medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Competing Risks in Patients with Primary Prevention Implantable Cardioverters Defibrillators: Global Electrical Heterogeneity and Clinical Outcomes (GEHCO) Study

Jonathan W. Waks[1], MD, Kazi T. Haq[2], PhD, Christine Tompkins[3], MD, Albert J. Rogers[4], MBA, MD, Ashkan Ehdaie[5], MD, Aron Bender[2], MD, Jessica Minnier[2,6], PhD, Khidir Dalouk[7], MD, Stacey Howell[2], MD, Achille Peiris[5], MS, Merritt Raitt[7], MD, Sanjiv M. Narayan[4], MD, PhD, Sumeet Chugh[5], MD, and Larisa G. Tereshchenko[2], MD, PhD

From

[1]Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, MA, [2]Oregon Health & Science University, Knight Cardiovascular Institute, Portland, OR; [3]University of Colorado, Aurora, CO; [4]Stanford University School of Medicine, Palo Alto, CA; [5]Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA; [6]Oregon Health & Science University, OHSU-PSU School of Public Health, Portland, OR;[7]VA Portland Health Care System, Portland, OR.

Correspondence: Larisa Tereshchenko, 3181 SW Sam Jackson Park Rd; UHN62; Portland, OR, 97239. E-mail:tereshch@ohsu.edu. Phone:503-494-7400; Fax:503-494-8550.

Brief title: GEH and competing risks in ICD patients

Words:8398

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Background—Global electrical heterogeneity (GEH) is associated with sudden cardiac death in the general population. The association between GEH and sustained ventricular tachycardia (VT)/ventricular fibrillation (VF) leading to appropriate ICD therapies in systolic heart failure patients with primary prevention implantable cardioverter-defibrillators (ICDs) is unclear.

Methods— We conducted a multicenter retrospective cohort study. GEH parameters including spatial ventricular gradient (SVG) direction and magnitude, QRS-T angle, and sum absolute QRST integral were measured on 12-lead ECGs prior to primary prevention ICD implantation. Multiple imputations using chained equations were employed to address missingness. Survival analysis using cause-specific hazard functions compared the strength of associations with two competing outcomes: sustained VT/VF leading to appropriate ICD therapies and all-cause mortality without appropriate ICD therapies.

Results—We analyzed data from 2,668 patients (age 63±12y; 23% female; 78% white; 43% nonischemic cardiomyopathy; left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) 28±11% from 6 academic medical centers). After adjustment for demographic (age, sex, race, study center), clinical (LVEF, NYHA class, cardiomyopathy type, hypertension, diabetes, stroke, atrial fibrillation, renal function, medications), device (number of leads, manufacturer, ICD therapy programming), and traditional ECG characteristics, SVG elevation (Hazard Ratio (HR) per 1 standard deviation (SD) 1.14 (95% CI 1.04-1.25); P=0.004), SVG azimuth (HR 1.12(1.01-1.24); P=0.039); SVG magnitude (HR per 1 SD 0.75 (0.66-0.85); P<0.0001), and QRS-T angle (HR per 1 SD 1.21 (95% CI 1.08-1.36); P=0.001) were associated with appropriate ICD therapies. The association of SVG azimuth with competing outcomes was distinctly different (P_{dif}=0.007).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Conclusion—In patients with primary prevention ICDs, SVG direction is independently associated with sustained VT/VF and appropriate ICD therapies, but not competing mortality.

Clinical Trial Registration−URL:www.clinicaltrials.gov Unique identifier: NCT03210883.

Keywords: ICD, competing risk, ventricular tachyarrhythmia, VCG, heart failure, global electrical heterogeneity, spatial ventricular gradient.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

Patients with cardiomyopathy (CM) and reduced left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) are at elevated risk of sudden cardiac death (SCD), and in this population, current guidelines recommend consideration of implantable cardioverter-defibrillators (ICDs) for primary prevention of SCD[1]. However, current guidelines for implantation of primary prevention ICDs rely primarily on LVEF and the New York Heart Association (NYHA) functional class, which are overall poor predictors of ICD benefit, especially in patients with nonischemic CM (NICM).[2] As ICD implantation is associated with the cost to the medical system and risk to individual patients, improved methods of identifying patients most likely to benefit from primary prevention ICDs are needed.

Global electrical heterogeneity (GEH) is an emerging and promising electrocardiographic marker of SCD risk.[3, 4] GEH is a comprehensive characterization of the spatial ventricular gradient (SVG),[5] including SVG vector direction (azimuth and elevation), magnitude, its scalar value, and spatial QRS-T angle.[3] It integrates static and dynamic alternations in ventricular repolarization and conduction, which have been linked to ventricular arrhythmias in studies from the bench to the bedside.[6] Abnormal GEH is associated with SCD in the general population[3, 7] where it is explicitly associated with SCD over non-arrhythmic modes of death[3], and an increased risk of drug-induced torsades-de-pointes.[8] The utility of assessing GEH for SCD risk stratification in CM patients with reduced LVEF who meet primary prevention ICD indications, however, is unknown. As GEH might be a useful way of identifying patients who are most (or least) likely to benefit from primary prevention ICD implantation, we conducted a novel retrospective multicenter cohort study[9] to determine the associations between the clinical, device,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

traditional ECG, and GEH parameters with sustained ventricular arrhythmias requiring appropriate ICD therapies and competing mortality without appropriate ICD therapies.

Methods

Ethics approval and data availability

The multicenter study has been approved by the Oregon Health & Science University (OHSU) Institutional Review Board (IRB). In addition, each participating center obtained local IRB approval prior to participating.

The open-source MATLAB (MathWorks, Natick, MA, USA) code for ECG analysis is provided at https://physionet.org/physiotools/geh and https://github.com/Tereshchenkolab/Origin. Statistical analysis code is provided at https://github.com/Tereshchenkolab/statistics.

Study design

The study design and protocol has been previously described.[9] In brief, we conducted a retrospective, multicenter cohort study that included data from six academic medical centers in the United States: OHSU in Portland, OR, Veteran Administration Portland Healthcare System (Portland VA) in Portland, OR, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center (BIDMC) in Boston, MA, the University of Colorado (U Colorado) in Aurora, CO, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center (CSMC) in Los Angeles, CA, and Stanford University (Stanford U) in Palo Alto, CA. We included all patients above the age of 18 years with chronic systolic heart failure (HF) due to infarct-related cardiomyopathy and/or NICM, who underwent implantation of any ICD [including single chamber, dual-chamber, cardiac resynchronization defibrillator (CRT-D), or subcutaneous] for primary prevention of SCD between the years of 1996 and 2019, and had an available digital 12-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

lead ECG recording. Patients with inherited channelopathies and cardiomyopathies, congenital heart disease, and those with ICD implanted for secondary prevention were excluded.

ECG analysis: global electrical heterogeneity measurement

A digital 12-lead ECG recorded around the time of initial ICD implantation was collected (median 0 days (interquartile range 0-29 days). Raw, digital ECG signals were analyzed in the Tereshchenko laboratory at OHSU, as previously described.[3, 7, 10, 11] At least two physician-investigators manually labeled each cardiac beat (SH, EB, LGT). The Kors transformation matrix was used to transform 12-lead ECGs into orthogonal XYZ vectorcardiograms.[12] The time-coherent global median beat was constructed using the dominant type of beat present in the ECG, and the origin point of the vectorcardiogram was identified.[11] We included three categories of median beats: normal (N) median beats included normal sinus rhythm, atrial pacing, junctional rhythm, and ectopic atrial rhythm; ventricular pacing (VP) median beats included right ventricular or biventricular pacing; supraventricular (S) median beats included atrial fibrillation or atrial flutter with a consistent QRS morphology. QT interval was corrected using Bazett, Fridericia, and Hodges equations. The presence of premature ventricular complexes (PVCs) on 12-lead ECG was noted.

We constructed spatial peak and area QRS and T vectors as well as their vector sum (the spatial ventricular gradient (SVG)) and measured their magnitude, direction (azimuth (orientation in the XZ plane) and elevation (orientation in the XY plane)), and spatial QRS-T angles.[7, 10, 11] Scalar approximations of the SVG were measured via the sum absolute QRST integral (SAIQRST)[13-15] and by the QT integral on vector magnitude (VMQTi) lead.[10] Quality control of automated ECG analysis was performed to verify appropriate beat identification and fiducial point annotation (KTH). Open-source MATLAB (MathWorks, Natick, MA, USA) code

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

for GEH measurement is provided at https://physionet.org/physiotools/geh & https://github.com/Tereshchenkolab/Origin.

Primary Competing Outcomes

The primary outcome was defined as the first sustained ventricular tachyarrhythmia event (VT or VF) with appropriate ICD therapy (either anti-tachycardia pacing (ATP) or shock). All-cause death without preceding appropriate ICD therapy served as the primary competing outcome.

