# 1 Electrophysiological characteristics of lead-position-dependent EGM

# 2 uninterrupted transition during left bundle branch pacing

- Jiabo Shen, MD,<sup>1</sup> Longfu Jiang, MD,<sup>1</sup> Hao Wu<sup>1</sup>, Lu Zhang, MD<sup>1</sup>, Hengdong Li MD<sup>1</sup>,
- 4 and Lifang  $Pan^2$
- <sup>1</sup>Department of Cardiology, Ningbo No.2 Hospital, Ningbo, Zhejiang, China
- 6 <sup>2</sup>Department of Global Health, Ningbo Institute of Life and Health Industry,
- 7 University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Ningbo, Zhejiang, China
- 8
- 9 Address for correspondence:
- 10 Longfu Jiang, MD
- 11 Department of Cardiology, Ningbo No.2 Hospital, Ningbo, Zhejiang, China
- 12 41 Xibei Street
- 13 Ningbo, Zhejiang, 315010, China
- 14 Email: longfujianghwamei@163.com
- 15 Work Telephone Numbers: 86-0574-83871071
- 16
- 17 Running title: Characteristics of lead-position-dependent EGM during LBBP
- 18
- 19 Word count: 4968
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

## 29 Abstract

30 **Background and Aims:** Left bundle branch pacing (LBBP) is a novel pacing strategy 31 that improves ventricular synchrony by utilizing the native conduction system. 32 However, the current standard practices limit continuous monitoring of paced 33 electrocardiogram (ECG) and intracardiac electrogram (EGM) transition, which may 34 result in overlooked or misinterpreted subtle transitions. This study aimed to explore 35 the electrophysiological characteristics of the lead-position-dependent EGM 36 continuous transition and evaluate their clinical significance.

37 Methods: This observational study included patients referred for LBBP due to 38 symptomatic bradyarrhythmia. A continuous pacing and recording technique was 39 employed, allowing real-time monitoring of progressive alterations in the paced QRS 40 complex as the lead penetrates deeper into the ventricular septum. EGM and ECG 41 parameters were continuously monitored and analyzed.

42 Results: The study encompassed 105 patients, with selective LBBP achieved in 88 43 patients (83.8%). The amplitude of ventricular EGM predictably changed with radial 44 interventricular septum depth and peaked in the mid-septum. As the lead was inserted 45 into the left ventricular subendocardium, the ventricular current of injury (COI) 46 declined to a level approximating that of the right septum. Continuous recording 47 technique enabled real-time monitoring of the entire perforation process and the 48 subtle variations that exist among different perforation modalities. The discernment of 49 discrete was feasible through the examination of unfiltered EGM, suggesting that 50 selective LBB capture can also be confirmed by observing the subtle morphological 51 transitions within the ventricular COI.

52 **Conclusions:** The continuous recording technique provides a more detailed 53 understanding of the radial depth of the pacing lead throughout the implantation 54 process. It simplifies the implantation procedures and facilitates the prevention or 55 early detection of perforations. Future studies are needed to validate these findings 56 and explore their clinical implications.

5	7
Э	1

83

58	Keywords: Left bundle branch pacing; Continuous recording technique; Unfiltered
59	unipolar electrogram; Current of Injury; Septal perforation.
60	
61	What's new?
62	1.Utilization of Ventricular Electrogram (EGM) for Lead Positioning: The amplitude
63	of ventricular EGM changes predictably with radial interventricular septum depth,
64	peaking in the mid-septum. This provides a useful way to determine whether the lead
65	is located on the left, right, or middle of the ventricular septum.
66	
67	2.Real-time Monitoring of Perforation Process: The continuous recording technique
68	enables real-time monitoring of the entire perforation process. This feature helps to
69	distinguish the subtle variations that exist among different perforation modalities,
70	facilitating early detection and prevention of perforations.
71	
72	3.Confirmation of Selective Left Bundle Branch Pacing (SLBBP): The emergence of
73	a discrete ventricular current of injury (COI) may serve as a novel characteristic of
74	SLBBP. This suggests that SLBBP can be confirmed by observing the subtle
75	morphological transitions within the ventricular COI.
76	
77	Introduction
78	Left bundle branch pacing (LBBP), a novel pacing strategy, utilizes the native
79	conduction system to improve ventricular synchrony, providing stable pacing
80	parameters.[1] For the achievement of left conduction system capture, the LBBP lead
81	must be embedded sufficiently deep within the left ventricular septum's
82	subendocardium.[2] Current standard practices of intermittent recording technique

84 during lead rotation, thereby inhibiting the capacity for continuous monitoring of

require the employment of an alligator clip for lead connection, a link disrupted

85 paced QRS transition. Consequently, this may result in overlooked or misinterpreted 86 subtle transitions. This limitation impedes the precise determination of left bundle 87 branch (LBB) capture and any changes in the pacing modality as the lead advances 88 into the ventricular septum. [3, 4] We have previously described a real-time recording 89 technique that yields improved electrocardiogram (ECG) and intracardiac electrogram 90 (EGM) recording capabilities in LBBP [5-7]. While previous studies have 91 comprehensively described the lead-position-dependent QRS transition and 92 output-dependent QRS and EGM transition, [7-10] the lead-position-dependent EGM 93 transition remains inadequately established. Therefore, this study aims to explore the 94 electrophysiological characteristics of the lead-position-dependent EGM continuous 95 transition and evaluate their clinical significance.

