete nature of non-ischemic cardiomyopathy scars, which may not align with

119 coronary artery territories and might have the potential to detect smaller scar areas in non-
120 ischemic conditions.

121

122 **CMR image acquisition and post-processing**

123 All enrolled patients were scanned with perfusion protocol using a 3.0 Tesla scanner
124 (Magnetom Vida, Siemens Healthineers, Erlangen, Germany) with an 18-channel cardiac
125 phased array receiver. Gadobutrol (Gadovist, Bayer Healthcare, Leverkusen, Germany) or
126 Gadoterate meglumine (Dotarem; Guerbet, Villepinte, France) with a total dose of 0.15
127 mmol/kg was injected during first-pass perfusion images acquisition. Late gadolinium
128 enhancement (LGE) images with optimal inversion time (Ti) received from Ti scout were
129 acquired 5-10 minutes after gadolinium injection. Spoiled gradient echo with phase-sensitive
130 reconstruction (PSIR) acquired during breath holding in 2-chamber, 3-chamber, 4-chamber,
131 and short-axis stack covering the whole ventricle was used as a primary pulse sequence for
132 LGE images acquisition and interpretation. If patients could not perform breath holding or
133 significant arrhythmia occurred, single-shot, non-breath holding, steady-state free precession
134 pulse sequence was utilized for LGE images instead. Each slice was configured with a 6 mm
135 thickness without a slice gap. Myocardial scar was diagnosed when LGE was visualized in
136 two orthogonal planes and further classified into ischemic scars (subendocardial and
137 transmural) and non-ischemic scars (mid-wall, subepicardial, and patchy). (10)

138 Post-processing software (Syngo.via, Siemens Healthineers, Erlangen, Germany) was
139 used to analyze images. Data regarding the presence of myocardial scars was retrieved from
140 the CMR reports validated by experienced CMR imaging specialists.

141

142 **EKG leads and LV segmentation**

143 EKG leads and LV segments were divided into 3 groups correlated to each other.
144 EKG leads V1-V4 were categorized as anterior leads and interpreted as corresponding to the
145 myocardial scar in anterior segments of LV (basal anterior, basal anteroseptal, mid anterior,
146 mid anteroseptal, apical anterior, apical septal, and apical cap segments). EKG leads I, aVL,
147 and V5-V6 were categorized as lateral leads and interpreted as corresponding to the
148 myocardial scar in lateral segments of LV (basal anterolateral, basal inferolateral, mid
149 anterolateral, mid inferolateral, and apical lateral segments). EKG leads II, III, and aVF were
150 categorized as inferior leads and interpreted as corresponding to the myocardial scar in
151 inferior segments of LV (basal inferoseptal, basal inferior, mid inferoseptal, mid inferior, and
152 apical inferior segments). [\[Graphical Abstract\]](#)

153

154 **Primary and secondary outcomes**

155 The primary outcome was the diagnostic performance of f-QRS from EKG with 0.15-
156 100 Hz low-pass filter in myocardial scar detection in the corresponding left ventricle (LV)
157 segments which was described by sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV),
158 NPV, positive (LR+) and negative likelihood ratio (LR-), and area under the receiver
159 operating characteristic (ROC) curve (AUC). The secondary outcomes were (i) to compare
160 the diagnostic performance of f-QRS in detecting ischemic scars and non-ischemic scars, (ii)
161 to compare the diagnostic performance between f-QRS diagnosed from 0.15-40 (routine) and
162 0.15-100 Hz (standard) low-pass filters, and (iii) to compare the diagnostic performance of f-
163 QRS presented in 2 consecutive leads and f-QRS presented in solitary lead.

164

165 **Statistical analysis**

166 Categorical data was presented as frequency with percentage and analyzed with the
167 Chi-square or Fisher's exact tests as appropriate. Continuous data was displayed as mean with
168 standard deviation (SD) or median with interquartile range (IQR) and analyzed with
169 independent t-test or Mann-Whitney U test as appropriate. The sensitivity, specificity, PPV,
170 NPV, LR+, and LR- were calculated to demonstrate the diagnostic performance of f-QRS.
171 ROC curve was employed to investigate the relationship between f-QRS and myocardial scar
172 which presented as AUC. Two assessors of EKG were tested for inter- and intra-observer
173 reliability. A p-value of less than 0.05 is considered statistically significant. The statistical
174 analyses were conducted using the IBM SPSS software, version 29 for Windows.