Clinical characteristics and ICD programming

Patients' demographics, clinical history, and laboratory values at the pre-implant clinical evaluation were abstracted from the medical record. Estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) was calculated using the Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration equation.[16] ICD detection parameters were obtained at the time of device implant or at the time of appropriate ICD therapies if they occurred during follow-up. To harmonize ICD therapies programming across different device manufacturers and generations, we comprised two ICD programming categories: (1) therapies delay (longer time or more intervals needed for VT/VF detection) and (2) historical (more aggressive) programming (Table 1).

Statistical analyses

Normally distributed continuous variables were reported as means and standard deviation (SD). An unadjusted comparison of circular variables (spatial QRS-T angle, SVG azimuth, and SVG elevation) was performed using the Wheeler-Watson-Mardia test. Circular variables were reported as mean and 95% confidence interval (CI). ANOVA (for normally distributed continuous variables) and Pearson's χ^2 test (for categorical variables) were used to compare ECG

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

characteristics in patients with and without primary and competing outcomes. Unadjusted analyses were performed using the dataset with missing values.

As we conducted a retrospective study, the data contained missing values for reasons unrelated to the study itself. Missingness data for individual covariates are reported in Supplemental Table 1. The most likely reason for missing values (incomplete data in the medical record) was unrelated to the unobserved data but likely was dependent upon the observed data (e.g., ICD therapy), which is characteristic for data missing at random. Therefore, we employed multiple imputations using chained equations (MICE)[17], which does not require the multivariate normal assumption. Our study's investigation of data missingness showed an arbitrary pattern. Observations with missing primary outcomes were excluded. We used predictive mean matching with 20 nearest neighbors for continuous variables, logistic regression for binary variables, ordinal logistic regression for ordinal variables, and multinomial logistic regression for nominal variables with 66 imputations, exceeding the minimum required by the von Hippel method.[18] Convergence was confirmed. Relative variance increase, fraction missing information, and relative efficiency were assessed for each multivariable model and confirmed acceptable.

After examining a normal quantile plot, we included QRS-T and SVG elevation angles in all adjusted statistical analyses without transformation because their distributions were nearly normal. The SVG azimuth angle is ranging from -180º to +180º. Thus, as recommended,[19-21] we transformed SVG azimuth by doubling its value and then adding 360º.

As the risk of sustained VT/VF leading to appropriate ICD therapy competes with the risk of death without appropriate ICD therapy, we employed cause-specific hazards functions, estimated using Cox proportional hazards models. For a model with sustained VT/VF and appropriate ICD

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

therapy outcome, all-cause death event was censored at the date of death if there was no documented sustained ventricular tachyarrhythmia at any time since implant until death. Accordingly, for a model with death without preceding sustained ventricular tachyarrhythmia with appropriate ICD therapy outcome, sustained VT/VF with appropriate ICD therapy event was censored at the arrhythmic event date. Alive and event-free patients were censored at the time of the last device follow-up.

We compared the strength of association of demographic, clinical, ECG, and device characteristics between the two competing outcomes (appropriate ICD therapies and all-cause death) by testing the null hypothesis that the coefficients for a given variable (b_1 and b_2) were the same across the two competing outcomes by calculating Z-scores:

$$z = \frac{b_1 - b_2}{\sqrt{[s.e.(b_1)]^2 + [s.e.(b_2)]^2}}$$

where *s.e.* is a standard error and determining their statistical significance.

To study an association of GEH with the primary competing outcomes, we constructed four models. All models (1-4) with GEH exposure variables were adjusted for the type of median beat, mean RR interval, presence of PVCs, and possible distortion of median beat by premature beats. Model 1 was adjusted for demographic characteristics (age, sex, race) and study center. Model 2 included model 1 variables with additional adjustment for known clinical risk factors of the primary competing outcomes [LVEF, NYHA class, CM type, hypertension, diabetes, stroke, atrial fibrillation, $eGFR_{CKD\text{-}EPI}$, and medications (use of beta-blockers, ACEi/ARBs, and class 1 or III antiarrhythmic drugs (AAD)]. Model 3 contained all covariates included in model 2, and, in addition, device characteristics: device type (ICD or CRT-D), manufacturer, and programming (including VT and VF zone cutoffs). Model 4, in addition to model 3 variables, was adjusted for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

traditional ECG metrics: heart rate, QRS duration, and Hodges-corrected QT interval. To standardize comparisons, we expressed continuous variables per 1 SD.

To test the study findings' robustness under missing at random assumption, we conducted a sensitivity analysis using an imputed dataset based on complete ECG data. The dataset without missing pre-implant ECG data included 2251 patients; 480 of them had sustained VT/VF with appropriate ICD therapy, and 401 died without appropriate ICD therapy.

Statistical analyses were performed using STATA MP 16.1 (StataCorp LP, College Station, TX). A P value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. STATA do files are available at https://github.com/Tereshchenkolab/gehco.

Results

Study Population

After excluding the ineligible patient records and those with missing outcomes, our study population included 2,668 patients (Figure 1). Clinical characteristics are shown in Table 2. Mean age was 63.1 ± 13.0 years, 23.4% of patients were female, 9.7% of patients were African-Americans, 7.5% were Hispanic, and 4.5% were Asian. Approximately 51% of patients had ischemic CM, 83% were NYHA class II-III, 79% were using the Renin-Angiotensin-Aldosterone System (RAAS)-modifying medications, and 85% of patients were on beta-blockers. On average, renal function was normal (average eGFR 70 mL/min/1.73 m^2). Diabetes was present in 36% of patients, and 34% of patients had a history of atrial fibrillation. CRT-D devices were implanted in 36% of patients.

Over a median retrospective follow-up of 4 years, 541 patients experienced sustained ventricular tachyarrhythmia leading to appropriate ICD therapy [incidence rate 50.1 (95% CI

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

46.0-54.5) per 1000 person-years], and 479 patients died without appropriate ICD therapy [incidence rate 44.0 (95%CI 40.2-48.1) per 1000 person-years]. The average rate of appropriate ICD therapy was similar to the rate of death without appropriate ICD therapy: ~ 5% per year.

An average heart rate, QRS duration, and QTc were within the normal range (Table 3). Patients who died without appropriate ICD therapy had a higher heart rate than those who remained alive and event-free (P=0.030) and a longer QTc than those who developed sustained VT/VF and were treated with appropriate ICD therapy. Patients who received appropriate ICD therapies were more likely to have PVC recorded on 12-lead ECG, smaller SVG magnitude and SAIQRST, wider QRS-T angle, and SVG vector pointing more superiorly, in comparison to events-free patients (Table 3).

Demographic and clinical characteristics associated with primary competing outcomes

In minimally adjusted model 1 (Table 4), male sex, black race, atrial fibrillation, use of AADs, history of MI and revascularization procedures, NYHA class III, and higher BUN were associated with increased risk of appropriate ICD therapies. In contrast, greater age, eGFR, and LVEF were associated with a lower risk of appropriate ICD therapies. Adjustment for cardiac disease substrate, risk factors (model 2), and device programming (model 3) explained the association of race, atrial fibrillation, MI and revascularization, NYHA class, and BUN with sustained VT/VF, which became non-significant. In fully adjusted analysis (model 4), only age, male sex, use of AADs, LVEF, and eGFR remained significantly associated with sustained VT/VF and appropriate ICD therapies (Table 4).

In model 1 assessing the competing outcome of death without appropriate ICD therapy (Table 5), age, ischemic CM, MI, revascularization history, NYHA class II-IV, diabetes, atrial fibrillation, and BUN were associated with a higher risk of all-cause death, while use of beta-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

blockers, ACEIs, higher LVEF, and higher eGFR were associated with a lower risk of death. Adjustment for the HF characteristics and risk factors (model 2), device characteristics (model 3), and traditional ECG metrics (model 4) only slightly attenuated an association of clinical risk factors with the competing mortality outcome.

Even after comprehensive adjustment (model 3), several clinical risk factors had significantly different cause-specific hazards associated with two competing outcomes (Supplemental Table 2). For every 13 years (1 SD) increase in age, the hazard of appropriate ICD therapy decreased by 20% (Table 4), whereas the hazard of death without appropriate ICD therapy increased by 32% (Table 5). Diabetes increased the hazard of death without appropriate ICD therapy by 45% but was not associated with appropriate ICD therapy (Figure 2). As expected, NYHA class and BUN had stronger associations with death than with appropriate ICD therapy. The use of beta-blockers and ACEIs was associated with a reduced hazard of death but not with the hazard of appropriate ICD therapy.

In contrast, there was no statistically significant difference in adjusted cause-specific hazards of two competing outcomes for the male sex, ischemic CM, atrial fibrillation, the use of AADs, LVEF, and eGFR (Figure 2 and Supplemental Table 2).

Device characteristics associated with primary competing outcomes

In minimally adjusted model 1, ICD device type and programming were significantly associated with sustained VT/VF and appropriate ICD therapies (Table 4). Adjustment for HF characteristics, risk factors, comorbidities, and traditional ECG metrics (models 2-4) did not change the strength of the association. In contrast, very few device characteristics associated with mortality without appropriate ICD therapy (Table 5).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

In adjusted competing risk analysis, device characteristics had significantly different cause-specific hazards associated with the two competing outcomes (Supplemental Table 2). Unsurprisingly, for each additional 15 bpm increase in VT zone threshold, the hazard of sustained ventricular tachyarrhythmias with appropriate ICD therapies decreased by 25% (Figure 2), but it did not affect all-cause mortality without sustained VT/VF. Consistent with prior observations, more agressive ICD programming (as compared to longer detection settings) was associated with a 56% higher risk of appropriate ICD therapies but was not associated with the competing death outcome.