96

#### 97 Methods

# 98 Study population

99 This observational study encompassed consecutive patients referred to our center for 100 LBBP, due to symptomatic bradyarrhythmia, from September 2022 through 101 November 2023. Patients for whom definitive LBB capture could not be confirmed 102 were excluded from the study. The research protocol was approved by the 103 Institutional Review Board of Ningbo No.2 Hospital, and informed consent was duly 104 obtained from each participant.

105

#### 106 **Definitions of LBB capture**

Dynamic paced QRS transition served as a criterion for LBB capture diagnosis.[7, 11, 12] LBB capture is confirmed by paced QRS morphology of the right bundle branch block pattern and all of the following strict criteria: (1) demonstration of the left ventricular septal pacing (LVSP) to nonselective LBBP (NSLBBP) transition during the process of lead screwing and/or NSLBBP to selective LBBP (SLBBP) transition during unipolar pacing threshold testing, and (2) both low and high outputs

maintained the shortest and constant pacing stimulus to V6 R-wave peak time(Stim-V6RWPT).

115

#### 116 **Implantation procedure**

117 This study employs a continuous pacing and recording technique, utilizing a 118 transseptal pacing lead as detailed in previous researches. [5, 7] Following a 119 successful puncture of either the left axillary or subclavian vein, the C315 His sheath 120 (Medtronic, Minneapolis, MN) is positioned in the right ventricle. Angiography is 121 performed using 30° right anterior oblique fluoroscopy to visualize the tricuspid valve 122 annulus (TVA), the image of which serves as a reference for the lead implantation site 123 (Figure 1A).[13] Throughout the lead deployment process, a continuous 124 pacemapping technique is adopted, establishing a persistent connection between the 125 pacing lead and the pacing system analyzer (PSA) via the John Jiang connecting cable 126 (Xinwell Medical Technology Co, Ningbo, Zhejiang, China).[5] In contrast to the 127 interrupted pacing method, in which the alligator cable is momentarily disconnected 128 during lead rotation, this strategy enables the real-time monitoring of progressive 129 alterations in the paced QRS complex as the lead penetrates deeper into the 130 interventricular septum (IVS).

131 The lead implantation procedure and schematic diagrams of the connection have been 132 presented in earlier studies, illustrated through video documentation.[5, 7] The 133 operational principle of the John Jiang connecting cable resembles a bearing, 134 facilitating the free movement of internal and external components. This design 135 ensures uninterrupted electrical conduction during lead rotation, thereby enabling 136 continuous pacing and recording of ECG and EGM. The intricate internal structure 137 and functional mechanism of the connector have been described in a previous study.[5] 138 The distal pin of the 3830 lead (Medtronic, Minneapolis, MN) is inserted into the 139 rotatable interface hole of the connector, after which the lead's helix is inserted into 140 the C315 His sheath and advanced into the right ventricle. Under fluoroscopic

guidance, the 3830 lead is positioned at the LBB screw-in site, and the lead body is then rotated, gradually driving the helix from the right side of the ventricular septum to the left (**Figure 1B and C**). During this process, careful monitoring of changes in the ECG and EGM is crucial to accurately identify lead positioning and prevent perforation. The depth of the lead within the IVS is assessed by contrast injection from the sheath using a 45° left anterior oblique fluoroscopic view (**Figure 1D-F**).

147

## 148 Electrophysiological observations

149 Continuous monitoring of ECG and EGM was conducted using the Workmate Claris 150 (Abbott, Plymouth, MN) electrophysiology system at a speed of 100 mm/s. A filtered 151 unipolar ventricular electrogram was obtained with high- and low-pass filter settings 152 of 200 and 500 Hz to monitor the discrete EGM transition.[14] Unfiltered ventricular 153 current of injury (COI) was monitored from the tip lead with band-pass filter settings 154 of 0.5 and 500 Hz using a unipolar configuration during lead rotation.[15] The 155 ventricular COI manifests as an increase in the duration and elevation of the 156 ventricular electrogram compared to the baseline (Figure 2). Employing a continuous 157 recording technique allows for the monitoring of changes in electrophysiological 158 characteristics across all pacing modes during interventricular septum traversal. A 159 detailed examination was conducted on five representative pacing modes within this 160 study. Right ventricular septal pacing (RVSP) was defined when the lead was located 161 in the RVS and exhibited the classic W pattern in lead V1. Intraventricular septal 162 pacing (IVSP) was defined when the lead was screwed into the ventricular septum, 163 and QRS morphological changes transitioned from the W pattern to the Qr pattern in 164 lead V1. LVSP was defined when the lead was screwed into the deep septum, 165 demonstrating a right bundle branch block pattern just before LBB capture. NSLBBP 166 was defined when the Stim-V6RWPT for two adjacent paced complexes decreased by at least 10 ms with a constant output (2 V/0.5 ms) during screwing in. SLBBP was 167 168 confirmed when the QRS morphology changed, the Stim-V6RWPT was fixed, and an

