



## Risk score for the exclusion of arrhythmic events in arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy at first presentation<sup>☆</sup>



Annina S. Vischer<sup>a,\*</sup>, Silvia Castelletti<sup>b,1</sup>, Petros Syrris<sup>c,1</sup>, Rachel Bastiaenen<sup>d,j,1</sup>, Chris Miles<sup>d,j,1</sup>, Deniz Akdis<sup>e,1</sup>, Kris Denhaerynck<sup>f,1</sup>, Daniel Jacoby<sup>g,1</sup>, Ardan M. Saguner<sup>e,1</sup>, Andrew D. Krahn<sup>h,1</sup>, Elijah R. Behr<sup>d,j,1</sup>, William J. McKenna<sup>c,1</sup>, Antonios Pantazis<sup>i,1</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Medical Outpatient Department, University Hospital Basel, Basel, Switzerland

<sup>b</sup> Istituto Auxologico Italiano, IRCCS, Center for Cardiac Arrhythmias of Genetic Origin, Milan, Italy

<sup>c</sup> Institute of Cardiovascular Science, University College of London, London, UK

<sup>d</sup> Molecular and Clinical Sciences Research Institute, St George's University of London, London, UK

<sup>e</sup> Department of Cardiology, University Heart Center, Zurich, Switzerland

<sup>f</sup> University of Basel, Department of Public Health, Institute of Nursing Science, Basel, Switzerland

<sup>g</sup> Section of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

<sup>h</sup> Division of Cardiology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

<sup>i</sup> Cardiomyopathy Service, Royal Brompton Hospital, London, UK

<sup>j</sup> Cardiology Clinical Academic Group, St George's University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 8 March 2019

Received in revised form 25 April 2019

Accepted 29 April 2019

Available online 1 May 2019

#### Keywords:

Arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy

Arrhythmic risk

Ventricular arrhythmia

ICD

Sudden cardiac death

Risk stratification

### ABSTRACT

**Aims:** Arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy (ARVC) is a genetically determined heart muscle disorder associated with an increased risk of life-threatening arrhythmias in some patients. Risk stratification remains challenging. Therefore, we sought a non-invasive, easily applicable risk score to predict sustained ventricular arrhythmias in these patients.

**Methods:** Cohort of Patients who fulfilled the 2010 ARVC task force criteria were consecutively recruited. Detailed clinical data were collected at baseline and during follow up. The clinical endpoint was a composite of recurrent sustained ventricular arrhythmias and hospitalization due to ventricular arrhythmias. Multivariable logistic regression was used to develop models to predict the arrhythmic risk. A cohort including patients from other registries in UK, Canada and Switzerland was used as a validation population.

**Results:** One hundred and thirty-five patients were included of whom 35 patients (31.9%) reached the endpoint. A model consisting of filtered QRS duration on signal-averaged ECG, non-sustained VT (NSVT) on 24 h-ECG, and absence of negative T waves in lead aVR on 12 lead surface ECG was able to predict arrhythmic events with a sensitivity of 81.8%, specificity of 84.0% and a negative predictive value of 95.5% at the first presentation of the disease. This risk score was validated in international ARVC registry patients.

**Conclusion:** A risk score consisting of a filtered QRS duration  $\geq 117$  ms, presence of NSVT on 24 h-ECG and absence of negative T waves in lead aVR was able to predict arrhythmic events at first presentation of the disease.

© 2019 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

### 1. Introduction

Arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy (ARVC) is a genetically determined heart muscle disorder characterized by disruption of the myocytic architecture resulting in electrical instability and increased risk of life-threatening ventricular arrhythmias (VA) [1].

Although the overall risk of sudden cardiac death (SCD) is low [2], ARVC has been reported to be an important cause of SCD in adults younger than 35 years, accounting for up to 11% of SCD cases [3,4] with up to 22% in athletes [5,6].

The 2006 ACC/AHA/ESC guidelines recommend the use of an implantable cardioverter-defibrillator (ICD) in patients with ARVC and documented sustained ventricular tachycardia (VT) or fibrillation (VF) [7]. The 2015 Task Force Consensus Statement on Treatment of ARVC adds syncope, non-sustained VT (NSVT) and moderate dysfunction of the right (RV), left (LV) or both ventricles as risk factors, but risk stratification remains imperfect [8]. To date, there is only retrospective data from small cohorts available (Table A.1). Both definition of outcome and selection of patients vary highly in the named studies.