CRT-D implantation was associated with a lower risk of both competing outcomes (Figure 2).

Association of GEH with primary competing outcomes

In minimally adjusted analysis, the presence of PVCs and all GEH metrics were associated with sustained VT/VF and appropriate ICD therapies (Table 4), although there were differences between area-based and peak-based measurements. However, the adjustment for known clinical risk factors and device characteristics explained that association for SAIQRST and VMQTi. Notably, after full adjustment in model 4 (including heart rate, QTc, and QRS duration), area and peak spatial QRS-T angle and SVG elevation, area SVG magnitude, and peak SVG azimuth were associated with appropriate ICD therapies (Table 4).

In comparison, only resting heart rate, spatial QRS-T angle, and area SVG magnitude associated with competing mortality outcome. The strength of associations diminished from model 1 to model 4, suggesting confounding by the HF substrate (Table 5).

In minimally adjusted competing risk analysis, heart rate and QTc had significantly different cause-specific hazards associated with the two competing outcomes (Supplemental Table 2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

However, these differences were explained by differences in clinical risk factors. In adjusted models, QRS duration and corrected QT interval were not associated with either appropriate ICD therapies or total mortality. After adjustment, only PVCs and peak SVG azimuth had significantly different cause-specific hazards associated with two competing outcomes (Figure 2). The presence of PVCs was associated with a 42% higher risk of appropriate ICD therapies but did not associate with competing mortality risk. Each additional 1 SD increase in peak SVG azimuth (+36°, backward) was associated with a 12% increase in the hazard of appropriate ICD therapies and a 10% reduction in the hazard of total mortality without appropriate ICD therapy. Accordingly, 1 SD reduction in peak SVG azimuth (-36°, forward) was associated with a 12% decrease in the hazard of appropriate ICD therapies and a 10% increase in the risk of death without appropriate ICD therapy. Area SVG azimuth showed a U-shaped association with appropriate ICD therapy (Table 4) but not competing death risk (Table 5).

On the other hand, the spatial QRS-T angle and SVG magnitude were associated with both appropriate ICD therapy and death without appropriate ICD therapy. For each 1 SD (33°) increase in area QRS-T angle, we observed an ~20% increase in the hazard of both outcomes (Figure 2). Each additional 1 SD increase in area SVG magnitude (25 mV*ms) was associated with a 25% *reduction* in the hazard of appropriate ICD therapies and a 14% *reduction* in the hazard of death without appropriate ICD therapy. For area SVG elevation, each 1 SD (31°) increase was associated with a 14% increase in the hazard of appropriate ICD therapies.

Sensitivity analysis (Supplemental Table 3) showed similar results.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Discussion

This large multicenter retrospective cohort study of novel risk factors for SCD had two important findings. First, in competing risk analysis, we showed an independent association of GEH with ventricular arrhythmias leading to appropriate ICD therapies. After adjusting for demographic, clinical, ECG, and device characteristics, SVG vector pointed to distinctly different directions in patients who developed sustained VT/VF rescued by appropriate ICD therapies (backward-upward, counterclockwise) versus those who died without ICD therapy (forward, clockwise). SVG magnitude and spatial QRS-T angle were associated with both competing outcomes.

Second, we showed significantly different strength of association of age, diabetes, use of beta-blockers and ACEIs, NYHA class, BUN, ICD device programming features and VT zone cutoff, and the presence of PVCs between the two competing outcomes (appropriate ICD therapies and all-cause death). There was no difference in the associations of sex, CM type, atrial fibrillation, AAD use, LVEF, eGFR, and ICD device type with both competing outcomes.

Differences in the risk factors of two competing outcomes

The importance of considering naturally competing outcomes in ICD patients is critically important.[22] However, very few studies conducted a formal comparison of the strengths of association of a risk factor with two competing outcomes.[23] In our study of primary prevention ICD recipients, unsurprisingly, ICD therapy programming category and VT zone programming threshold were distinctly different attributes of the risk of ventricular tachyarrhythmia with appropriate ICD therapies.[24] After adjustment for HF characteristics, comorbidities, and management, each additional 15 bpm increase in VT zone threshold was associated with reducing the hazard of sustained ventricular tachyarrhythmias and appropriate ICD therapies by

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

25%. ICD therapy delay (NID VT ≥ 30/40 intervals or VT detection time ≥ 10 sec) reduced the hazard of appropriate ICD therapy by 58%. Our results are consistent with the well-recognized fact that appropriate ICD therapies occur more frequently than SCD,[25] and ICD programming determines whether patients receive unnecessary therapies for what would have been nonsustained VT with longer ICD detection times.[24]

We observed that diabetes, BUN, NYHA class, and HF therapy (ACEIs, beta-blockers) were strongly associated with all-cause death without appropriate ICD therapies but *did not* associate with the primary arrhythmic outcome. These clinical characteristics are often perceived as risk factors of both outcomes. Observed differences in these clinical risk factors' association with two competing outcomes should be considered in planning future clinical studies and developing SCD risk models.

Age was associated with both outcomes in distinctly different ways. After adjusting for confounders, for every 1 SD (13 years) increase in age, the hazard of death without preceding appropriate ICD therapy *increased* by 35%, while the hazard of sustained ventricular tachyarrhythmia leading to appropriate ICD therapy *decreased* by 21%. Age is a ubiquitous risk marker. It is well-recognized that many ICD recipients, despite having an ICD, often die secondary to progressive heart failure or other non-cardiac comorbidities that congregate with advanced age.

Similarities in the risk factors of two competing outcomes

Noticeably, a set of particular clinical risk factors (sex, type of CM, atrial fibrillation, use of AADs, LVEF, eGFR), and ICD type had similar associations with both outcomes, suggesting common or overlapping mechanisms. All of these risk factors are well-known, however, our study conducted a novel formal statistical comparison of the strengths of their associations with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

competing outcomes in primary prevention ICD recipients. Besides apparent ICD device failure to detect and treat life-threatening ventricular arrhythmia, ICD is ineffective in clinical scenarios when ventricular tachyarrhythmias accompany an unsurvivable myocardial injury. Common mechanisms of two competing outcomes highlight challenges in selecting an ideal candidate for primary prevention ICD. On the other hand, targeting common mechanisms can be especially rewarding, resulting in a sizable reduction of cardiovascular mortality. Primary prevention of atrial fibrillation, HF, and kidney dysfunction[26] can potentially reduce the risk of both competing outcomes and should be a focus of future investigations.

Global electrical heterogeneity

Our study confirmed that after multivariable adjustment in competing risk analysis, there is an independent association between SVG direction and sustained ventricular tachyarrhythmias leading to appropriate ICD therapies, but not competing death outcome. The SVG vector points towards the area of the myocardium with the shortest excited state,[4, 9] and deviations from normal suggest the accumulation of a critical mass of abnormal electrical substrate, which might predispose to ventricular arrhythmias. Our results support the use of GEH, and specifically the orientation of the area SVG vector, as a marker of abnormal underlying electrophysiological substrate responsible for a propensity for sustained ventricular arrhythmias.[8, 27] Further studies of mechanisms behind SVG directions are warranted.

Notably, we observed that PVCs' presence on 12-lead ECG was also associated with competing risk of appropriate ICD therapy, but not all-cause mortality. Cardiac memory developing in response to PVCs may affect GEH.[28] It is well known that PVCs are associated with the development or worsening of HF, as well as that PVCs can trigger life-threatening ventricular tachyarrhythmias. Further studies of the interaction between an underlying

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

arrhythmogenic substrate (manifesting by GEH) and PVCs (manifesting by cardiac memory development) are needed to uncover the underlying mechanisms, leading to novel therapies.

In contrast to SVG direction, which had significantly different cause-specific hazards associated with two competing outcomes, area SVG magnitude and spatial QRS-T angle had similar associations with both outcomes. Finding of QRS-T angle being associated with both competing outcomes is expected. Numerous previous studies showed an association of QRS-T angle with broadly defined cardiovascular disease.[29] Our results underscore the importance and added value of a comprehensive GEH concept, which includes measurement of SVG direction, in addition to the QRS-T angle.