175

176 **RESULTS**

177 **Study population and baseline characteristics**

178 A total of 1,728 patients were identified by searching the electrical database from
179 May 2020 to May 2023. Twenty-four patients with recent-onset myocardial infarction, 6
180 patients with uninterpretable EKG, and 6 patients with inadequate CMR image quality were
181 excluded, leaving 1,692 participants for the analyses [Figure 1]. The median age was 67
182 (IQR: 59, 85) years old and 52.5% were male. 826 (49%) participants exhibited f-QRS on
183 EKG. Hypertension, diabetes mellitus, and dyslipidemia were present in 1,082 (64%), 517
184 (30.6%), and 1,107 (65.5%) participants, respectively. The median estimated glomerular
185 filtration rate (eGFR) was 78 (IQR: 61, 91) mL/min/1.73m². A history of CAD was found in
186 396 (23.4%) participants with 13.3% and 2.2% who had experienced percutaneous coronary
187 intervention and coronary artery bypass graft surgery, respectively. The median left

188 ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) was 61% (IQR; 52, 67). 727 (43%) participants revealed
189 myocardial scars on CMR imaging (ischemic scars 25.7% and non-ischemic scars 19.4%).
190 Myocardial scars were present in the anterior segments in 449 (26.5%) participants, the
191 lateral segments in 308 (18.2%) participants, and the inferior segments in 564 (33.3%)
192 participants. [\[Table 1\]](#)

193 Male, history of CAD, and myocardial scars were significantly more frequent in the
194 participants with f-QRS (59.4% vs 46%, p-value < 0.001 for male; 26.4% vs 20.6%, p-value
195 0.005 for CAD; and 48.9% vs 37.3%, p-value < 0.001 for the presence of scars), while
196 median LVEF was lower (61%, IQR 47, 66 vs 62%, IQR 55, 68; p < 0.001). Other baseline
197 characteristics were not significantly different between the 2 groups.

198 The interobserver reliability for the presence of f-QRS was 0.78 (95% CI: 0.53, 0.94)
199 as determined by Fleiss' Kappa coefficient. The overall intraobserver for the presence of f-
200 QRS was 0.78 (95% CI: 0.61-0.90) using the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC).

201

202 **Primary outcome**

203 The sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, LR+, LR-, and AUC of f-QRS from EKG
204 with 0.15-100 Hz low-pass filter for detecting myocardial scars were 25.6%, 88.7%, 45.1%,
205 76.8%, 2.27, 0.84, and 0.57 for anterior segments; 22.1%, 91.5%, 36.8%, 84.1%, 2.61, 0.85,
206 and 0.57 for lateral segments; and 42.9%, 63.4%, 36.9, 68.9%, 1.17, 0.9, and 0.53 for inferior
207 segments. [\[Table 2 and Graphical Abstract\]](#)

208

209 **Secondary outcomes**

210 *f*-QRS for detecting ischemic and non-ischemic scars

211 The sensitivity, PPV, and LR+ of *f*-QRS were higher for detecting non-ischemic scars
212 compared to ischemic scars while specificity, NPV, LR-, and AUC were not significantly
213 different. These findings were not only similar for all EKG categories and LV segments but
214 also independent of low-pass filters. [\[Supplementary Table 1\]](#)

215

216 *f*-QRS from 0.15-40 (routine) vs 0.15-100 Hz (standard) low-pass filter

217 The *f*-QRS from 0.15-100 Hz showed a higher sensitivity but lower specificity, PPV,
218 and LR+ for all EKG categories and LV segments. NPV, LR-, and AUC were not
219 significantly different between the 2 filters. [\[Table 2\]](#)

220

221 *f*-QRS presented in 2 consecutive leads vs presented in the solitary lead

222 Compared with standard 2 consecutive leads, *f*-QRS presented in the solitary lead
223 showed a higher sensitivity with a lower specificity, PPV, and LR+. NPV and AUC were not
224 significantly different. LR- of *f*-QRS in the solitary lead was lower in anterior and lateral
225 segments but higher in the inferior segment. [\[Supplementary table 2\]](#)

226

227 **DISCUSSION**

228 This study investigated the diagnostic performance of *f*-QRS for detecting any
229 myocardial scars (both ischemic and non-ischemic) assessed by CMR. To the best of our
230 knowledge, the current study included the largest size of participants and the only study that

231 assessed myocardial scars by using 3.0 Tesla CMR. The f-QRS from EKG with 0.15-100 Hz
232 low-pass filter was found in half of the total participants. Participants with f-QRS had more
233 underlying CAD, lower LVEF, and more myocardial scars (both ischemic and non-ischemic).