<sup>☆</sup> Performed at the Heart Hospital, London UK and St. George's Hospital, London, UK.

\* Corresponding author at: University Hospital Basel, Medical Outpatient Department, Petersgraben 4, CH-4031 Basel, Switzerland.

E-mail address: [annina.vischer@usb.ch](mailto:annina.vischer@usb.ch) (A.S. Vischer).

<sup>1</sup> This author takes responsibility for all aspects of the reliability and freedom from bias of the data presented and their discussed interpretation.

The aim of this study was to identify clinically applicable, non-invasive predictors for arrhythmic risk in ARVC and to combine detected predictors into a clinically useful risk score.

## 2. Methods

The study cohort included unrelated patients consecutively referred to the Inherited Cardiovascular Disease Unit of The Heart Hospital in London between 2003 and 2014, and to St Georges University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (SGUH), London (before 2003 when the service moved to the Heart Hospital), with suspected ARVC, or with family history of SCD and/or ARVC. All patients were evaluated according to the 2010 task force criteria and classified into definite, borderline or possible ARVC [1]. Only patients who fulfilled diagnostic criteria and who have thus been diagnosed with definite ARVC according to the 2010 task force criteria [1] at any time throughout the course of their disease were included for the development of the score.

Detailed clinical and genetic data were collected at baseline and during follow up.

A cohort including patients from SGUH (not included in the first population), from the Zurich ARVC program, and from the Vancouver based BC Inherited Arrhythmia Program was used as a validation cohort.

The study was approved by the local ethics committees of each participating center.

### 2.1. Clinical data

Baseline clinical evaluation included personal and family history, 12 lead-electrocardiogram (ECG), signal-averaged ECG (SAECG) and 24 h-ECG, 2D-echocardiography, and cardiopulmonary exercise test (CPEX).

Follow-up visits were performed as clinically necessary, usually every 6–12 months. Patients who had not been seen for at least 2 years were contacted by telephone in January 2015 using a structured questionnaire.

Paper prints of the ECGs were evaluated with regard to electrical axis, QRS duration in leads V1 and V6, duration of terminal activation measured from the nadir of the S wave to the end of the QRS in leads V1 and V2, presence of T wave inversions and Q waves in all leads, presence of low voltage (<5 mm in all limb leads and <10 mm in all precordial leads), delayed R progression, left or right bundle branch block, presence and configuration of ventricular ectopics (VE) according to standard definition [9–12].

Automated interpretation of SAECGs was performed with regard to filtered QRS duration (fQRSd), low-amplitude signal duration (LAS) and root-mean-square voltage of the terminal 40 ms (RMS), the same parameters in only the Z-axis, the number of beats analysed and the documented noise. SAECGs with a noise  $\geq 0.5$  mV and SAECG in patients with complete right bundle branch block were excluded [1,13].

Automated interpretation of 24 h-ECGs was checked and utilised for the number of VE, couplets, triplets, tachycardias and supraventricular ectopics and tachycardias. Full disclosure was available if needed.

CPEX was performed using a standard Bruce protocol. Maximal oxygen consumption, its percentage of predicted, peak heart rate, its percentage of predicted, respiratory quotient, minutes of exercise, achieved power in Watts, occurring arrhythmias and current medication were taken from the standardized reports.

All echocardiographic measurements were taken from the standardized reports. Information on decreased RV function, dilatation and wall motion abnormalities were also taken from the written reports, unless there were conflicting reports, in which case three cardiologists with a special interest in cardiomyopathies reviewed the images independently. The consensus regarding dilatation and wall motion abnormalities was then used.

Genotyping was performed using next generation sequencing as described before for hypertrophic cardiomyopathy [14].

Magnetic resonance imaging measurements were not utilised, as results were available in less than one third of patients.

Patients from the validation cohort were analysed specifically for the parameters included in the risk score as reported above.

### 2.2. End point

The primary endpoint was a composite of recurrent sustained VT/VF causing patients to seek medical attention or leading to shock from their ICDs, and hospitalization due to VT/VF or SCD at any time after inclusion in the study.

### 2.3. Statistical analysis

Continuous variables were compared between the groups with mean  $\pm$  standard deviation and categorical variables as number (percentages) of all cases. Simple logistic regression analyses were calculated for each of the candidate predictors. Predictors were evaluated using odds ratios (OR) and their area under the curve (AUC) to evaluate their accuracy with regard to discrimination of patients at risk of sustained ventricular arrhythmia. Cut-off values for balanced specificity and sensitivity as well as one for sensitivity  $>80\%$  were determined. We corrected for multiple testing of the predictors selection using the false discovery rate method, implying that the level of significant  $p$ -values was lowered to reduce random findings to an expected 5% [15].