169 isoelectric interval and discrete component appeared on the EGM (Figure 3). 170 Measurements, including the maximum amplitude of ventricular COI elevation and 171 other parameters, were performed by two individuals who were blinded to the study 172 protocol. The values obtained from these measurements were subsequently averaged 173 (Figure 4). In the event of identifying a perforation, characterized by a positive 174 ventricular COI transition to a negative ventricular electrogram and high output loss 175 capture, the lead was carefully withdrawn (Figure 5). During this withdrawal process, 176 unipolar electrograms were continuously monitored to observe the recovery of 177 positive ventricular COI. This observation served as a confirmation of the perforation. 178

179 Statistical analysis

180 Continuous variables are represented as the mean  $\pm$  standard deviation, while 181 categorical variables are expressed in percentages. Statistical evaluation of differences 182 among the ECG parameters within the six pacing modalities was conducted using 183 repeated-measures analysis of variance complemented with Bonferroni post hoc 184 analysis. A p-value of less than 0.05 was designated as the threshold for statistical 185 significance. Statistical analyses were carried out utilizing SPSS (version 25.0; IBM 186 Corp., Armonk, NY, USA) and GraphPad Prism 9 (GraphPad Software, Inc., San 187 Diego, CA, USA).

188

189 **Results** 

#### 190 **Baseline characteristics**

This study encompassed a total of 105 patients who underwent pacemaker implantation. NSLBBP was confirmed in ninety-four patients (89.5%) who displayed an abrupt shortening of Stim-V6RWPT by at least 10 ms. SLBBP was achieved in 88 patients (83.8%), as indicated by isoelectric intervals and discrete components during threshold testing. In the absence of a Stim-V6RWPT's abrupt shortening of 10 ms and an isoelectric interval, LVSP was confirmed in eleven patients.

197 An analysis was performed on paced parameter changes in the 88 patients who met 198 the criteria for selective LBB (SLBB) capture. The mean age of the patients was 73.7 199  $\pm$  9.1 years. The left ventricular ejection fraction was reported as 62.8  $\pm$  11.1%. The 200 indications for pacemaker implantation included atrioventricular block in 56 patients 201 and sick sinus syndrome in 31 patients. In the pacemaker population, hypertension 202 was identified in 53 patients, diabetes mellitus in 23 patients, cardiomyopathy in 4 203 patients, coronary heart disease in 14 patients, and atrial fibrillation in 22 patients. 204 Table 1 provides a summary of the patients' characteristics. The pacing-related and 205 procedure-related characteristics are presented in Table 2.

206

# 207 Lead-position-dependent parameters during implantation

The ECG and EGM parameters at the depth of implantation are documented in **Table** 3 and **Figure 3**. The ventricular COI amplitude was recorded as  $10.5 \pm 5.9$  mV in the RVSP group and  $11.9 \pm 6.4$  mV in the SLBBP group, with no significant difference (p= 0.328). There was no significant difference in the ventricular COI amplitude between the LVSP and NSLBBP groups ( $19.8 \pm 9.6$  mV vs.  $20.0 \pm 9.2$  mV). A significant statistical difference was observed in the amplitude of ventricular COI among other pacing modes at varying depths.

Impedance was measured as  $948.7 \pm 202.1\Omega$  in the RVSP group and  $980.3 \pm 156.3 \Omega$ in the IVSP group, with no significant difference (p = 0.555). A significant difference in impedance was noted between the IVSP group ( $980.3 \pm 156.3 \Omega$ ) and the NSLBBP group ( $929.5 \pm 191.4 \Omega$ ) (p < 0.05), as well as between the NSLBBP group ( $929.5 \pm$ 191.4  $\Omega$ ) and the SLBBP group ( $886.0 \pm 164.4 \Omega$ ) (p < 0.05). Stim-V6RWPT was 103.2±16.9 ms in the RVSP group and  $83.8 \pm 12.5$  ms in the

Stim-V6RWPT was  $103.2\pm16.9$  ms in the RVSP group and  $83.8\pm12.5$  ms in the IVSP group, with a significant difference (p < 0.05). There was no significant difference in Stim-V6RWPT between the IVSP and LVSP groups ( $83.8\pm12.5$  ms vs.  $81.8\pm12.3$  ms). However, Stim-V6RWPT significantly shortened from LVSP to

NSLBBP (67.5  $\pm$  9.7 ms, p < 0.05), with no significant difference between the NSLBBP and SLBBP groups (66.9  $\pm$  9.5 ms).