234 This study demonstrated unsatisfactory diagnostic performance of f-QRS from 0.15-
235 100 Hz low-pass filter EKG for detecting myocardial scars in every EKG lead and LV
236 segment with a sensitivity of 22-43%, PPV of 36-45%, LR+ of 1.17-2.61, LR- of 0.84-0.9,
237 and AUC of 0.53-0.57. The specificity (63-91%) and NPV (69-84%) were the only 2
238 parameters that showed desirable values. Surprisingly, this study's results were different from
239 most of the previous publications that reported a high sensitivity (78-86%), specificity (65-
240 93%), PPV (39-84%), and NPV (88-91%). (4, 7, 11, 12) All of these studies utilized stress
241 SPECT with Technetium-99m (^{99m}Tc) sestamibi as a modality for myocardial scar
242 assessment. In contrast to our study, we used CMR which is considered the gold standard
243 noninvasive test for evaluating myocardial scars. (13, 14) CMR provided better spatial
244 resolution resulting in a higher accuracy for detecting myocardial scars. (15) In addition,
245 SPECT with ^{99m}Tc sestamibi was known for its limitation in classifying true myocardial scars
246 and hibernating viable myocardium. Myocardial scars were overestimated from SPECT with
247 ^{99m}Tc sestamibi when compared with SPECT with Thallium-201 (²⁰¹Tl), positron emission
248 tomography with ¹⁸F-Fludeoxyglucose, and CMR. (16-18) The limitations of SPECT with
249 ^{99m}Tc sestamibi may be the explanation for the different results in our study. One study
250 diagnosing myocardial scars with 1.5 Tesla CMR also reported higher sensitivity (68%) and
251 PPV (95%) with lower specificity (30%) and NPV (5%) compared to our study. (19)
252 However, the previous study included patients with a history of myocardial infarction which
253 was a dissimilar population to our study. Compared to 3.0 Tesla CMR, likewise, 1.5 Tesla
254 CMR has a lower signal-to-noise ratio and blood-to-myocardial contrast causing a poorer

255 accuracy for myocardial scar identification. Another noteworthy finding in our study is that
256 detecting f-QRS in the inferior territory exhibited higher sensitivity but lower specificity
257 compared to other regions. One hypothesis is that other related factors may influence the
258 presence of f-QRS in interior territories. A study of f-QRS in healthy adults found that they
259 are most commonly detected as inferior leads and associated with left deviation of the frontal
260 QRS axis rather than myocardial scars, (20) Additionally, f-QRS in inferior leads may be
261 associated with epicardial fat and metabolic syndrome. This relationship has been noted in
262 the previous study. (21)

263 Almost all of the previous publications investigated the diagnostic performance of f-
264 QRS only in the context of ischemic scars (e.g., patients with coronary artery disease and
265 myocardial infarction). Our study explored the performance of f-QRS in both ischemic and
266 non-ischemic scars. This study demonstrated a higher sensitivity, PPV, and LR+ of f-QRS for
267 detecting non-ischemic scars with an indifferent specificity, NPV, LR-, and AUC. These
268 findings were consistent in all EKG categories, LV segments, and low-pass filter ranges.
269 Even with higher performance, unfortunately, f-QRS was inadequate to use as a non-ischemic
270 scar indicator. Unlike our findings, two studies that examined the value of f-QRS in patients
271 with nonischemic dilated cardiomyopathy and hypertrophic cardiomyopathy found an
272 excellent association between f-QRS and myocardial scars. (22, 23) In contrast to our study
273 which included 329 patients with non-ischemic scars (19% of overall participants), these 2
274 studies included only 17 and 39 patients in their analysis. Moreover, the population in these
275 studies was different from our study.

276 According to its higher sensitivity, an EKG with 0.15-100 or 0.15-150 Hz low-pass
277 filters was theoretically suitable and considered a standard filter for detecting f-QRS. (8)
278 However, these filter ranges were not acquired in routine clinical practice which usually used

279 a lower low-pass filter (e.g., 0.15-40 Hz). This was the first study that compared the
280 performance of f-QRS from EKG with 0.15-40 (routine) and 0.15-100 Hz (standard) low-
281 pass filters. The f-QRS from EKG with a standard 0.15-100 Hz low-pass filter expectedly
282 demonstrated a higher sensitivity with lower specificity, PPV, and LR+. NPV, LR-, and AUC
283 were not significantly different between the 2 filters. These findings informed that an EKG
284 setting in routine practice may be more suitable to predict the presence of myocardial scar
285 because of its higher specificity. Given lower sensitivity, nonetheless, this routine setting
286 should not be used as a screening test.

287 The presence of f-QRS in the solitary lead revealed a higher sensitivity with a lower
288 specificity, PPV, and LR+ when compared with standard 2 consecutive leads. Although the
289 sensitivity was higher, f-QRS in a single lead was insufficient to be applied as a screening
290 indicator for the presence of myocardial scars.