An alpha level of 0.05 was considered as statistically significant. All data were analysed with SPSS version 22 and SAS version 9.4.

### 2.4. Development of the risk score

The patients were compared in two groups, one consisting of those patients reaching the composite endpoint, the other consisting of the remainder. Predictors were searched using the baseline data from their first investigation at The Heart Hospital/SGUH. Parameters, which showed a statistically significant corrected  $p$ -value were grouped as SAECG, ECG, 24 h-ECG, CPEX and echocardiography parameters and subsequently entered into multiple logistic regression models. To prevent overfitting, we limited the number of variables per model to a maximum of one of each group, thus maximally five parameters per model, but fitting several models instead to cover all possible predictors. Only significant variables were retained in the models.

All models were subsequently analysed as possible risk scores. All patients were assigned points for each one of these scores, 1 point for each parameter that was positive, as all used parameters were categorized. Sensitivity, specificity, positive (PPV) and negative predictive values (NPV),  $p$ -value, OR and AUC were computed for each risk score based on all possible numbers of points given for the specific risk score. Only patients with complete baseline information for the parameters investigated were included for this analysis.

Previously reported risk factors for sustained ventricular arrhythmia and scores were computed for our cohort if possible from our data and evaluated by calculating sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, OR and AUC.

### 2.5. Validation

Sensitivity, specificity, PPV and NPV,  $p$ -value, OR and AUC were computed in all patients with baseline SAECG, 12 lead ECG, and 24 h-ECG data as reported for the original cohort.

## 3. Results

278 patients with definite, borderline and possible ARVC were identified. 135 patients (48.6%), mean age  $44 \pm 14$  years, 82 men (60.7%) fulfilled the 2010 task force criteria for a definite diagnosis of ARVC. Fig. A.1 shows the flow chart of patients included. Patients were followed for a mean of  $8.4 \pm 4.8$  years since their ARVC diagnosis and for  $6.8 \pm 3.3$  years after their referral to our institution.

Of the 135 patients with definite ARVC 35 patients (31.9%) reached the composite endpoint. All patients had recurrent sustained VT documented, 8 (22.9%) experienced electrical storm and 2 (5.7%) were hospitalized for recurrent VT not identified as electrical storms. No patient with definite ARVC died suddenly. Thirty-three (94.3%) patients reaching the endpoint were treated with an ICD (15 (45.5%) for secondary prevention) at some point throughout the course of the disease, in comparison to 57 (58.2%) (14 (24.6%) for secondary prevention) in those who did not reach the endpoint.

### 3.1. Development of the score

Significant results from comparing candidate predictors at baseline are depicted in Table 1.

No other clinical, genetic, electrocardiographic or echocardiographic feature differed significantly between those with and without events. This includes other previously examined risk factors such as syncope or extensive T wave inversion (Tables A.2–A.8).

Parameters with a significant OR were combined into multivariable logistic regression analyses with one of each of the 12 lead ECG, SAECG, 24 h-ECG, echocardiographic and CPEX arrhythmia parameters (any arrhythmias – VE or NSVT – during exercise). The 2010 ARVC task force diagnostic criteria “arrhythmias” and “sustained VT/VF as a reason for screening” were excluded as parameters in multivariable analysis, because they were an element of the endpoint. Treatment with beta-blockers and the maximal heart rate during the first CPEX were both excluded as variables for multivariable analysis, as the first was physician’s choice and the latter could have been influenced by the former. Arrhythmias during CPEX, however, did not seem to be influenced, as they were more common in patients treated with beta-blockers, which is why we included this parameter in the analysis.

This resulted in 10 models with 3 parameters each, in which all parameters were significant. All models were significant (Table A.9).

The model with the best relation between a high sensitivity and acceptable specificity, reflected in the highest AUC and OR, was a model consisting of absence of negative T waves in lead aVR, fQRSd  $\geq 117$  ms and NSVT  $\geq 3$  beats in a 24 h-ECG. This model reached an AUC of 0.90 and OR of 13.03. With one out of three parameters positive, the risk score showed a sensitivity and NPV of 100%. With three out of three parameters positive, specificity and PPV increased to 100%, however at cost of sensitivity. The sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, *p*-value, OR and AUC, stratified for the number of positive parameters, for the risk score are presented in Table 2.