Significant statistical differences were observed in stimulus to V1 R-wave peak time with different depth pacing modes. No significant difference was noted in stimulus-QRS end duration (Stim-QRSend) between the LVSP and NSLBBP groups (138.6  $\pm$  14.3ms vs. 136.0  $\pm$  18.8 ms). However, a significant difference in Stim-QRSend was observed between the NSLBBP group (136.0  $\pm$  18.8 ms) and the SLBBP group (147.5  $\pm$  17.6 ms) (p < 0.05).

Apart from LVS perforation experienced by three patients, no other procedure-related complications, such as electrode displacement, pericardial effusion, infection, or pocket hematoma, were reported.

235

#### 236 Discussion

237 Our study demonstrates several novel findings: 1) The amplitude of ventricular EGM 238 predictably changes with radial IVS depth, and peaks in the mid-interventricular 239 septum, making it a useful ventricular COI feature to distinguish whether the lead is 240 located on the left, right, or middle of the ventricular septum; 2) As the lead is 241 inserted into the left ventricular subendocardium, producing a decline in the 242 ventricular COI to a level approximating that of the right septum, the operation 243 necessitates an extraordinarily cautious screwing of the lead. Simultaneously, careful 244 observation of the QRS transition is necessitated along with the execution of output 245 testing; 3) Continuous recording technique enables real-time monitoring of the entire 246 perforation process. This feature helps to distinguish the subtle variations that exist 247 among different perforation modalities; 4) The discernment of discrete is feasible 248 through the examination of unfiltered EGM. This suggests that SLBB capture can also 249 be confirmed by meticulously observing the subtle morphological transitions within 250 the ventricular COI.

# 252 Mid-interventricular septal pacing

253 During the implantation procedure of cardiac devices, acute tissue injury, also known 254 as the COI, can be caused by the fixation of leads into the myocardial tissue. The 255 presence of COI has been associated with improved acute performance and long-term 256 stability of active fixation leads. [16-18] It is generally accepted that a deeper 257 electrode screw-in leads to increased tissue damage, consequently resulting in higher 258 COI amplitudes. Intriguingly, our study reveals that while deeper electrode insertion 259 may potentially cause increased myocardial damage, it is not positively correlated 260 with COI elevation. Instead, it exhibits an inverted U-shaped relationship, resembling 261 a parabolic curve. This suggests that the injury current might be associated not solely 262 with myocardial damage, but also with the depth at which the lead is positioned 263 within the ventricular septum. If the COI does not increase when the electrode is 264 initially inserted under the right septal imaging positioning, it implies that the 265 electrode is entangled with the endometrium or myocardial fibrosis, necessitating a 266 change in position. The peak of the ventricular COI is not observed in the left deep 267 septum; rather, it is in the mid-interventricular septum where the maximum amplitude 268 is recorded. Positioning of the lead in the mid-interventricular septum may suggest its 269 optimal stability.

270 Evidence from previous studies indicates that IVSP is characterized by a relatively 271 short RWPT and QRS duration, indicative of a superior level of synchronicity 272 between the left and right ventricles associated with this pacing modality. Our 273 research also suggests the potential for this modality to offer superior stability. 274 Consequently, given the current lack of consensus regarding the optimal strategy for 275 trans-septal pacing, IVSP may be considered a viable choice for practitioners seeking 276 to attain the greatest lead stability and good ventricular synchrony. Compared to 277 left-side deep septal pacing (including LVSP and LBBP), the application of IVSP 278 may be more straightforward and presents a lower risk of perforation.

279

## 280 Deep septal pacing lead localization and perforation

281 The implantation technique of LBBP involves inserting a lead into the deep septum 282 below the left ventricular subendocardium to engage the LBB. The number of 283 rotations required to access the LBB area is dependent on factors such as septal 284 thickness, the degree of fibrosis, and sheath support. The assessment of ventricular 285 perforation can be conducted using X-ray fluoroscopy and echocardiography, but the 286 precise positioning of the intramyocardial lead often remains unclear due to the lack 287 of soft tissue visualization in X-ray fluoroscopy and off-axis imaging planes in 288 echocardiography. Typically, lead position is determined through the observation of 289 ECG changes, while perforation detection relies on monitoring impedance changes 290 and threshold assessments. However, impedance values can be significantly 291 influenced by the quality of tissue-electrode contact, which varies during rapid 292 screwing, making it challenging to accurately respond to real-time impedance 293 changes.[19] Consequently, delays might occur in identifying perforation via 294 impedance and threshold evaluations.