Similarly to this study, in another primary prevention ICD study (PROSE-ICD),[15, 30] we observed that smaller SVG magnitude and SAIQRST were associated with increased risk of ventricular tachyarrhythmias ICD therapies. In contrast, in the MADIT-II study,[31] and the general population,[3] *larger* SAIQRST and SVG magnitude were associated with ventricular arrhythmias and SCD. Such discrepant results highlight the complexity of ECG amplitudes interpretation, which remains poorly understood. Observed differences could be only partially explained by racial/ethnic differences in patient populations.[21] We speculate that another plausible explanation of such a discrepancy could be cardiac memory.[28] In relatively healthy individuals, after the restoration of previously altered ventricular conduction, cardiac memory manifests by an increase in T and SAI QRST magnitudes. In contrast, in patients with preexistent ventricular remodeling due to CM, if ventricular conduction remains persistently altered, SAIQRST and SVG magnitudes diminish further.[28] Future studies of GEH are needed to improve further our understanding of how these parameters are affected by different patient characteristics.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Statistical assessment of competing risks

In this study, we preferred to use cause-specific hazards rather than the analysis of subdistribution hazards because Fine and Gray's method is not valid for causal inference and can produce misleading results.[32, 33] We used cause-specific hazard that removes an individual from the risk set when *any* type of event occurs. In contrast, the subdistribution hazard does not remove an individual from the risk set when a competing event occurs. Nonetheless, those who experience one competing event are no longer at risk of the other competing event. As a result, the Fine and Gray method does not isolate distinct causal effects on the competing risks but instead may confound them. The interpretation of Fine and Gray's method is challenging when outcomes are not rare (as in this study).[34] On the other hand, cumulative incidence functions are useful for prediction, which we utilized in our previous study where we developed a GEH-based SCD competing risk.[3]

Strengths and Limitations

Our study's strengths include the large sample size and population drawn from a diverse group of medical centers from across the United States. However, because the study included only academic medical centers, the results may not apply to all patients with ICDs. Because of our study's retrospective nature, ICD programming was not standardized, and differences in ICD detection and treatment parameters could have influenced the results, although we attempted to correct this by including ICD programming in our multivariable models. There was no postmortem ICD interrogation data, and we cannot precisely determine if there were ventricular arrhythmias close to the time of death. Importantly, appropriate ICD therapy is a surrogate for SCD, as all ventricular arrhythmias treated by the ICD would not necessarily have led to cardiac

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

arrest or SCD. As in any observational study, residual confounding cannot be completely eliminated.

Acknowledgment

The authors thank Zachary Zouyed, BS, Nichole Rogovoy, BS, Katherine Yang, BS, and Christopher Hamilton, BA, for their help with the data preparation for analysis.

Funding sources

This study was funded through the AHA Grant-In-Aid #17GRNT33670428 (LGT) and partially HL118277 (LGT).

Disclosures

None.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References:

1. Al-Khatib SM, Stevenson WG, Ackerman MJ, et al. 2017 AHA/ACC/HRS guideline 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 on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society. Heart Rhythm 2018;15:e190-e252.
2. Kober L, Thune JJ, Nielsen JC, et al. Defibrillator Implantation in Patients with Nonischemic Systolic Heart Failure. N Engl J Med 2016;375:1221-1230.
3. Waks JW, Sitlani CM, Soliman EZ, et al. Global Electric Heterogeneity Risk Score for Prediction of Sudden Cardiac Death in the General Population: The Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) and Cardiovascular Health (CHS) Studies. Circulation 2016;133:2222-2234.
4. Waks JW, Tereshchenko LG. Global electrical heterogeneity: A review of the spatial ventricular gradient. J Electrocardiol 2016;49:824-830.
5. Burch GE, Abildskov JA, Cronvich JA. A Study of the Spatial Vectorcardiogram of the Ventricular Gradient. Circulation 1954;9:267-275.
6. Goldberger JJ, Basu A, Boineau R, et al. Risk stratification for sudden cardiac death: a plan for the future. Circulation 2014;129:516-526.
7. Perez-Alday EA, Bender A, German D, et al. Dynamic predictive accuracy of electrocardiographic biomarkers of sudden cardiac death within a survival framework: the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) study. BMC cardiovascular disorders 2019;19:255.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

8. Stabenau HF, Shen C, Zimetbaum P, Buxton AE, Tereshchenko LG, Waks JW. Global electrical heterogeneity associated with drug-induced torsades de pointes. Heart Rhythm 2020.

9. Waks JW, Hamilton C, Das S, et al. Improving sudden cardiac death risk stratification by evaluating electrocardiographic measures of global electrical heterogeneity and clinical outcomes among patients with implantable cardioverter-defibrillators: rationale and design for a retrospective, multicenter, cohort study. J Interv Card Electrophysiol 2018;52:77-89.

10. Thomas JA, E AP-A, Junell A, et al. Vectorcardiogram in athletes: The Sun Valley Ski Study. Ann Noninvasive Electrocardiol 2019;24:e12614.

11. Perez-Alday EA, Li-Pershing Y, Bender A, et al. Importance of the heart vector origin point definition for an ECG analysis: The Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) study. Comput Biol Med 2019;104:127-138.

12. Kors JA, van HG, Sittig AC, van Bemmel JH. Reconstruction of the Frank vectorcardiogram from standard electrocardiographic leads: diagnostic comparison of different methods. EurHeart J 1990;11:1083-1092.

13. Sur S, Han L, Tereshchenko LG. Comparison of sum absolute QRST integral, and temporal variability in depolarization and repolarization, measured by dynamic vectorcardiography approach, in healthy men and women. PLoS One 2013;8:e57175.

14. Tereshchenko LG, Cheng A, Fetics BJ, et al. A new electrocardiogram marker to identify patients at low risk for ventricular tachyarrhythmias: sum magnitude of the absolute QRST integral. J Electrocardiol 2011;44:208-216.

15. Tereshchenko LG, Cheng A, Fetics BJ, et al. Ventricular arrhythmia is predicted by sum absolute QRST integral but not by QRS width. J Electrocardiol 2010;43:548-552.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

16. Levey AS, Stevens LA, Schmid CH, et al. A new equation to estimate glomerular filtration rate. Ann Intern Med 2009;150:604-612.

17. van Buuren S, Boshuizen HC, Knook DL. Multiple imputation of missing blood pressure covariates in survival analysis. Statistics in Medicine 1999;18:681-694.

18. von Hippel PT. How Many Imputations Do You Need? A Two-stage Calculation Using a Quadratic Rule. Sociological Methods & Research 2018;49:699-718.

19. Cox NJ. Speaking Stata: In Praise of Trigonometric Predictors. The Stata Journal 2006;6:561-579.

20. Howell SJ, German D, Bender A, et al. Does sex modify an association of electrophysiological substrate with sudden cardiac death? The Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) study. Cardiovascular Digital Health Journal 2020;1:80-88.

21. Jensen K, Howell SJ, Phan F, et al. Bringing Critical Race Praxis Into the Study of Electrophysiological Substrate of Sudden Cardiac Death: The ARIC Study. J Am Heart Assoc 2020;9:e015012.

22. Koller MT, Schaer B, Wolbers M, Sticherling C, Bucher HC, Osswald S. Death without prior appropriate implantable cardioverter-defibrillator therapy: a competing risk study. Circulation 2008;117:1918-1926.

23. Chatterjee NA, Tikkanen JT, Panicker GK, et al. Simple electrocardiographic measures improve sudden arrhythmic death prediction in coronary disease. Eur Heart J 2020;41:1988-1999.

24. Schuger C, Daubert JP, Zareba W, et al. Reassessing the role of Antitachycardia Pacing in Fast Ventricular Arrhythmias in Primary Prevention Implantable Cardioverter Defibrillator Recipients: Results from MADIT-RIT. Heart Rhythm 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

25. Ellenbogen KA, Levine JH, Berger RD, et al. Are implantable cardioverter defibrillator shocks a surrogate for sudden cardiac death in patients with nonischemic cardiomyopathy? Circulation 2006;113:776-782.

26. Khayyat-Kholghi M, Oparil S, Davis BR, Tereshchenko LG. Worsening Kidney Function Is the Major Mechanism of Heart Failure in Hypertension. JACC: Heart Failure 2020.

27. Stabenau HF, Shen C, Tereshchenko LG, Waks JW. Changes in global electrical heterogeneity associated with dofetilide, quinidine, ranolazine, and verapamil. Heart Rhythm 2020;17:460-467.

28. Haq K, Cao J, Tereshchenko LG. Characteristics of Cardiac Memory in Patients with Implanted Cardioverter Defibrillator: the CAMI study. medRxiv 2019https://doi.org/10.1101/19005181.

29. Oehler A, Feldman T, Henrikson CA, Tereshchenko LG. QRS-T Angle: A Review. Ann Noninvasive Electrocardiol 2014;19:534-542.

30. Tereshchenko LG, Cheng A, Fetics BJ, et al. A new electrocardiogram marker to identify patients at low risk for ventricular tachyarrhythmias: sum magnitude of the absolute QRST integral. J Electrocardiol 2011;44:208-216.

31. Tereshchenko LG, McNitt S, Han L, Berger RD, Zareba W. ECG marker of adverse electrical remodeling post-myocardial infarction predicts outcomes in MADIT II study. PLoS One 2012;7:e51812.