A clustered bar chart of this test is depicted in Fig. 1 panel A, the receiver operating curve in Fig. A.2. Stratification of patients based on sustained VT/VF (primary vs secondary prophylactic population) before initial investigation is shown in Fig. A.3. By applying the risk score only to patients without a history of VT/VF the AUC was 0.899, *p*-value 0.002, 95%CI 0.781–1.000.

Fourteen patients (82.4%) fulfilling 2 or more criteria of this risk score were treated with an ICD in comparison to 23 patients (50.0%) fulfilling 1 or less criteria (*p* 0.024).

### 3.2. Validation of risk score in other ARVC patient cohorts

Our validation cohort included 58 patients (51.7% men, mean age  $41.9 \pm 12.8$  years) with a definite diagnosis of ARVC, of which 12 patients (20.7%) reached the endpoint over a mean follow up-time of  $7.5 \pm 6.0$  years. When applied to all these patients, our risk score reached a specificity of 80.4% and a NPV of 88.1% with two out of three parameters positive. With only one out of three parameters positive, the NPV rose to 100% (Table 3). The overall AUC was 0.793 (0.664–0.923). The clustered bar chart is shown in Fig. 1 panel B.

### 3.3. Performance of other scores in our cohort

In our cohort, the parameters suggested by Protonotarios [16] reached a sensitivity of 85.7% if only one parameter had to be positive, however at a specificity of 9.0%. Corrado's parameters (syncope and NSVT in either 24 h-ECG or CPEX) [17] had a specificity of 90.8%, however, with a sensitivity of only 7.4%. The most balanced tests were Liao's [18], who used a positive SAECC in all 3 parameters as a predictor of arrhythmias, which reached a sensitivity of 59.1% and a specificity of 66.2%, Wichter's [19], with a sensitivity of 60% and a specificity of 58.8%, and Piccini's [20] with a sensitivity of 57.1% and a specificity of 78.0%. The predictor (major risk factors) recommended by the 2015

Task Force document had indeed a sensitivity and NPV of 100%, however at a specificity of only 20.2% [8] (Table A.10).

## 4. Discussion

We observed, that arrhythmic risk can be predicted at the first presentation of the disease, in patients with definite ARVC with and without disease-causing genetic mutations. Using simple clinical data typically gathered at the initial visit (fQRSd from SAECC of  $\geq 117$  ms, presence of NSVT beats in a 24 h-ECG and the absence of negative T waves in lead aVR at baseline) we developed a risk score that substantially improves on prior efforts to predict clinically important arrhythmias in this complex patient population. Each parameter counted as 1 point. 52.9% of patients, who had a risk score of 2, and 100% of patients with a score of 3, reached the arrhythmic endpoint over  $101 \pm 57$  months. A score of 0 virtually excluded the occurrence of arrhythmia over 10 years follow-up. This score can therefore help in the decision about ICD implantation. The advantage of these measurements is that they are non-invasive, relatively easily accessible and not investigator-dependent.

Risk stratification in patients with ARVC is imperfect. Several risk factors have previously been published, but with significant variation in both inclusion criteria and definition of outcome. The international task force consensus statement on treatment of ARVC from 2015 underlined the sparse evidence for risk stratification [8]. Our work increases the evidence to improve risk stratification.

SAECC use in patients with ARVC was explored by Blomström-Lundqvist in 1988 [21]. Turrini [22] correlated late potentials, especially RMS with a filter of 25 Hz, to sustained VA. Late potentials in SAECC appear to correlate with fibro-fatty substitution on biopsy and magnetic resonance imaging, and may therefore be a sign of slow conduction and hence of the substrate for arrhythmia [18]. Positivity of all three SAECC parameters was reported as a predictor for arrhythmia in a smaller series [18]. All three usually reported SAECC parameters (fQRSd, LAS and RMS), were considered for our risk score. However, only fQRSd contributed to the most sensitive and specific risk score.

Corrado et al. [17] reported NSVT  $\geq 3$  beats as a predictor of appropriate ICD interventions and shocks for VF and ventricular flutter. Our definition of the outcome differs from Corrado's in that we also included SCD and hospitalization for VT.