295 Septal perforation could be associated with the operator's endeavor to achieve the best 296 possible paced QRS morphology and the LBB capture. This highlights the clinical 297 need for the precise localization of the lead. The ventricular COI, represented by the 298 unfiltered intracardiac electrical signal detected at the lead's tip, can accurately 299 measure the contact between the lead and myocardial tissue, suggesting its potential 300 to subtly discern ventricular perforation. This sensitivity primarily arises since any 301 disruption in the lead-myocardium contact is immediately mirrored in this 302 measurement. However, the current intermittent recording technique, which requires 303 disconnection during lead screwing, limits the widespread use of this indicator by 304 eliminating the possibility of real-time tracking of dynamic intracardiac electrical 305 signal changes. Consequently, it becomes impossible to definitively confirm the 306 occurrence of perforation during this process. Confirmation can only be achieved

307 once reconnection between the pacing lead and the external PSA is established,

308 undeniably prolonging the procedure and increasing the risk of complications.

309 The continuous recording technique addresses these limitations. As demonstrated in 310 our research, the amplitude of the ventricular COI allows for real-time determination 311 of the radial depth of the lead within the interventricular septum, thereby facilitating 312 the prevention and detection of perforations. During the entire screw-in process, it 313 was observed that the amplitude of the ventricular COI increases and peaks as the lead 314 is inserted from the right septum to the mid-septum. As the lead continues to be 315 inserted deeper into the left septum, the ventricular COI amplitude gradually 316 decreases, eventually approximating the amplitude initially detected within the right 317 septum. In our study, it was observed that the ventricular COI from both the right and 318 left septum were closely aligned. Consequently, it was inferred that by monitoring the 319 COI of the right septum, the ventricular COI amplitude of the left septum could be 320 predicted. This insight enabled us to determine, with greater precision, the 321 individualized endpoint for halting the screwing into the left ventricular endocardium, 322 based on the COI amplitude in the right ventricular septum. At this stage, the lead 323 should be manipulated with care to prevent a sudden drop in the ventricular COI. 324 Simultaneously, dynamic changes in the ECG, such as an abrupt shortening of 325 V6RWPT and the emergence of an initial r wave in the V1 lead, need to be closely 326 monitored. Once these changes are detected, the rotation of the lead should be 327 immediately terminated and threshold testing conducted, typically revealing a discrete 328 ventricular electrogram.

Even in the face of complications such as ventricular perforation, the advantages of the continuous recording technique allow for the rapid detection of a sudden decrease in ventricular COI, enabling early termination of lead rotation and a change in the implantation location. Simultaneously, this process discerns the nature of the perforation. It enables differentiation between a micro-perforation, where the helix partially enters the left ventricle cavity, and a complete perforation, where the helix

fully penetrates the ventricular septum. With micro-perforations, the ventricular COI
can still be observed, whereas complete perforations typically present as a QS
pattern.[20]

338

## 339 Selective left bundle branch pacing

340 The gold standard for confirming LBB capture typically involves observing a 341 transition in QRS morphology, a change that indicates differences in excitability (as 342 measured by threshold testing) and/or refractoriness (as determined by programmed 343 stimulation) between the LBB and myocardium.[11] Wu et al. demonstrated that an 344 LBB potential can still be recorded by the lead even when positioned a certain 345 distance away from the LBB, suggesting that the presence of an LBB potential does 346 not necessarily confirm LBB capture.[21] A previous study proposed that the LBB 347 COI reflects the anatomical location of the tip of the lead within the LBB region, 348 possibly due to localized cell membrane damage caused by the pressure exerted by 349 the electrode on the LBB. Therefore, recording an LBB potential with COI can serve 350 as an indicator of LBB capture.[22] However, this method is only applicable to 351 patients without left bundle branch block, as a considerable proportion of patients do 352 not have Po<sub>LBB</sub> and thereby LBB COI, and its applicability is somewhat limited.

353 As previous studies have shown, the presence of ventricular COI is associated with 354 adequacy of lead fixation in the endocardium.[16-18] It is generally believed that 355 ventricular COI itself is not diagnostic for LBB capture.[23] In our study, besides 356 finding that the characteristics of COI vary at different septum depths, small and 357 significant changes in ventricular COI can also be observed when the NSLBB 358 transition to SLBB capture. Just as filtered electrograms can display discrete EGM, 359 unfiltered electrograms can also display discrete ventricular COI. Previous research 360 has shown that the physiological Purkinje activation was like distal to proximal 361 activation of the ventricular component.[24] A discrete EGM in the pacing lead can 362 be recorded because direct myocardial capture is absent and therefore ventricular

activation over the pacing lead occurs late following initial conduction only over the LBB-Purkinje system. Recording discrete EGM was defined as SLBBP and had a specificity of 100% for confirmation of LBB capture, which was demonstrated by a previous study.[25] Therefore, the discrete ventricular COI can also serve as an electrophysiological phenomenon for capturing the LBB.