291 The mechanism that underlined the formation of f-QRS was an abnormal “zigzag”
292 electrical conduction around the myocardial scars causing multiple spikes (fragmentation,
293 high frequency) on the QRS complex. Myocardial scars are the area of fibrosis containing
294 various types of extracellular substances. Given no viable cardiomyocyte and the presence of
295 dense electrical insulate substances, electrical conduction cannot be conducted through and
296 has to re-route around myocardial scars. (8) However, f-QRS are not recognized only in
297 patients with myocardial scars. One study reported a high prevalence of f-QRS in healthy
298 population (15.6% for inferior leads, 2.9% for anterior leads, and 0.5% for lateral leads)
299 which was not much different from the population with known cardiac disease (16.7% for
300 inferior leads, 3.8% for anterior leads, and 1.8% for lateral leads). (24) The f-QRS was also
301 found to be associated with myocardial ischemia even though absence of scar. (25) In
302 addition, f-QRS was depicted in patients with arrhythmic diseases such as Brugada syndrome

303 and long QT syndrome. The prevalence of f-QRS was as high as 80% when patients
304 presented with ventricular arrhythmia and syncope. (26, 27) These studies suggested that f-
305 QRS were not exclusively specific for myocardial scars.

306 A few problems regarding the diagnosis of f-QRS are currently unresolved. The
307 present criteria proposed by Das, et al (2006) might include a benign variant of the QRS
308 complex. Some publications have attempted to redefine the definition of pathologic f-QRS;
309 though, no consensus was concluded. (28, 29) Moreover, diagnosing f-QRS was interpreter-
310 dependent and filter-dependent. With the higher low-pass filter, the sensitivity of f-QRS was
311 increased with a lower specificity trade-off. The most appropriate filter in this circumstance
312 was unclear and needs more study to clarify this uncertainty. Most of the previous
313 publications did not state interobserver and intraobserver reliability of f-QRS identification
314 while our study demonstrated interobserver and intraobserver reliability of 0.78 and 0.78
315 respectively. Despite good agreement indicated by these values, many f-QRS identifications
316 were discordant.

317 There are several strong points of the current study. This study included the largest
318 number of participants, nearly 1,700 participants, making the results of the study more robust.
319 Moreover, we used 3.0 Tesla CMR as a reference test causing a higher accuracy of
320 myocardial scar diagnosis. All EKGs were recorded just before the CMR scan, minimizing
321 the effect of time on the accuracy of results. Importantly, the current study was the first study
322 that examined the performance of f-QRS between different filter ranges and different
323 numbers of leads.

324 This study had several limitations that are worth mentioning. Firstly, our study did not
325 investigate the prognostic value of f-QRS. Many studies reported the association between f-

326 QRS and adverse cardiac outcomes in various cardiac diseases. (6, 30-32) Secondly, all
327 EKGs were analyzed on a high-definition display with digital software that can increase the
328 size of EKG waves. With this method of interpretation, the f-QRS detection rate might be
329 more prevalent compared to the paper EKG. This can limit the external generalizability of
330 our result. Thirdly, CMR findings were retrieved from the database and not re-analyzed.
331 However, all CMR studies in our center were processed and interpreted by cardiac imaging
332 specialists making the reports reliable. Fourthly, the association of f-QRS and the extension
333 and patterns of myocardial scars were not investigated. Knowing these associations may lead
334 to a further understanding of the true value of f-QRS. Lastly, this study did not classify the
335 types of f-QRS. As mentioned before, the exact type of f-QRS that best predicted myocardial
336 scar was unclear.

337

338 **CONCLUSION**

339 This study illustrated the limitations of f-QRS and raised the concern about the usage
340 of f-QRS as a marker of myocardial scars. Given its high specificity, however, the presence
341 of f-QRS from EKG performed in routine clinical practice may still be used to rule in the
342 suspected patients for further investigation. We also emphasized the necessity of re-defining
343 the f-QRS diagnostic criteria and validating this criterion with standard scar-detecting
344 modality namely contrast-enhanced CMR.