Lead aVR is a marker of the RV outflow tract [23]. Recently, epsilon waves in lead aVR were described in a small number of patients with ARVC [24]. To our knowledge, the morphology of the T wave in lead

**Table 1**  
Significant baseline characteristics.

Modality	Parameter	Recurrent arrhythmia <i>n</i> = 35	Favourable outcome <i>n</i> = 100	<i>p</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value adapted
Reason for screening	Family history	2 (5.7%)	40 (40.0%)	0.000	0.017
	VT/VF	20 (57.1%)	22 (22.0%)	0.000	0.017
12 lead-ECG	Negative T wave aVR	15 (42.9%)	69 (72.6%)	0.003	0.038
Signal-averaged-ECG	fQRSd $\geq 117$ ms	16 (72.7%)	22 (31.0%)	0.001	0.017
	$\geq 800$ VPB	16 (80.0%)	26 (39.4%)	0.002	0.028
24 h-ECG	Couplets present	17 (94.4%)	37 (56.1%)	0.002	0.028
	$\geq 8$ couplets	16 (88.9%)	25 (37.9%)	0.000	0.000
CPEX	Triplets present	15 (83.3%)	19 (29.2%)	0.000	0.000
	VT $\geq 3$ beats	15 (83.3%)	25 (35.8%)	0.000	0.017
Echocardiogram	Maximal heart rate (bpm)	$129 \pm 23.7$	$145.7 \pm 29.0$	0.005	0.049
	Visual RV dilatation (incl. Upper normal)	31 (88.6%)	62 (63.9%)	0.005	0.049
	Visual RV dilatation (excl. Upper normal)	29 (82.9%)	52 (53.6%)	0.002	0.028
	RVOT PLAX $\geq 3.4$ cm	22 (91.7%)	41 (57.7%)	0.002	0.028
	RVIT (cm)	$4.3 \pm 0.8$	$3.6 \pm 0.8$	0.001	0.021
	RVIT $\geq 3.7$ cm	18 (81.8%)	27 (46.6%)	0.005	0.049
	RV/LV	$1.3 \pm 0.7$	$0.9 \pm 0.5$	0.005	0.049
	RV/LV $\geq 0.81$	16 (80.0%)	15 (34.1%)	0.001	0.021
	RV/LV $\geq 0.79$	18 (90.0%)	20 (45.5%)	0.001	0.021

CPEX: cardiopulmonary exercise test, fQRSd: filtered QRS duration, LV: left ventricle, PLAX: parasternal long axis view, RV: right ventricle/ventricular, RVIT: RV inflow tract, RVOT: RV outflow tract, VF: ventricular fibrillation, VPB: ventricular premature beats, VT: ventricular tachycardia.

**Table 2**

Performance, effect size and accuracy of risk score.

Parameters positive	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	OR (95% CI)	P value	AUC (95% CI)
1 out of 3	100	40.4	26.2	100	NA	0.011	0.70 (0.56–0.84)
2 out of 3	81.8	84.6	52.9	95.7	24.75 (4.49–136.48)	0.000	0.83 (0.69–0.98)
3 out of 3	36.4	100	100	88.1	NA	0.001	0.68 (0.48–0.89)

Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), odds ratio (OR), p-value and area under the curve (AUC) depending on number of criteria fulfilled for risk score based on filtered QRS duration  $\geq 117$  ms, non-sustained ventricular tachycardia on 24 h-ECG and absence of negative T-waves in lead aVR.

aVR in the context of ARVC has not been characterized. Patients with arrhythmic events characteristically did not show the usual negative T wave in aVR, but a flattened or positive T wave. T wave abnormalities in lead aVR may be a sign of electrical changes due to loss of cell-cell adhesion and fibro-fatty alteration, especially in the area of the RV outflow tract.

The absence of further predictors of arrhythmic risk in our cohort may derive from small prevalences of these factors in our cohort, as many patients have not developed a full phenotype at their first presentation yet.

No echocardiographic parameter qualified as a predictor for arrhythmias in our study. This may be related to the hypothesis that structural changes detected may occur only later in the course of the disease and may be preceded by electrical changes [25].

A history of syncope has previously been reported as a risk factor for arrhythmia [26], appropriate ICD interventions [17] and SCD [22]. In our cohort, almost 30% of patients with an arrhythmic outcome reported syncope at baseline and another 6% during follow-up. However, similar proportions suffered from syncope in the non-arrhythmic group. Syncope may be sensitive, but not very specific and has therefore not been added to our risk score.

Reduced LV function has also been reported as a risk factor for arrhythmia [16], major adverse cardiac events [27], and appropriate ICD discharges [17,19]. LV dysfunction was relatively rare in our cohort, which explains why it has not been taken into account as an independent predictor. The low prevalence of LV dysfunction emphasizes that our patients were investigated before the occurrence of it, i.e. not at very advanced stages. However, in a patient with significant LV dysfunction, there may still be a significant arrhythmic risk and decisions upon therapy should not solely depend on our risk score.