32. Lesko CR, Lau B. Bias Due to Confounders for the Exposure–Competing Risk Relationship. Epidemiology 2017;28:20-27.

33. Cole SR, Hudgens MG, Brookhart MA, Westreich D. Risk. American Journal of Epidemiology 2015;181:246-250.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

34. Austin PC, Fine JP. Practical recommendations for reporting Fine-Gray model analyses for competing risk data. Stat Med 2017;36:4391-4400.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1. ICD therapies programming categories

Possible programming options (either/or)	Therapy delay category	Historic programming
Initial NID VT, n	≥30	<30
Redetect NID VT, n	≥18	<18
NID numerator, n	≥30	<30
NID denominator, n	≥40	<40
Initial time VT, sec	≥10	<10
Redetect time VT, sec	>1	≤1
Initial time VF, sec	≥3	<3
Redetect time VF, sec	>1	≤1

NID=number of intervals to detect.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Clinical characteristics of the study population

Characteristic	N=2668
Age(SD), y	63.1(13.0)
Female, %	23.4
White, %	78.4
Black, %	9.7
Hispanic,%	7.5
Ischemic cardiomyopathy, %	57.0
Nonischemic cardiomyopathy, %	43.0
LVEF(SD), %	28.2(11.1)
NYHA class I, %	14.5
NYHA class II, %	39.6
NYHA III, %	43.2
NYHA IV, %	2.7
Myocardial infarction, %	49.1
History of revascularization, %	43.1
Hypertension, %	69.4
Diabetes, %	36.2
Atrial fibrillation, %	33.9
History of stroke, %	11.1
Class I or III antiarrhythmic drugs, %	11.2
RAAS-modifying drugs, %	78.7
Use of beta-blockers, %	85.1
$eGFR_{CKD\text{-}EPI}$(SD), mL/min/1.73 m^2	70.4(29.0)
BUN(SD), mg/dL	24.7(13.8)
ICD single-chamber, %	36.2
ICD dual-chamber, %	26.9
CRT-D, %	36.3
ICD replacement, %	30.2
VT detection zone programmed, %	90.5
Antitachycardia pacing ON, %	85.8
VT zone (SD), bpm	178(15)
VF zone (SD), bpm	225.4(48.3)
Historic ICD therapies programming, %	67.3
Delayed ICD therapies programming, %	32.7
Medtronic device, %	60.5
Boston Scientific device, %	24.3
St. Jude device, %	13.4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 3. Comparison of ECG and VCG metrics in patients with vs. without primary competing outcomes

Characteristic	Outcome-free (n=1,351)	Appropriate VTVF therapy (n=478)	Death before VTVF (n=401)	P-value
Heart Rate(SD), bpm	71.0(14.8)	71.5(15.7)	73.2(16.2)	0.037
QRS duration(SD), ms	116(35)	118(38)	120(35)	0.178
QTc Bazett(SD), ms	463.7(51.3)	452.6(52.4)	465.0(51.6)	0.0001
QTc Fridericia(SD), ms	452.2(47.8)	441.1(49.7)	451.4(49.6)	0.0001
QTc Hodges(SD), ms	450.8(45.9)	440.6(48.3)	450.1(47.6)	0.0002
Median beat N, n(%)	1034(76.5))	352(73.6)	269(67.1)	
Median beat S, n(%)	154(11.4)	71(14.9)	61(15.2)	0.001
Median beat VP, n(%)	163(12.1)	55(11.5)	71(17.7)	
PVC presence, n(%)	229(17.0)	116(24.3)	77(19.2)	0.002
SAIQRST(SD), mVms	199.7(114.0)	180.8(102.7)	198.2(107.1)	0.005
VMQTi(SD), mVms	136.1(79.7)	121.7(69.0)	133.4(71.6)	0.002
Area SVG(SD), mVms	44.2(26.7)	34.9(19.0)	37.1(21.2)	<0.0001
Peak SVG magnitude(SD), mV	1.19(0.50)	1.12(0.44)	1.09(0.46)	0.0001
Peak QRS-T angle(95%CI), deg	135.4(133.0-137.8)	139.5(136.1-142.8)	143.6(140.3-146.9)	<0.0001
Area QRS-T angle(95%CI), deg	142.7(140.9-144.4)	146.9(144.5-149.4)	149.0(146.5-151.5)	0.005
Peak SVG elevation(95%CI),°	82.5.(81.3-83.8)	83.9(81.5-86.2)	86.9(84.3-89.4)	0.029
Area SVG elevation(95%CI),°	85.6(84.0-87.2)	90.2(87.2-93.3)	90.2(87.3-93.1)	0.147
Peak SVG azimuth(95%CI),°	60.6(58.2-63.1)	60.2(55.9-64.6)	64.2(59.5-68.8)	0.318
Area SVG azimuth(95%CI),°	52.9(49.4-56.5)	57.7(50.8-64.7)	70.7(63.6-77.8)	0.001
T area(SD), mVms	47.1(34.6)	42.6(31.1)	48.9(32.7)	0.011
Peak T magnitude(SD), mV	0.34(0.22)	0.32(0.21)	0.35(0.21)	0.074
QRS area(SD), mVms	72.1(50.2)	61.0(40.0)	67.9(42.1)	0.0001
Peak QRS magnitude(SD), mV	1.41(0.57)	1.33(0.51)	1.33(0.53)	0.005

Median beat: N=normal sinus; S=atrial fibrillation or flutter; VP=ventricular paced

Table 4. The cause-specific hazard of sustained ventricular tachyarrhythmia with appropriate ICD therapy

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	HR (95%CI)	*P*	HR (95%CI)	*P*	HR (95%CI)	*P*	HR (95%CI)	*P*
Age, per 1SD (13y)	**0.88(0.80-0.97)**	**0.010**	**0.80(0.71-0.89)**	**<0.0001**	**0.80(0.72-0.90)**	**<0.0001**	**0.79(0.70-0.89)**	**<0.0001**
Male sex (vs. female)	**1.63(1.26-2.11)**	**<0.0001**	**1.59(1.22-2.07)**	**0.001**	**1.61(1.23-2.10)**	**0.001**	**1.55(1.19-2.03)**	**0.001**
Black race (vs. white)	**1.45(1.08-1.95)**	**0.014**	**1.40(1.03-1.91)**	**0.030**	1.37(0.99-1.87)	0.054	1.31(0.95-1.81)	0.096
ICM (vs. NICM)	1.24(0.99-1.56)	0.061	**1.30(1.02-1.64)**	**0.031**	1.13(0.89-1.45)	0.318	1.17(0.91-1.51)	0.220
Hypertension	1.01(0.83-1.24)	0.890	0.97(0.79-1.20)	0.804	0.96(0.78-1.19)	0.696	0.96(0.78-1.19)	0.705
Diabetes	0.99(0.82-1.18)	0.892	0.91(0.75-1.10)	0.323	0.90(0.74-1.08)	0.256	0.89(0.73-1.08)	0.230
Atrial fibrillation	**1.25(1.01-1.54)**	**0.041**	1.08(0.86-1.37)	0.487	1.07(0.85-1.35)	0.583	1.09(0.86-1.38)	0.460
Stroke	1.20(0.92-1.56)	0.187	1.22(0.93-1.61)	0.146	1.18(0.90-1.56)	0.228	1.21(0.92-1.60)	0.176
AAD (class I or III) use	**1.56(1.23-2.00)**	**<0.0001**	**1.40(1.07-1.83)**	**0.015**	**1.40(1.06-1.84)**	**0.016**	**1.52(1.15-2.01)**	**0.003**
Beta-blockers use	1.19(0.90-1.56)	0.228	1.15(0.86-1.52)	0.340	1.16(0.87-1.55)	0.303	1.16(0.87-1.55)	0.304
LVEF, per 1SD (11%)	**0.83(0.74-0.92)**	**<0.0001**	**0.86(0.77-0.97)**	**0.012**	**0.87(0.77-0.98)**	**0.020**	**0.89(0.79-0.997)**	**0.045**
NYHA class II vs. I	1.21(0.92-1.60)	0.165	1.14(0.86-1.51)	0.375	1.20(0.90-1.60)	0.220	1.21(0.90-1.61)	0.203
NYHA class III vs. I	**1.36(1.03-1.79)**	**0.030**	1.17(0.87-1.58)	0.291	**1.37(1.00-1.86)**	**0.048**	1.34(0.98-1.84)	0.066
NYHA class IV vs. I	1.28(0.68-2.41)	0.453	1.07(0.56-2.05)	0.846	1.13(0.58-2.20)	0.716	0.97(0.49-1.90)	0.924
eGFR, per 1SD (29 mL/min/1.73 m²)	**0.84(0.75-0.93)**	**0.001**	**0.87(0.78-0.97)**	**0.016**	**0.88(0.79-0.98)**	**0.023**	**0.88(0.78-0.98)**	**0.020**
ACE Inhibitors	1.12(0.92-1.36)	0.254	1.00(0.79-1.26)	0.981	1.01(0.80-1.29)	0.909	1.03(0.81-1.32)	0.784
Angiotensin Receptr Blockers use	0.82(0.65-1.06)	0.129	0.84(0.62-1.12)	0.234	0.91(0.68-1.23)	0.549	0.93(0.69-1.26)	0.640
CRT-D vs. ICD	**0.77(0.61-0.95)**	**0.017**	**0.68(0.53-0.86)**	**0.002**	**0.67(0.53-0.86)**	**0.002**	**0.68(0.52-0.89)**	**0.005**
VT zone, per 1SD (15 bpm)	**0.75(0.67-0.85)**	**<0.0001**	**0.77(0.68-0.87)**	**<0.0001**	**0.75(0.66-0.86)**	**<0.0001**	**0.75(0.65-0.86)**	**<0.0001**
VF zone, per 1SD (48 bpm)	0.88(0.77-1.004)	0.057	0.89(0.78-1.03)	0.110	1.07(0.91-1.26)	0.403	1.07(0.90-1.25)	0.449
ICD therapy historic programming	**1.59(1.20-2.10)**	**0.001**	**1.51(1.13-2.01)**	**0.005**	**1.56(1.16-2.12)**	**0.004**	**1.58(1.17-2.14)**	**0.003**
Heart rate, per 1SD (15 bpm)	1.10(0.999-1.21)	0.051	1.09(0.99-1.21)	0.083	1.10(0.99-1.22)	0.075	1.09(0.98-1.20)	0.125
QTc Hodges, per 1SD (46 ms)	0.92(0.84-1.02)	0.104	**0.89(0.80-0.98)**	**0.024**	0.93(0.83-1.03)	0.148	0.90(0.81-1.01)	0.077
PVC on 12-lead ECG	**1.34(1.08-1.68)**	**0.009**	**1.38(1.10-1.72)**	**0.005**	**1.45(1.15-1.83)**	**0.002**	**1.42(1.13-1.79)**	**0.003**
QRS duration, per 1SD(36 ms)	0.98(0.90-1.06)	0.646	0.97(0.89-1.06)	0.533	1.02(0.93-1.12)	0.649	1.05(0.96-1.16)	0.297
Myocardial infarction	**1.34(1.11-1.61)**	**0.003**	1.28(0.95-1.74)	0.108	1.20(0.88-1.64)	0.239	1.20(0.87-1.65)	0.263
Revascularization	**1.28(1.06-1.55)**	**0.009**	1.21(0.94-1.56)	0.140	1.23(0.95-1.59)	0.112	1.24(0.96-1.61)	0.106