345 REFERENCES


- 346 1. Longo D, et al. *Electrocardiography*. Harrison's principle of internal medicine. 20th ed:
347 McGraw-Hill Education LLC.; 2020. p. 1831-9.
- 348 2. Das MK, Zipes DP. Fragmented QRS: a predictor of mortality and sudden cardiac death.
349 *Heart Rhythm*. 2009;6(3 Suppl):S8-14.
- 350 3. Fares H, Heist K, Lavie CJ, Kumbala D, Ventura H, Meadows R, et al. Fragmented QRS
351 complexes-a novel but underutilized electrocardiographic marker of heart disease. *Crit Pathw Cardiol*.
352 2013;12(4):181-3.
- 353 4. Das MK, Khan B, Jacob S, Kumar A, Mahenthiran J. Significance of a fragmented QRS complex
354 versus a Q wave in patients with coronary artery disease. *Circulation*. 2006;113(21):2495-501.
- 355 5. Das MK, Saha C, El Masry H, Peng J, Dandamudi G, Mahenthiran J, et al. Fragmented QRS on
356 a 12-lead ECG: a predictor of mortality and cardiac events in patients with coronary artery disease.
357 *Heart Rhythm*. 2007;4(11):1385-92.
- 358 6. Korhonen P, Husa T, Konttila T, Tierala I, Mäkijärvi M, Väänänen H, et al. Fragmented QRS in
359 prediction of cardiac deaths and heart failure hospitalizations after myocardial infarction. *Ann*
360 *Noninvasive Electrocardiol*. 2010;15(2):130-7.
- 361 7. Sadeghi R, Dabbagh VR, Tayyebi M, Zakavi SR, Ayati N. Diagnostic value of fragmented QRS
362 complex in myocardial scar detection: systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature. *Kardiol*
363 *Pol*. 2016;74(4):331-7.
- 364 8. Take Y, Morita H. Fragmented QRS: What Is The Meaning? *Indian Pacing Electrophysiol J*.
365 2012;12(5):213-25.
- 366 9. Das MK, Suradi H, Maskoun W, Michael MA, Shen C, Peng J, et al. Fragmented wide QRS on a
367 12-lead ECG: a sign of myocardial scar and poor prognosis. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol*.
368 2008;1(4):258-68.
- 369 10. Mahrholdt H, Wagner A, Judd RM, Sechtem U, Kim RJ. Delayed enhancement cardiovascular
370 magnetic resonance assessment of non-ischaeamic cardiomyopathies. *Eur Heart J*. 2005;26(15):1461-
371 74.
- 372 11. Mahenthiran J, Khan BR, Sawada SG, Das MK. Fragmented QRS complexes not typical of a
373 bundle branch block: a marker of greater myocardial perfusion tomography abnormalities in
374 coronary artery disease. *J Nucl Cardiol*. 2007;14(3):347-53.
- 375 12. Dabbagh Kakhki VR, Ayati N, Zakavi SR, Sadeghi R, Tayyebi M, Shariati F. Comparison
376 between fragmented QRS and Q waves in myocardial scar detection using myocardial perfusion
377 single photon emission computed tomography. *Kardiol Pol*. 2015;73(6):437-44.
- 378 13. Kim RJ, Wu E, Rafael A, Chen EL, Parker MA, Simonetti O, et al. The use of contrast-enhanced
379 magnetic resonance imaging to identify reversible myocardial dysfunction. *N Engl J Med*.
380 2000;343(20):1445-53.
- 381 14. Mann DL. *Electrocardiography*. Braunwald's heart disease. 12nd ed. Philadelphia: Elsevier Inc;
382 2015. p. 114-53.
- 383 15. Wagner A, Mahrholdt H, Holly TA, Elliott MD, Regenfus M, Parker M, et al. Contrast-
384 enhanced MRI and routine single photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) perfusion imaging
385 for detection of subendocardial myocardial infarcts: an imaging study. *Lancet*. 2003;361(9355):374-
386 9.
- 387 16. Cuocolo A, Pace L, Ricciardelli B, Chiariello M, Trimarco B, Salvatore M. Identification of
388 viable myocardium in patients with chronic coronary artery disease: comparison of thallium-201
389 scintigraphy with reinjection and technetium-99m-methoxyisobutyl isonitrile. *J Nucl Med*.
390 1992;33(4):505-11.