Bhonsale et al. published a risk score, which states PKP mutations and T wave inversions as risk factors [27]. However, they have included family members without a definite diagnosis of ARVC. As both risk factors named are part of the 2010 ARVC task force criteria, they are simply likely to be associated with a definite diagnosis, which impairs the prognosis, in contrast to a possible or borderline diagnosis.

#### 4.1. Clinical implications


Previously reported risk factors for arrhythmia are either very sensitive [8,16] or very specific [17,20]. This means, that by applying them, we either overestimate the risk and hence implant patients unnecessarily with ICDs from which they will not benefit, but still may experience complications, or miss patients at high risk and put them at risk of SCD. Our diagnostic score shows both a high sensitivity and specificity and therefore may improve patient selection for prophylaxis and treatment of VA and can be used in addition to previously reported risk factors. With the very high NPV of a low risk score, this may be used to reassure patients during screening situations and the risk stratification process.

#### 4.2. Limitations

This is a retrospective multicenter study. The risk factors included in our risk score were not investigated prospectively and should thus be regarded as preliminary. Our centers served as a tertiary referral center and a high referral bias is therefore to be expected. However, all patients in our database have been included, both patients with and without known genetic mutations, and therefore this cohort represents real clinical life. Additionally, we included both patients with and without previous episodes of VT/VF for the development of the score, to represent a cohort with a broad spectrum of arrhythmic risk including patients with a very high risk. Several recently researched factors such as C-reactive protein were not added to our database and could therefore not be examined. As we did not have MRI results in a large proportion of our patients we were unable to include MRI parameters into the development of the risk score. Our risk score describes an aspect of the arrhythmic phenotype, but does not predict the risk of SCD.

#### 4.3. Conclusion

Ventricular arrhythmic risk in patients with ARVC can be evaluated at their first presentation based on a novel risk score comprised of SAECG measurements (fQRSd  $\geq 117$  ms), T wave morphology



**Fig. 1.** Clustered Bar Chart for Risk score. Clustered Bar Chart for risk score based on filtered QRS duration  $\geq 117$  ms, NSVT  $\geq 3$  beats  $> 100$  bpm on 24 h-ECG, absence of negative T wave in lead aVR. Panel A: Performance in the development cohort. Panel B: Performance in the validation cohort.

**Table 3**  
Performance, effect size and accuracy of risk score in validation cohort.

Parameters positive	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	OR (95% CI)	p-Value	AUC (95% CI)
≥1 out of 3	100.0	39.1	30.0	100	1.429 (1.166–1.750)	0.011	0.696 (0.556–0.836)
≥2 out of 3	58.3	80.4	43.8	88.1	5.756 (1.478–22.409)	0.013	0.694 (0.514–0.874)
3 out of 3	25.0	97.8	75.0	83.3	15.000 (1.397–161.045)	0.025	0.614 (0.417–0.812)

Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), odds ratio (OR), p-value and area under the curve (AUC) depending on number of criteria fulfilled for risk score based on filtered QRS duration  $\geq 117$  ms, non-sustained ventricular tachycardia on 24 h-ECG and absence of negative T-waves in lead aVR.

(absence of negative T waves in lead aVR) and arrhythmias (NSVT  $\geq 3$  beats) on 24 h-ECGs at baseline. A higher score indicates a higher arrhythmic risk, whereas a low score virtually excludes an arrhythmic risk. Our risk score has promise to form a risk stratification algorithm in the future.

### Funding sources

ASV: research grant from the Swiss Heart Rhythm Foundation. SC: European Society of Cardiology Research Grant and by the Italian Society of Cardiology with a grant by the MSD Italia-Merck Sharp & Dohme Corporation. RB: NIHR Clinical Lectureship. CM is funded by the Robert Lancaster Memorial sponsored by McColl's Retail Group Limited. The Zurich ARVC Program (DA, AMS) is funded by the Bertha and Georg Schwyzer Winiker Foundation, Baugarten Foundation, and Swiss National Science Foundation, Switzerland. AK receives support from the Heart and Stroke Foundation of Canada, the Sauder Family and Heart and Stroke Foundation Chair in Cardiology and the Paul Brunet Chair in Heart Rhythm Disorders. The study was supported by the Heart and Stroke Foundation of Canada (G-13-0002775), and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (MOP-142218 and SRG-15-P09-001). ERB is funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England and receives research funds from the British Heart Foundation, the Robert Lancaster Memorial sponsored by McColl's Retail Group Limited and unrestricted funds from Biotronik. WJM: Higher Education Funding Council for England, British Heart Foundation Program Grant RG/13/19/30568, and Foundation Leducq Transatlantic Networks of Excellence Program: GRANT no 14 CVD 03. University College London/University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust receives a proportion of funding from the Department of Health's NIHR Biomedical Research Centre funding scheme. PS, KD, DJ and AP have nothing to declare.