Ca-channel blockers use	0.76(0.53-1.08)	0.129	0.79(0.55-1.13)	0.198	0.81(0.56-1.16)	0.248	0.82(0.57-1.18)	0.284
Aldosterone antagonists use	1.13(0.93-1.37)	0.224	1.04(0.85-1.27)	0.726	1.07(0.87-1.32)	0.512	1.05(0.85-1.29)	0.666
BUN, per 1SD (14 mg/dL)	**1.11(1.02-1.22)**	**0.016**	1.00(0.88-1.13)	0.985	1.01(0.89-1.15)	0.853	1.01(0.89-1.15)	0.850
ATP programmed ON	0.93(0.69-1.26)	0.637	0.95(0.69-1.29)	0.730	1.07(0.78-1.51)	0.620	1.06(0.76-1.49)	0.713
VT zone programmed ON	0.94(0.67-1.32)	0.716	0.95(0.67-1.34)	0.766	1.03(0.64-1.64)	0.908	1.05(0.65-1.68)	0.846
Area QRS-T angle, per 1SD (33°)	**1.18(1.06-1.31)**	**0.002**	**1.17(1.05-1.31)**	**0.004**	**1.21(1.08-1.35)**	**0.001**	**1.21(1.08-1.36)**	**0.001**
Peak QRS-T angle, per 1SD(43°)	**1.11(1.01-1.22)**	**0.034**	1.10(0.995-1.22)	0.062	**1.14(1.03-1.26)**	**0.015**	**1.13(1.02-1.26)**	**0.023**
SAIQRST, per 1SD (111 mVms)	**0.89(0.81-0.99)**	**0.025**	0.90(0.81-1.004)	0.058	0.95(0.85-1.06)	0.374	0.92(0.80-1.06)	0.248
VMQTi, per 1SD (80 mVms)	**0.88(0.80-0.98)**	**0.016**	**0.89(0.80-0.99)**	**0.036**	0.94(0.84-1.05)	0.292	0.91(0.79-1.04)	0.176
Peak SVG azimuth, per 1SD (36°)	**1.12(1.01-1.24)**	**0.033**	1.09(0.98-1.20)	0.108	**1.12(1.01-1.25)**	**0.031**	**1.12(1.01-1.24)**	**0.039**
Area SVG azimuth T1(-180-20)	1.19(0.95-1.50)	0.132	1.24(0.98-1.56)	0.080	1.15(0.90-1.47)	0.262	1.16(0.91-1.49)	0.234
Area SVG azimuth T2(20-70)	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Area SVG azimuth T3(70-180)	1.25(0.99-1.58)	0.056	1.21(0.96-1.52)	0.115	1.20(0.95-1.52)	0.134	1.20(0.95-1.52)	0.128
Area SVG azimuth Q1 (-180-0)	1.21(0.93-1.57)	0.152	1.22(0.93-1.59)	0.155	1.14(0.87-1.50)	0.349	1.14(0.87-1.50)	0.339
Area SVG azimuth Q2 (0-50)	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Area SVG azimuth Q3 (50-90)	1.12(0.86-1.45)	0.397	1.07(0.82-1.39)	0.635	1.11(0.84-1.45)	0.462	1.09(0.83-1.43)	0.549
Area SVG azimuth Q4 (90-180)	1.19(0.91-1.55)	0.211	1.10(0.84-1.45)	0.497	1.11(0.85-1.47)	0.439	1.10(0.84-1.46)	0.480
Area SVG elevation, per 1SD (31°)	**1.13(1.03-1.24)**	**0.007**	**1.13(1.03-1.23)**	**0.010**	**1.15(1.05-1.25)**	**0.003**	**1.14(1.04-1.25)**	**0.004**
Peak SVG elevation, per 1SD (25°)	1.10(0.999-1.21)	0.053	1.10(0.99-1.20)	0.079	**1.10(1.004-1.21)**	**0.042**	**1.11(1.005-1.22)**	**0.040**
Area SVG magnitude, per 1SD (25mVms)	**0.72(0.64-0.81)**	**<0.0001**	**0.73(0.65-0.83)**	**<0.0001**	**0.76(0.67-0.86)**	**<0.0001**	**0.75(0.66-0.85)**	**<0.0001**
Peak SVG magnitude, per 1SD (0.5mV)	0.92(0.83-1.2)	0.097	0.95(0.86-1.05)	0.336	0.95(0.86-1.06)	0.381	0.95(0.86-1.06)	0.377

Red color indicates a statistically significant difference in the point estimates for two competing outcomes.

Table 5. The cause-specific hazard of all-cause death without sustained ventricular tachyarrhythmia and appropriate ICD therapy