368

### 369 Conclusion

370 In this study, we present a detailed description of the electrophysiological properties 371 of unipolar lead-position-dependent EGM. Such insights offer clinicians a subtle 372 understanding of the radial depth of the pacing lead throughout the implantation 373 process. Given that IVSP results in the most favorable ventricular COI, this strategy 374 provides operators with a more selection of pacing locations. Furthermore, the 375 emergence of a discrete ventricular COI may serve as a novel characteristic of SLBBP. 376 Consequently, the use of continuous recording technique enables the observation of a 377 broader array of electrophysiological phenomena during traversal of the IVS. This 378 approach not only provides practitioners with more insights but also simplifies 379 implantation procedures and facilitates the prevention or early detection of 380 perforations. Future studies are needed to further validate these findings and explore 381 their clinical implications.

382

#### 383 Study Limitations

This study has several limitations that should be noted. Firstly, the study was conducted at a single center, and the sample size was relatively small. This may limit the generalizability of our findings to broader populations or different clinical settings. Secondly, the observational nature of the study design precludes the determination of causality. Future studies with randomized controlled trials are needed to establish causal relationships between the variables we studied. Thirdly, we used specific equipment and techniques for the continuous recording of electrophysiological

391 phenomena during left bundle branch pacing. The results might not be applicable to 392 centers using different types of equipment or techniques. Lastly, although our study 393 provides evidence that the continuous recording technique can facilitate the 394 observation of a broader array of electrophysiological phenomena during traversal of 395 the IVS, more research is needed to determine whether this approach can improve 396 clinical outcomes, such as reducing the incidence of complications or improving the 397 long-term stability of the pacing lead.

398

#### **399 Conflict of interest**

400 The corresponding author owns the patent for John Jiang's connecting cable. The401 other author declares no conflict of interest.

402

# 403 Funding Sources

This work was supported by the Ningbo Public Service Technology Foundation [grant
number 2023S089], Zhejiang Provincial Public Service and Application Research
Foundation, China [grant number LGF22H020009], and Zhu Xiu Shan Talent Project
of Ningbo No.2 Hospital, China [grant number 2023HMYQ18].

408

#### 409 **References**

- Huang W, Su L, Wu S, et al. A Novel Pacing Strategy With Low and Stable
   Output: Pacing the Left Bundle Branch Immediately Beyond the Conduction
   Block. Can J Cardiol 2017, 33:1736.e1731-1736.e1733.
- 413 2. Mafi-Rad M, Luermans JGLM, Blaauw Y, et al. Feasibility and Acute
  414 Hemodynamic Effect of Left Ventricular Septal Pacing by Transvenous
  415 Approach Through the Interventricular Septum. Circulation Arrhythmia and
  416 Electrophysiology 2016, 9:e003344.

- 417 3. Jastrzębski M, Kiełbasa G, Moskal P, et al. Fixation beats: A novel marker for
  418 reaching the left bundle branch area during deep septal lead implantation.
- 419 Heart Rhythm 2021, 18:562-569.
- 420 4. Ponnusamy SS, Vijayaraman P. Left bundle branch pacing guided by
  421 premature ventricular complexes during implant. HeartRhythm Case Rep 2020,
  422 6:850-853.
- 5. Shen J, Jiang L, Cai X, et al. Left Bundle Branch Pacing Guided by
  Continuous Pacing Technique That Can Monitor Electrocardiograms and
  Electrograms in Real Time: A Technical Report. Can J Cardiol 2022,
  38:1315-1317.
- 427 6. Wu H, Jiang L, Shen J. Recording an isoelectric interval as an endpoint of left
  428 bundle branch pacing with continuous paced intracardiac electrogram
  429 monitoring. Kardiol Pol 2022, 80:664-671.
- 430 7. Shen J, Jiang L, Wu H, et al. A Continuous Pacing and Recording Technique
  431 for Differentiating Left Bundle Branch Pacing From Left Ventricular Septal
  432 Pacing: Electrophysiologic Evidence From an Intrapatient-Controlled Study.
  433 Can J Cardiol 2023, 39:1-10.
- 434 8. Chen K, Li Y, Dai Y, et al. Comparison of electrocardiogram characteristics
  435 and pacing parameters between left bundle branch pacing and right ventricular
  436 pacing in patients receiving pacemaker therapy. Europace 2019, 21:673-680.
- 437 9. Jastrzębski M, Burri H, Kiełbasa G, et al. The V6-V1 interpeak interval: a
  438 novel criterion for the diagnosis of left bundle branch capture. Europace 2022,
  439 24:40-47.
- 440 10. Shimeno K, Matsumoto N, Matsuo M, et al. Device Electrogram-Guided
  441 Determination of Output-Dependent QRS Transition in Left Bundle Branch
  442 Pacing. JACC Clin Electrophysiol 2024:102308.
- 443 11. Burri H, Jastrzebski M, Cano Ó, et al. EHRA clinical consensus statement on
  444 conduction system pacing implantation: endorsed by the Asia Pacific Heart

445	Rhyth	m Society (	APHRS	b), Canadia	an Heart	Rhythm Soc	eiety (CHRS	s), and
446	Latin	American	Heart	Rhythm	Society	(LAHRS).	Europace	2023,
447	25:120	08-1236.						