### Conflict of interest

No conflict of interest declared.

### Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcard.2019.04.090>.

### References

- [1] F.I. Marcus, W.J. McKenna, D. Sherrill, C. Basso, B. Bauce, D.A. Bluemke, et al., Diagnosis of arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy/dysplasia: proposed modification of the Task Force Criteria, *Eur. Heart J.* 31 (2010) 806–814.
- [2] J.A. Groeneweg, A. Bhonsale, C.A. James, A.S. te Riele, D. Dooijes, C. Tichnell, et al., Clinical presentation, long-term follow-up, and outcomes of 1001 arrhythmogenic right ventricular dysplasia/cardiomyopathy patients and family members, *Circ. Cardiovasc. Genet.* 8 (2015) 437–446.
- [3] M. Vassalini, A. Verzeletti, M. Restori, F. De Ferrari, An autopsy study of sudden cardiac death in persons aged 1–40 years in Brescia (Italy), *J. Cardiovasc. Med. (Hagerstown)* 17 (2016) 446–453.
- [4] C.M. Pilmer, B. Porter, J.A. Kirsh, A.L. Hicks, N. Gledhill, V. Jamnik, et al., Scope and nature of sudden cardiac death before age 40 in Ontario: a report from the cardiac death advisory committee of the office of the chief coroner, *Heart Rhythm.* 10 (2013) 517–523.
- [5] B.J. Maron, T.S. Haas, C.J. Murphy, A. Ahluwalia, S. Rutten-Ramos, Incidence and causes of sudden death in U.S. college athletes, *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* 63 (2014) 1636–1643.
- [6] D. Corrado, C. Basso, M. Schiavon, G. Thiene, Screening for hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in young athletes, *N. Engl. J. Med.* 339 (1998) 364–369.
- [7] D.P. Zipes, A.J. Camm, M. Borggrefe, A.E. Buxton, B. Chaitman, M. Fromer, et al., ACC/AHA/ESC 2006 guidelines for management of patients with ventricular arrhythmias and the prevention of sudden cardiac death—executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force and the European Society of Cardiology Committee for Practice Guidelines (Writing Committee to Develop Guidelines for Management of Patients with Ventricular Arrhythmias and the Prevention of Sudden Cardiac Death) Developed in collaboration with the European Heart Rhythm Association and the Heart Rhythm Society, *Eur. Heart J.* 27 (2006) 2099–2140.
- [8] D. Corrado, T. Wichter, M.S. Link, R. Hauer, F. Marchlinski, A. Anastasakis, et al., Treatment of arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy/dysplasia: an international task force consensus statement, *Eur. Heart J.* 36 (2015) 3227–3237.
- [9] B. Surawicz, R. Childers, B.J. Deal, L.S. Gettes, J.J. Bailey, A. Gorgels, et al., AHA/ACC/HRS recommendations for the standardization and interpretation of the electrocardiogram, part III: intraventricular conduction disturbances: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association Electrocardiography and Arrhythmias Committee, Council on Clinical Cardiology; the American College of Cardiology Foundation; and the Heart Rhythm Society. Endorsed by the International Society for Computerized Electrocardiology, *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* 53 (2009) 976–981.
- [10] P.M. Rautaharju, B. Surawicz, L.S. Gettes, J.J. Bailey, R. Childers, B.J. Deal, et al., AHA/ACC/HRS recommendations for the standardization and interpretation of the electrocardiogram, part IV: the ST segment, T and U waves, and the QT interval: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association Electrocardiography and Arrhythmias Committee, Council on Clinical Cardiology; the American College of Cardiology Foundation; and the Heart Rhythm Society. Endorsed by the International Society for Computerized Electrocardiology, *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* 53 (2009) 982–991.
- [11] M.G. Cox, J.J. van der Smagt, A.A. Wilde, A.C. Wiesfeld, D.E. Atsma, M.R. Nelen, et al., New ECG criteria in arrhythmogenic right ventricular dysplasia/cardiomyopathy, *Circ. Arrhythm. Electrophysiol.* 2 (2009) 524–530.