- 391 17. Marzullo P, Sambuceti G, Parodi O. The role of sestamibi scintigraphy in the radioisotopic
392 assessment of myocardial viability. *J Nucl Med.* 1992;33(11):1925-30.
- 393 18. Crean A, Khan SN, Davies LC, Coulden R, Dutka DP. Assessment of Myocardial Scar;
394 Comparison Between F-FDG PET, CMR and Tc-Sestamibi. *Clin Med Cardiol.* 2009;3:69-76.
- 395 19. Ahn MS, Kim JB, Yoo BS, Lee JW, Lee JH, Youn YJ, et al. Fragmented QRS complexes are not
396 hallmarks of myocardial injury as detected by cardiac magnetic resonance imaging in patients with
397 acute myocardial infarction. *Int J Cardiol.* 2013;168(3):2008-13.
- 398 20. Tian Y, Zhang Y, Yan Q, Mao J, Dong J, Ma C, et al. Fragmented QRS Complex in Healthy
399 Adults: Prevalence, Characteristics, Mechanisms, and Clinical Implications. *International Journal of*
400 *Heart Rhythm.* 2017;2(1):34-9.
- 401 21. Sarıkaya R, Şengül C, Kümet Ö, İmre G, Akbulut T, Oğuz M. Fragmented QRS in inferior leads
402 is associated with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease, body-mass index, and interventricular septum
403 thickness in young men. *Anatol J Cardiol.* 2022;26(2):100-4.
- 404 22. Basaran Y, Tigen K, Karaahmet T, Isiklar I, Cevik C, Gurel E, et al. Fragmented QRS complexes
405 are associated with cardiac fibrosis and significant intraventricular systolic dyssynchrony in
406 nonischemic dilated cardiomyopathy patients with a narrow QRS interval. *Echocardiography.*
407 2011;28(1):62-8.
- 408 23. Ratheendran AC, Subramanian M, Bhanu DK, Prabhu MA, Kannan R, Natarajan KU, et al.
409 Fragmented QRS on electrocardiography as a predictor of myocardial scar in patients with
410 hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Acta Cardiol.* 2020;75(1):42-6.
- 411 24. Terho HK, Tikkanen JT, Junntila JM, Anttonen O, Kenttä TV, Aro AL, et al. Prevalence and
412 prognostic significance of fragmented QRS complex in middle-aged subjects with and without clinical
413 or electrocardiographic evidence of cardiac disease. *Am J Cardiol.* 2014;114(1):141-7.
- 414 25. Hekmat S, Pourafkari L, Ahmadi M, Chavoshi MR, Zamani B, Nader ND. Fragmented QRS on
415 surface electrocardiogram as a predictor of perfusion defect in patients with suspected coronary
416 artery disease undergoing myocardial perfusion imaging. *Indian Heart J.* 2018;70 Suppl 3(Suppl
417 3):S177-s81.
- 418 26. Morita H, Kusano KF, Miura D, Nagase S, Nakamura K, Morita ST, et al. Fragmented QRS as a
419 marker of conduction abnormality and a predictor of prognosis of Brugada syndrome. *Circulation.*
420 2008;118(17):1697-704.
- 421 27. Haraoka K, Morita H, Saito Y, Toh N, Miyoshi T, Nishii N, et al. Fragmented QRS is associated
422 with torsades de pointes in patients with acquired long QT syndrome. *Heart Rhythm.*
423 2010;7(12):1808-14.
- 424 28. Haukilahti MA, Eranti A, Kenttä T, Huikuri HV. QRS Fragmentation Patterns Representing
425 Myocardial Scar Need to Be Separated from Benign Normal Variants: Hypotheses and Proposal for
426 Morphology based Classification. *Front Physiol.* 2016;7:653.
- 427 29. Brohet C. Fragmentation of the QRS complex: the latest electrocardiographic craze? *Acta*
428 *Cardiol.* 2019;74(3):185-7.
- 429 30. Gong B, Li Z. Total Mortality, Major Adverse Cardiac Events, and Echocardiographic-Derived
430 Cardiac Parameters with Fragmented QRS Complex. *Ann Noninvasive Electrocardiol.* 2016;21(4):404-
431 12.
- 432 31. Güngör B, Özcan KS, Karataş MB, Şahin İ, Öztürk R, Bolca O. Prognostic Value of QRS
433 Fragmentation in Patients with Acute Myocardial Infarction: A Meta-Analysis. *Ann Noninvasive*
434 *Electrocardiol.* 2016;21(6):604-12.
- 435 32. Jain R, Singh R, Yamini S, Das MK. Fragmented ECG as a risk marker in cardiovascular
436 diseases. *Curr Cardiol Rev.* 2014;10(3):277-86.