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	HR (95%CI)	*P*	HR (95%CI)	*P*	HR (95%CI)	*P*	HR (95%CI)	*P*
Age, per 1SD (13y)	**1.61(1.44-1.80)**	**<0.0001**	**1.29(1.14-1.47)**	**<0.0001**	**1.32(1.16-1.50)**	**<0.0001**	**1.35(1.18-1.55)**	**<0.0001**
Male sex (vs. female)	1.17(0.91-1.49)	0.228	1.17(0.90-1.52)	0.241	1.16(0.89-1.50)	0.280	1.16(0.89-1.51)	0.280
Black race (vs. white)	1.13(0.78-1.62)	0.516	1.03(0.70-1.51)	0.884	0.99(0.67-1.45)	0.945	0.95(0.64-1.41)	0.809
ICM (vs. NICM)	**1.43(1.14-1.79)**	**0.002**	**1.50(1.19-1.90)**	**0.001**	**1.45(1.14-1.84)**	**0.002**	**1.43(1.12-1.82)**	**0.004**
Hypertension	1.14(0.91-1.43)	0.250	0.95(0.74-1.20)	0.652	0.97(0.76-1.24)	0.809	0.98(0.77-1.25)	0.881
Diabetes	**1.81(1.51-2.18)**	**<0.0001**	**1.47(1.21-1.80)**	**<0.0001**	**1.45(1.19-1.77)**	**<0.0001**	**1.41(1.15-1.72)**	**0.001**
Atrial fibrillation	**1.48(1.20-1.84)**	**<0.0001**	**1.33(1.06-1.69)**	**0.015**	**1.33(1.05-1.68)**	**0.019**	**1.35(1.07-1.71)**	**0.012**
Stroke	1.22(0.91-1.62)	0.179	1.19(0.88-1.59)	0.257	1.17(0.87-1.57)	0.298	1.19(0.88-1.59)	0.257
AAD (class I, III) use	**1.44(1.13-1.85)**	**0.004**	1.06(0.80-1.39)	0.693	1.08(0.82-1.42)	0.602	1.10(0.83-1.45)	0.512
Beta-blockers use	**0.72(0.57-0.92)**	**0.008**	**0.74(0.58-0.95)**	**0.019**	**0.74(0.57-0.96)**	**0.021**	**0.75(0.58-0.96)**	**0.022**
LVEF, per 1SD (11%)	**0.74(0.66-0.84)**	**<0.0001**	**0.84(0.73-0.96)**	**0.009**	**0.82(0.72-0.94)**	**0.004**	**0.84(0.73-0.96)**	**0.013**
NYHA class II vs. I	**1.62(1.16-2.26)**	**0.004**	**1.54(1.10-2.17)**	**0.012**	**1.62(1.15-2.27)**	**0.006**	**1.61(1.14-1.27)**	**0.007**
NYHA class III vs. I	**2.51(1.82-3.47)**	**<0.0001**	**1.99(1.42-2.81)**	**<0.0001**	**2.21(1.55-3.16)**	**<0.0001**	**2.13(1.49-3.05)**	**<0.0001**
NYHA class IV vs. I	**4.35(2.71-6.98)**	**<0.0001**	**3.19(1.94-5.24)**	**<0.0001**	**3.49(2.11-5.76)**	**<0.0001**	**3.01(1.80-5.05)**	**<0.0001**
eGFR, per 1SD (29 mL/min/1.73 m²)	**0.65(0.57-0.73)**	**<0.0001**	**0.75(0.66-0.85)**	**<0.0001**	**0.74(0.65-0.84)**	**<0.0001**	**0.74(0.65-0.84)**	**<0.0001**
ACE Inhibitors use	**0.70(0.57-0.86)**	**0.001**	**0.66(0.52-0.84)**	**0.001**	**0.65(0.51-0.83)**	**0.001**	**0.68(0.53-0.88)**	**0.003**
Angiotensin receptor blockers use	0.94(0.73-1.21)	0.644	0.79(0.58-1.08)	0.142	0.79(0.58-1.08)	0.143	0.81(0.59-1.11)	0.190
CRT-D vs. ICD	1.02(0.83-1.26)	0.863	**0.77(0.61-0.97)**	**0.029**	**0.77(0.61-0.97)**	**0.029**	0.77(0.59-1.001)	0.051
VT zone, per 1SD (15 bpm)	1.02(0.90-1.16)	0.759	1.07(0.94-1.21)	0.294	1.05(0.90-1.22)	0.545	1.04(0.90-1.21)	0.595
VF zone, per 1SD (48 bpm)	1.08(0.94-1.23)	0.303	1.06(0.92-1.22)	0.384	1.05(0.88-1.24)	0.609	1.05(0.89-1.25)	0.545
ICD therapy historic programming	1.05(0.80-1.36)	0.738	1.00(0.76-1.31)	0.995	1.03(0.77-1.36)	0.849	1.03(0.78-1.37)	0.824
Heart rate, per 1SD (15 bpm)	**1.31(1.18-1.44)**	**<0.0001**	**1.15(1.04-1.28)**	**0.008**	**1.15(1.04-1.28)**	**0.008**	**1.15(1.03-1.28)**	**0.010**
QTc Hodges, per 1SD (46 ms)	1.07(0.96-1.18)	0.206	0.98(0.88-1.09)	0.746	1.01(0.90-1.12)	0.898	1.01(0.90-1.13)	0.918
PVC on 12-lead ECG	0.99(0.78-1.26)	0.961	1.04(0.81-1.34)	0.740	1.04(0.81-1.34)	0.752	1.05(0.81-1.35)	0.737
QRS duration, per 1SD(36 ms)	0.99(0.90-1.08)	0.760	0.95(0.86-1.05)	0.348	0.99(0.89-1.10)	0.828	0.99(0.88-1.11)	0.824
Myocardial infarction	**1.28(1.04-1.56)**	**0.018**	0.96(0.71-1.31)	0.809	0.97(0.71-1.32)	0.833	0.97(0.71-1.33)	0.863
Revascularization	**1.25(1.02-1.52)**	**0.029**	0.95(0.74-1.22)	0.660	0.94(0.73-1.21)	0.620	0.95(0.74-1.23)	0.718

Ca-channel blockers use	1.05(0.75-1.47)	0.796	1.06(0.75-1.49)	0.736	1.08(0.76-1.52)	0.681	1.09(0.77-1.55)	0.615
Aldosterone antagonists use	0.94(0.75-1.19)	0.628	**0.78(0.61-0.99)**	**0.038**	0.79(0.62-1.001)	0.051	0.79(0.62-1.01)	0.061
BUN, per 1SD (14 mg/dL)	**1.43(1.32-1.54)**	**<0.0001**	**1.21(1.08-1.36)**	**0.001**	**1.23(1.09-1.38)**	**0.001**	**1.24(1.10-1.39)**	**<0.0001**
ATP programmed ON	0.78(0.60-1.01)	0.057	0.81(0.62-1.06)	0.117	0.78(0.59-1.03)	0.078	0.79(0.59-1.05)	0.098
VT zone programmed ON	0.79(0.58-1.06)	0.119	0.79(0.58-1.08)	0.133	**0.65(0.43-0.99)**	**0.042**	0.67(0.44-1.01)	0.054
Area QRS-T angle, per 1SD (33°)	**1.17(1.04-1.31)**	**0.007**	**1.15(1.01-1.29)**	**0.030**	**1.18(1.04-1.34)**	**0.011**	**1.20(1.05-1.37)**	**0.008**
Peak QRS-T angle, per 1SD (43°)	**1.16(1.04-1.30)**	**0.007**	**1.13(1.004-1.27)**	**0.042**	**1.16(1.03-1.31)**	**0.016**	**1.18(1.04-1.33)**	**0.012**
SAIQRST, per 1SD (111mVms)	0.97(0.87-1.07)	0.494	0.98(0.88-1.09)	0.727	1.02(0.91-1.14)	0.790	1.03(0.90-1.19)	0.664
VMQTi, per 1SD (80 mVms)	0.96(0.87-1.06)	0.416	0.97(0.87-1.09)	0.639	1.01(0.90-1.13)	0.866	1.02(0.89-1.18)	0.752
Peak SVG azimuth, per 1SD (36°)	0.95(0.85-1.05)	0.293	**0.90(0.81-1.0004)**	**0.051**	0.91(0.82-1.02)	0.094	0.91(0.82-1.02)	0.095
Area SVG azimuth T1(-180-20)	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Area SVG azimuth T2(20-70)	1.17(0.91-1.50)	0.222	1.13(0.87-1.46)	0.374	1.18(0.90-1.54)	0.225	1.19(0.90-1.56)	0.215
Area SVG azimuth T3(70-180)	**1.32(1.03-1.70)**	**0.030**	1.17(0.90-1.51)	0.243	1.22(0.93-1.58)	0.145	1.22(0.94-1.60)	0.135
Area SVG azimuth Q1 (-180-0)	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Area SVG azimuth Q2 (0-50)	1.08(0.81-1.45)	0.601	1.07(0.79-1.45)	0.676	1.11(0.81-1.52)	0.506	1.11(0.81-1.52)	0.505
Area SVG azimuth Q3 (50-90)	1.26(0.94-1.68)	0.116	1.13(0.84-1.52)	0.419	1.22(0.90-1.65)	0.206	1.23(0.90-1.68)	0.191
Area SVG azimuth Q4 (90-180)	**1.39(1.04-1.85)**	**0.027**	1.22(0.90-1.64)	0.198	1.28(0.94-1.73)	0.114	1.29(0.95-1.76)	0.104
Area SVG elevation, per 1SD (31°)	1.03(0.94-1.14)	0.499	1.02(0.92-1.13)	0.743	1.03(0.93-1.14)	0.564	1.03(0.93-1.15)	0.524
Peak SVG elevation, per 1SD (25°)	1.06(0.95-1.17)	0.315	1.01(0.91-1.13)	0.803	1.02(0.92-1.14)	0.712	1.02(0.92-1.14)	0.686
Area SVG magnitude, per 1SD(25mVms)	**0.81(0.72-0.91)**	**0.001**	**0.85(0.75-0.97)**	**0.012**	**0.87(0.77-0.99)**	**0.033**	**0.86(0.76-0.98)**	**0.029**
Peak SVG magnitude, per 1SD (0.5mV)	0.91(0.81-1.03)	0.131	1.00(0.89-1.13)	0.967	1.00(0.89-1.13)	0.983	1.00(0.89-1.13)	0.987

Red color indicates a statistically significant difference in the point estimates for two competing outcomes.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Study flowchart.