- [12] H. Blackburn, A. Keys, E. Simonson, P. Rautaharju, S. Punsar, The electrocardiogram in population studies. A classification system, *Circulation.* 21 (1960) 1160–1175.
- [13] G. Breithardt, M.E. Cain, N. el-Sherif, N. Flowers, V. Hombach, M. Janse, et al., Standards for analysis of ventricular late potentials using high resolution or signal-averaged electrocardiography. A statement by a Task Force Committee between the European Society of Cardiology, the American Heart Association and the American College of Cardiology, *Eur. Heart J.* 12 (1991) 473–480.
- [14] L.R. Lopes, A. Zekavati, P. Syrris, M. Hubank, C. Giambartolomei, C. Dalageorgou, et al., Genetic complexity in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy revealed by high-throughput sequencing, *J. Med. Genet.* 50 (2013) 228–239.
- [15] Y. Benjamini, Y. Hochberg, Controlling the false discovery rate – a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing, *J. Roy Stat Soc B Met.* 57 (1995) 289–300.
- [16] A. Protonotarios, A. Anastasakis, D.B. Panagiotakos, L. Antoniadis, P. Syrris, A. Vouliotis, et al., Arrhythmic risk assessment in genotyped families with arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy, *Europace.* 18 (2016) 610–616.
- [17] D. Corrado, H. Calkins, M.S. Link, L. Leoni, S. Favale, M. Bevilacqua, et al., Prophylactic implantable defibrillator in patients with arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy/dysplasia and no prior ventricular fibrillation or sustained ventricular tachycardia, *Circulation.* 122 (2010) 1144–1152.
- [18] Y.C. Liao, Y.J. Lin, F.P. Chung, S.L. Chang, L.W. Lo, Y.F. Hu, et al., Risk stratification of arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy based on signal averaged electrocardiograms, *Int. J. Cardiol.* 174 (2014) 628–633.
- [19] T. Wichter, M. Paul, C. Wollmann, T. Acil, P. Gerdes, O. Ashraf, et al., Implantable cardioverter/defibrillator therapy in arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy: single-center experience of long-term follow-up and complications in 60 patients, *Circulation.* 109 (2004) 1503–1508.
- [20] J.P. Piccini, D. Dalal, A. Roguin, C. Bomma, A. Cheng, K. Prakasa, et al., Predictors of appropriate implantable defibrillator therapies in patients with arrhythmogenic right ventricular dysplasia, *Heart Rhythm.* 2 (2005) 1188–1194.
- [21] C. Blomstrom-Lundqvist, I. Hirsch, S.B. Olsson, N. Edvardsson, Quantitative analysis of the signal-averaged QRS in patients with arrhythmogenic right ventricular dysplasia, *Eur. Heart J.* 9 (1988) 301–312.
- [22] P. Turrini, A. Angelini, G. Thiene, G. Bujala, L. Daliento, G. Rizzoli, et al., Late potentials and ventricular arrhythmias in arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy, *Am. J. Cardiol.* 83 (1999) 1214–1219.
- [23] A. George, P.S. Arumugham, V.M. Figueredo, aVR – the forgotten lead, *Exp. Clin. Cardiol.* 15 (2010) e36–e44.

- [24] S. Peters, Prognostic value of epsilon waves in lead aVR in arrhythmogenic cardiomyopathy, *Int. J. Cardiol.* 191 (2015) 77–78.
- [25] J. Gomes, M. Finlay, A.K. Ahmed, E.J. Ciaccio, A. Asimaki, J.E. Saffitz, et al., Electrophysiological abnormalities precede overt structural changes in arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy due to mutations in desmoplakin—a combined murine and human study, *Eur. Heart J.* 33 (2012) 1942–1953.
- [26] F. Migliore, A. Zorzi, M. Silvano, M. Bevilacqua, L. Leoni, M.P. Marra, et al., Prognostic value of endocardial voltage mapping in patients with arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy/dysplasia, *Circ. Arrhythm. Electrophysiol.* 6 (2013) 167–176.
- [27] A. Bhonsale, C.A. James, C. Tichnell, B. Murray, S. Madhavan, B. Philips, et al., Risk stratification in arrhythmogenic right ventricular dysplasia/cardiomyopathy-associated desmosomal mutation carriers, *Circ. Arrhythm. Electrophysiol.* 6 (2013) 569–578.