437


438 **FIGURE AND TABLE LEGENDS**

439 Graphical Abstract



440

441 Figure 1. Study profile



442

443

444

445

446

447

448 Table 1 Baseline characteristics

	Total (N=1692)	No f-QRS (N=866)	f-QRS (N=826)	p-value
Male, n (%)	889 (52.5)	389 (46)	491 (59.4)	<0.001
Age (years), median (IQR)	67 (59-85)	68 (60-75)	67 (59-75)	0.62
Hypertension, n (%)	1082 (64)	563 (65)	519 (62.8)	0.35
Diabetes mellitus, n (%)	517 (30.6)	264 (30.5)	253 (30.6)	0.95
Dyslipidemia, n (%)	1107 (65.5)	572 (66.1)	535 (64.8)	0.56
eGFR (mL/min/1.73m ²), median (IQR)	78 (61-91)	79 (60.5-92)	77 (61-90)	0.12
CKD Stage, n (%)				0.32
Stage 1	471 (27.9)	257 (29.7)	214 (25.9)	
Stage 2	818 (48.4)	400 (46.2)	418 (50.7)	
Stage 3	347 (20.5)	183 (21.2)	164 (19.9)	
Stage 4	28 (1.7)	13 (1.5)	15 (1.8)	
Stage 5	26 (1.5)	12 (1.4)	14 (1.7)	
Coronary artery disease, n (%)	396 (23.4)	178 (20.6)	218 (26.4)	0.005
Previous PCI, n (%)	225 (13.3)	107 (12.4)	118 (14.3)	0.24
Previous CABG, n (%)	37 (2.2)	18 (2.1)	19 (2.3)	0.75
LVEF (%), median (IQR)	61 (52-67)	62 (55-68)	61 (47-66)	<0.001
Presence of scar, n (%)	727 (43)	323 (37.3)	404 (48.9)	<0.001
Presence of infarct scar, n (%)	434 (25.7)	182 (21.0)	252 (30.5)	<0.001
Presence of non-infarct scar, n (%)	329 (19.4)	150 (17.3)	179 (21.7)	0.02
Data are presented as median (interquartile range) of frequency and percentage. eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; CKD, chronic kidney disease; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; CABG, coronary artery bypass graft; CMR, cardiac magnetic resonance imaging; ^a A scar refer to detected late gadolinium enhancement (LGE)				

449

450

451

452

453 Table 2 Primary outcomes

	Sensitivity (95%CI)	Specificity (95%CI)	PPV (95%CI)	NVP (95%CI)	LR+ (95%CI)	LR- (95%CI)	AUC (95%CI)
Anterior leads and LV segments							
40-Hz filter	14.5 (11.4-18.1)	96.1 (94.9-97.1)	57.5 (47.9-66.8)	75.7 (73.5-77.8)	3.75 (1.92-5.58)	0.89 (0.82-0.96)	0.55 (0.54-0.57)
100-Hz filter	25.6 (21.6-29.9)	88.7 (86.8-90.4)	45.1 (38.9-51.4)	76.8 (74.5-78.9)	2.27 (1.52-3.02)	0.84 (0.81-0.87)	0.57 (0.55-0.59)
Lateral leads and LV segments							
40-Hz filter	7.8 (5.1-11.4)	97.5 (96.5-98.2)	40.7 (28.1-54.3)	82.6 (80.7-84.4)	3.08 (1.74-4.42)	0.95 (0.93-0.97)	0.53 (0.51-0.54)
100-Hz filter	22.1 (17.6-27.1)	91.5 (90-93)	36.8 (29.8-44.1)	84.1 (82.1-85.9)	2.61 (1.79-3.43)	0.85 (0.82-0.88)	0.57 (0.54-0.59)
Inferior leads and LV segments							
40-Hz filter	19.9 (16.6-23.4)	88.2 (86.2-90)	45.7 (39.4-52.2)	68.8 (66.3-71.1)	1.68 (1.24-2.12)	0.91 (0.87-0.95)	0.54 (0.52-0.56)
100-Hz filter	42.9 (38.8-47.1)	63.4 (60.5-66.2)	36.9 (33.2-40.8)	68.9 (66-71.8)	1.17 (0.96-1.38)	0.90 (0.85-0.95)	0.53 (0.51-0.56)
Diagnostic performance of f-QRS for detecting myocardial scars; LR, likelihood ratio; PPV, positive predictive value; NVP, negative predictive value; OR, odd ratio; CI, confidence interval; Hz, Hertz.							

454

455

456

457

458 Supplementary table 1 Ischemic vs Non ischemic scars

	Sensitivity (95%CI)	Specificity (95%CI)	PPV (95%CI)	NVP (95%CI)	LR+ (95%CI)	LR- (95%CI)	AUC (95%CI)
Ischemic scars							
Anterior leads and LV segments							
40-Hz filter	12.8 (7.5-20)	96.3 (95-97.3)	27.6 (16.7-40.9)	90.9 (89.1-92.5)	3.45 (2.96-3.94)	0.91 (0.88-0.94)	0.55 (0.52-0.58)
100-Hz filter	20.8 (14.1-29)	89.1 (87.1-90.8)	17.3 (11.6-24.4)	91.1 (89.2-92.7)	1.9 (1.24-2.56)	0.89 (0.84-0.94)	0.55 (0.51-0.59)
Lateral leads and LV segments							
40-Hz filter	3.1 (0.4-10.7)	98.2 (97.3-98.9)	8.7 (1.1-28)	94.9 (93.5-96.1)	1.75 (0.97-2.53)	0.99 (0.97-1.01)	0.51 (0.49-0.53)
100-Hz filter	13.8 (6.5-24.7)	92.5 (90.9-94)	9.2 (4.3-16.7)	95.2 (93.8-96.3)	1.86 (1.21-2.51)	0.93 (0.9-0.97)	0.53 (0.49-0.58)
Inferior leads and LV segments							
40-Hz filter	12.7 (8.9-17.5)	88.7 (86.5-90.6)	21.9 (15.5-29.5)	80.2 (77.8-82.5)	1.12 (0.94-1.30)	0.99 (0.94-1.04)	0.51 (0.48-0.53)
100-Hz filter	41.7 (35.5-48)	63.4 (60.4-66.4)	22.2 (18.5-26.2)	81.3 (78.4-83.9)	1.14 (0.99-1.29)	0.92 (0.89-0.95)	0.53 (0.49-0.56)
Nonischemic scars							
Anterior leads and LV segments							
40-Hz filter	14.5 (10.7-19.1)	96.3 (94.9-97.3)	51.8 (40.6-62.9)	80.2 (77.9-82.4)	3.88 (2.76-4.99)	0.89 (0.82-0.92)	0.55 (0.53-0.58)
100-Hz filter	27 (22.1-32.5)	88.8 (86.8-90.7)	40.2 (33.3-47.4)	81.4 (79.1-83.6)	2.42 (2.12-2.73)	0.82 (0.8-0.85)	0.58 (0.55-0.61)
Lateral leads and LV segments							