- 448 12. Chung MK, Patton KK, Lau CP, et al. 2023 HRS/APHRS/LAHRS guideline
  449 on cardiac physiologic pacing for the avoidance and mitigation of heart failure.
  450 Heart Rhythm. 2023 Sep;20(9):e17-e91.
- 451 13. Liu X, Niu HX, Gu M, et al. Contrast-enhanced image-guided lead
  452 deployment for left bundle branch pacing. Heart Rhythm. 2021
  453 Aug;18(8):1318-1325.
- 454 14. Shen J, Jiang L, Wu H, et al. High-pass filter settings and the role and
  455 mechanism of discrete ventricular electrograms in left bundle branch pacing.
  456 Front Cardiovasc Med 2022, 9:1059172.
- 457 15. Shen J, Jiang L, Wu H, et al. Left bundle branch pacing guided by real-time
  458 monitoring of current of injury and electrocardiography. Front Cardiovasc
  459 Med 2022, 9:1025620.
- 460 16. Saxonhouse SJ, Conti JB, Curtis AB. Current of injury predicts adequate
  461 active lead fixation in permanent pacemaker/defibrillation leads. J Am Coll
  462 Cardiol 2005, 45:412-417.
- 463 17. Redfearn DP, Gula LJ, Krahn AD, et al. Current of injury predicts acute
  464 performance of catheter-delivered active fixation pacing leads. Pacing Clin
  465 Electrophysiol 2007, 30:1438-1444.
- 466 18. Haghjoo M, Mollazadeh R, Aslani A, et al. Prediction of midterm
  467 performance of active-fixation leads using current of injury. Pacing Clin
  468 Electrophysiol 2014, 37:231-236.
- 469 19. Jastrzębski M. Left bundle branch area pacing lead implantation using an
  470 uninterrupted monitoring of endocardial signals. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol.
  471 2022 May;33(5):1055-1057.

- 472 20. Ponnusamy SS, Basil W, Vijayaraman P. Electrophysiological characteristics
  473 of septal perforation during left bundle branch pacing. Heart Rhythm. 2022
  474 May;19(5):728-734.
- Wu H, Jiang L, Shen J. Characteristics and proposed meaning of intrinsic
  intracardiac electrogram morphology observed during the left bundle branch
  pacing procedure: A case report. HeartRhythm Case Rep 2022, 8:485-487.
- 478 22. Su L, Xu T, Cai M, et al. Electrophysiological characteristics and clinical
  479 values of left bundle branch current of injury in left bundle branch pacing. J
  480 Cardiovasc Electrophysiol 2020, 31:834-842.
- 481 23. Shali S, Wu W, Bai J, et al. Current of injury is an indicator of lead depth and
  482 performance during left bundle branch pacing lead implantation. Heart
  483 Rhythm. 2022 Aug;19(8):1281-1288.
- 484 24. Upadhyay GA, Cherian T, Shatz DY, et al. Intracardiac Delineation of Septal
  485 Conduction in Left Bundle-Branch Block Patterns. Circulation 2019,
  486 139:1876-1888.
- 487 25. Wu S, Chen X, Wang S, et al. Evaluation of the Criteria to Distinguish Left
  488 Bundle Branch Pacing From Left Ventricular Septal Pacing. JACC Clin
  489 Electrophysiol 2021, 7:1166-1177.
- 490

# 491 Figure legends

492 Figure 1 The procedure to implant the LBBP lead under fluoroscopy. A. 493 Visualization of the TVA to help locate the LBBP target zone under the RAO 30° 494 view. B-C. The 3830 lead was positioned in the LBBP screw-in site and fixed site 495 under the RAO 30° view. D-F. Through the combination of septal angiography and 496 the paced ECG and EGM morphologies associated, the RVSP, IVSP, and LBBP was 497 confirmed. RAO, right anterior oblique; TVA, tricuspid valve annulus; RVSP, right 498 ventricular septal pacing; IVSP, intraventricular septal pacing; LBBP, left bundle 499 branch pacing; ECG, electrocardiogram; EGM, intracardiac electrogram.

5	n	Λ
J	υ	v.