40-Hz filter	8.3 (5-12.7)	97.6 (96.5-98.4)	39.1 (25.1-54.6)	84.8 (82.8-86.7)	3.38 (2.89-3.87)	0.94 (0.89-0.97)	0.53 (0.51-0.55)
100-Hz filter	24.3 (18.8-30.6)	92.6 (90.9-94)	38.4 (30.3-47.1)	86.5 (84.5-88.4)	3.27 (2.76-3.78)	0.82 (0.79-0.86)	0.58 (0.56-0.61)
Inferior leads and LV segments							
40-Hz filter	25.5 (20.5-31)	88.2 (86.1-90)	36 (29.4-43.1)	81.9 (79.6-84.1)	2.16 (1.98-2.34)	0.85 (0.79-0.91)	0.57 (0.54-0.6)
100-Hz filter	43.6 (37.7-49.6)	63.5 (60.5-66.3)	23.7 (20.1-27.7)	81.2 (78.4-83.8)	1.19 (1.01-1.37)	0.89 (0.83-0.95)	0.54 (0.5-0.57)
Diagnostic performance of f-QRS for detecting ischemic and non-ischemic scars; LR, likelihood ratio; PPV, positive predictive value; NVP, negative predictive value; OR, odd ratio; CI, confidence interval; Hz, Hertz.							

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467 Supplementary table 2 Solitary lead

	Sensitivity (95%CI)	Specificity (95%CI)	PPV (95%CI)	NVP (95%CI)	LR+ (95%CI)	LR- (95%CI)	AUC (95%CI)
Anterior leads and LV segments							
40-Hz filter	31.8 (27.6-36.4)	88.7 (86.8-90.4)	50.5 (44.5-56.5)	78.3 (76-80.4)	2.83 (2.61-3.12)	0.77 (0.69-0.85)	0.6 (0.58-0.63)
100-Hz filter	51.2 (46.5-55.9)	63.1 (60.3-65.8)	33.4 (29.9-37)	78.2 (75.5-80.7)	1.39 (1.22-1.56)	0.77 (0.67-0.87)	0.57 (0.55-0.6)
Lateral leads and LV segments							
40-Hz filter	22.1 (17.6-27.1)	93 (91.5-94.3)	41.2 (33.6-49.1)	84.3 (82.4-86.1)	3.15 (2.58-3.72)	0.84 (0.79-0.89)	0.58 (0.55-0.6)
100-Hz filter	41.6 (36-47.3)	76.4 (74-78.6)	28.1 (24-32.5)	85.4 (83.4-87.4)	1.76 (1.27-2.25)	0.77 (0.70-0.84)	0.59 (0.56-0.62)
Inferior leads and LV segments							
40-Hz filter	35.5 (31.5-39.6)	74.3 (71.6-76.8)	40.8 (36.4-45.3)	69.7 (67-72.3)	1.38 (1.11-1.65)	0.87 (0.82-0.92)	0.55 (0.53-0.57)
100-Hz filter	59.4 (55.2-63.5)	43.4 (40.4-46.3)	34.4 (31.4-37.5)	68.1 (64.6-71.5)	1.05 (0.94-1.16)	0.94 (0.89-0.99)	0.51 (0.49-0.54)
Diagnostic performance of f-QRS in the solitary lead for detecting myocardial scars; PPV, positive predictive value; NVP, negative predictive value; OR, odd ratio; CI, confidence interval; Hz, Hertz.							

468

469

470 **Acknowledgements**

471 None

472 **Disclosure**

473 Nothing to disclosure

474

475 **Funding**

476 None

477