501	Figure 2 Lead-position-dependent EGM and ECG transition during screwing in.
502	NSLBBP, nonselective left bundle branch pacing; SLBBP, selective left bundle
503	branch pacing; LBB-F, filtered unipolar electrogram; LBB-U, unfiltered unipolar
504	electrogram.
505	
506	Figure 3 Electrophysiological characteristics of EGM and ECG in 5 pacing patterns.
507	COI, current of injury; Stim-V6RWPT, stimulus to V6 R-wave peak time;
508	Stim-V1RWPT, stimulus to V1 R-wave peak time. Abbreviations as in Figure 1 and
509	2.
510	
511	Figure 4 Discrete COI can be observed when the NSLBBP transition to SLBBP
512	during threshold testing. Hollow arrows are used to indicate the appearance of notches.
513	Abbreviations as in Figure 1 and 2.
514	
515	Figure 5 The continuous recording technique enables real-time monitoring of the
516	entire perforation process, facilitating early detection of perforations. The impedance
517	can be observed to drop from 662 $\Omega$ to 501 $\Omega$ . Abbreviations as in Figure 2.
518	
519	
520	
521	
522	
523	
524	
525	
526	
527	

- 528
- 529
- 530
- 531
- 532
- 533
- 534
- 535
- - -
- 536
- 537
- 538

Table 1. Patient characteristics (n = 88)	
Age (years)	$73.7\pm9.1$
Male	51 (58.0)
Pacing indication, n (%)	
Atrioventricular block	56 (63.6)
Sick sinus syndrome	31 (35.2)
Atrial fibrillation with bradycardia	4 (4.5)
Heart failure	5 (5.7)
Comorbidities, n (%)	
Hypertension	53 (60.2)
Diabetes mellitus	23 (26.1)
Cardiomyopathy	4 (4.5)
Coronary heart disease	14 (16.0)
Atrial fibrillation	22 (25.0)
LVEF (%)	$62.8 \pm 11.1$
LVDD (mm)	$49.7\pm7.8$
QRS morphology, n (%)	
Narrow QRS	60 (68.2)
RBBB	19 (21.6)
LBBB	11 (12.5)
NIVCD	2 (2.3)

Values are given as mean  $\pm$  SD or n (%).

LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; LVDD, left ventricular end-diastolic dimension; RBBB, right bundle branch block; LBBB, left bundle branch block; NIVCD, non-specific intraventricular conduction disturbance.

 Table 2. Procedure-related parameters (n=88)

Incidence of Po <sub>LBB</sub> , n (%)	66 (75.0%)
Po <sub>LBB</sub> -ventricular interval, ms	$24.7\pm8.1$
Po <sub>LBB</sub> -V6RWPT, ms	$64.5\pm7.1$
Po <sub>LBB</sub> amplitude, mV	$0.35\pm0.34$
Abrupt shortening of stim-V6RWPT, ms	$14.0\pm5.9$
Initial LBB capture threshold, V/0.5 ms	$0.76\pm0.56$
Initial LVS capture threshold, V/0.5 ms	$1.32\pm0.91$
Initial R-wave amplitude, mV	$8.1\pm3.9$
Initial Impedance, $\Omega$	$783.6 \pm 145.9$
Final LBB capture threshold, V/0.5 ms	$0.61\pm0.44$
Final LVS capture threshold, V/0.5 ms	$0.66\pm0.25$
Final R-wave amplitude, mV	$15.1 \pm 7.1$
Final Impedance, $\Omega$	$743.1\pm136.8$
Lead depth, mm	$15.1 \pm 2.6$
Perforation, n (%)	3 (3.4%)

Values are given as mean  $\pm$  SD or n (%). Po<sub>LBB</sub>, left bundle branch potential; stim-V6RWPT, stimulus to V6 R wave peak time; LVS, left ventricular septal.



# Table 3. Lead-position-dependent parameters during LBBP

	RVSP	IVSP	LVSP	NSLBBP	SLBBP	Pre-pac impla
COI (mV)	10.5±5.9	26.6±11.8	19.8±9.6	20.0±9.2	11.9±6.4	
Impedance ( $\Omega$ )	948.7±202.1	980.3±156.3	NA	929.5±191.4	886.0±164.4	743.1
Stim-V6RWPT (ms)	103.2±16.9	83.8±12.5	81.8±12.3	67.5±9.7	66.9±9.5	70.
Stim-V1RWPT (ms)	NA	$105.8 \pm 12.0$	113.7±11.0	$110.4{\pm}12.1$	$118.4{\pm}16.1$	114.
Stim-QRSend (ms)	$148.0{\pm}14.9$	133.9±13.8	138.6±14.3	136.0±18.8	147.5±17.6	144.

RVSP, right ventricular septal pacing; IVSP, intraventricular septal pacing; LVSP, left ventricular septal endocardium pacing; NSLBBP, non-selective left bundle branch pacing; SLBBP, selective left bundle bra pacing; COI, current of injury; RWPT, R wave peak time; Stim-QRSend, stimulus-QRS end duration.