Figure 2. Statistically significantly different ($P<0.05$) or similar ($P\geq0.05$) adjusted (model 3) cause-specific Cox hazard ratios and 95% confidence interval of two competing outcomes: sustained ventricular tachyarrhythmia with appropriate ICD therapies (red ovals) and all-cause death without prior ventricular tachyarrhythmia with appropriate ICD therapies (blue rectangles).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 1:



Figure 2:


Different (P < 0.05) Cause-Specific Hazard Ratios
Sustained VT/VF with appropriate ICD therapies
Death without sustained VT/VF and appropriate ICD therapies
Age 0.80 (0.72 - 0.90)
1.32 (1.16 - 1.50)
Diabetes 0.90 (0.74 - 1.08)
1.45 (1.19 - 1.77)
B-blockers 1.16 (0.87 - 1.55)
0.74 (0.57 - 0.96)
ACEI 1.01 (0.80 - 1.29)
0.65 (0.51 - 0.83)
NYHA II vs I 1.20 (0.90 - 1.60)
1.62 (1.15 - 2.27)
NYHA III vs I 1.37 (1.00 - 1.86)
2.21 (1.55 - 3.16)
NYHA IV vs I 1.13 (0.58 - 2.20)
3.49 (2.11 - 5.76)
BUN 1.01 (0.89 - 1.15)
1.23 (1.09 - 1.38)
VT zone 0.75(0.66-0.86)
1.05 (0.90 - 1.22)
ICD progr 1.56 (1.16 - 2.12)
1.03 (0.77 - 1.36)
PVCs 1.45 (1.15 - 1.83)
1.04 (0.81 - 1.34)
SVG az 1.12 (1.01 - 1.25)
0.91 (0.82 - 1.02)
0.5 1.0 2.5
0.5 1.0 2.5 4.5
Hazard Ratio of VT/VF
Hazard Ratio of death
Similar (P > 0.05) Cause-Specific Hazard Ratios
Sustained VT/VF with appropriate ICD therapies
Death without sustained VT/VF and appropriate ICD therapies
Male vs. Female 1.61 (1.23-2.10)
1.16 (0.89 - 1.50)
ICM vs. NICM 1.13 (0.89 - 1.45)
1.45 (1.14 - 1.84)
AFib 1.07 (0.85 - 1.35)
1.33 (1.05 - 1.68)
AAD 1.40 (1.06 - 1.84)
1.08 (0.82 - 1.42)
LVEF 0.87 (0.77 - 0.98)
0.82 (0.72 - 0.94)
eGFR 0.88 (0.79 - 0.98)
0.74 (0.65 - 0.84)
CRT-D vs. ICD 0.67 (0.53 - 0.86)
0.77 (0.61 - 0.97)
VT zone ON 1.03 (0.64 - 1.64)
0.65 (0.43 - 0.99)
Heart rate 1.10 (0.99 - 1.22)
1.15 (1.04 - 1.28)
QRS-T angle 1.21 (1.08 - 1.35)
1.18 (1.04 - 1.34)
SVG elevation 1.15 (1.05 - 1.25)
1.03 (0.93 - 1.14)
SVG mag 0.76 (0.67 - 0.86)
0.87 (0.77 - 0.99)
0.5 1.0 2.0
0.5 1.0 2.0
Hazard Ratio of VT/VF
Hazard Ratio of death

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplemental Table 1. Summary of observed and imputed data

Characteristic	Observed N(%)	Imputed N(%)
Age	2,652 (99.4)	16 (0.6)
Race	2,451 (91.9)	217 (8.1)
Cardiomyopathy	2386(89.4)	282(10.6)
MI history	2658 (99.6)	10 (0.4)
Revascularization history	2653 (99.4)	15 (0.6)
Hypertension	2656 (99.6)	12 (0.4)
Diabetes	2651 (99.3)	17 (0.7)
Atrial fibrillation	2655 (99.5)	13 (0.5)
Stroke history	2344 (87.9)	324 (12.1)
Use of antiarrhythmic drugs	2646 (99.2)	22 (0.8)
Use of beta-blockers	2654 (99.5)	14 (0.5)
Use of Ca-channel blockers	2344 (87.9)	324 (12.1)
ICD type	2517 (94.3)	151 (5.7)
Device manufacturer	2506 (93.9)	162 (6.1)
LVEF	2609 (97.8)	59 (2.2)
NYHA class	2530 (94.8)	138 (5.2)
BUN	2534 (95.0)	134 (5.0)
eGFR	2341 (87.7)	327 (12.3)
VCG GEH variables	2251 (84.4)	417 (15.6)
ACEI	2355 (88.3)	313 (11.7)
ARB	2354 (88.2)	314 (11.8)
Aldosterone inhibitors	2354 (88.2)	314 (11.8)
VT zone programmed	1995 (74.8)	673 (25.2)
ATP programmed ON	2287 (85.7)	381 (14.3)
VT zone heart rate cutoff	1899 (71.2)	769 (28.8)
VF zone heart rate cutoff	1916 (71.8)	752 (28.2)
Device therapies programming features	1636 (61.3)	1032 (38.7)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248369; this version posted December 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplemental Table 2. Statistics of Difference in the cause-specific hazards of two outcomes

Predictor	Model 1		Model 3	
	Z-statistic	P	Z-statistic	P
Age, per 1SD	**-8.014**	**<0.00001**	**-5.572**	**<0.00001**
Male sex (vs. female)	1.846	0.065	1.719	0.086
Black race (vs. white)	1.050	0.294	1.271	0.204
ICM (vs. NICM)	-0.851	0.395	-1.412	0.158
Hypertension	0.765	0.444	0.075	0.940
Diabetes	**-4.612**	**<0.00001**	**-3.441**	**0.0006**
Atrial fibrillation	-1.121	0.262	-1.282	0.200
Stroke	-0.086	0.931	0.063	0.950
AAD (class I, III) use	0.451	0.652	1.321	0.187
Beta-blockers use	**2.652**	**0.008**	**2.295**	**0.022**
LVEF, per 1SD	1.260	0.208	0.661	0.509
NYHA class II vs. I	-1.321	0.187	-1.316	0.188
NYHA class III vs. I	**-2.830**	**0.005**	**-1.999**	**0.046**
NYHA class IV vs. I	**-3.032**	**0.002**	**-2.651**	**0.008**
eGFR, per 1SD	**3.103**	**0.002**	1.952	0.051
ACE Inhibitors	**3.272**	**0.001**	**2.539**	**0.011**
ARB	-0.714	0.475	0.645	0.519
CRT-D vs. ICD	-1.841	0.066	0.737	0.461
VT zone, per 1SD	**-3.469**	**0.0005**	**-3.204**	**0.001**
VF zone, per 1SD	**-2.061**	**0.039**	0.208	0.835
Device programming (historic vs. Rx delay)	**2.137**	**0.033**	**1.998**	**0.046**
Myocardial infarction	0.328	0.743	0.982	0.326
Revascularization	0.218	0.827	1.479	0.139
Ca-channel blockers	-1.286	0.198	1.119	0.263
Aldosterone antagonists	1.155	0.248	1.905	0.057
BUN, per 1SD	**-4.178**	**0.00003**	**-2.165**	**0.030**
ATP programmed ON	0.881	0.378	1.102	0.270
VT zone programmed ON	0.763	0.445	1.431	0.152
Heart rate, per 1SD	**-2.526**	**0.012**	-0.662	0.508
QTc Hodges, per 1SD	**-2.003**	**0.045**	-1.093	0.273
QRS duration, per 1SD	0.069	0.945	0.463	0.643
PVC on 12-lead ECG	**2.021**	**0.043**	**2.051**	**0.040**
Area QRS-T angle, per 1SD	0.092	0.927	0.266	0.790
Peak QRS-T angle, per 1SD	0.639	0.523	-0.245	0.806
SAIQRST, per 1SD	-1.098	0.272	0.817	0.414
VMQTi, per 1SD	-1.129	0.259	-0.866	0.386
Area SVG azimuth T2 vs. T1	1.919	0.054	-1.653	0.098
Area SVG azimuth T3 vs. T1	-1.337	0.181	-0.867	0.386
Area SVG azimuth Q2 vs. Q1	-1.340	0.180	-1.118	0.264
Area SVG azimuth Q3 vs. Q1	-1.572	0.116	-1.082	0.279
Area SVG azimuth Q4 vs. Q1	-1.756	0.079	-1.294	0.196
Peak SVG azimuth, per 1SD	**2.249**	**0.025**	**2.708**	**0.007**
Area SVG elevation, per 1SD	1.294	0.196	1.538	0.124
Peak SVG elevation, per 1SD	0.536	0.592	1.073	0.283
Area SVG magnitude, per 1SD	-1.426	0.154	-1.458	0.145
Peak SVG magnitude, per 1SD	0.073	0.942	0.588	0.557

Supplemental Table 3. Sensitivity analysis using an imputed dataset based on complete ECG data (no ECG data were imputed): cause-specific hazard of competing outcomes

Out-come	Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
		HR (95%CI)	P	HR (95%CI)	P	HR (95%CI)	P	HR (95%CI)	P
Sustained VT/VF with appropriate ICD therapies (n=480/2,251)	Area QRS-T angle, per 1SD (33°)	**1.17(1.06-1.30)**	**0.003**	**1.18(1.06-1.31)**	**0.003**	**1.22(0.09-1.36)**	**0.001**	**1.21(1.08-1.36)**	**0.001**
	Peak QRS-T angle, per 1SD (43°)	**1.10(1.001-1.22)**	**0.046**	1.10(0.998-1.22)	0.055	**1.14(0.03-1.27)**	**0.013**	**1.13(1.02-1.26)**	**0.020**
	SAIQRST, per 1SD (111mVms)	**0.88(0.80-0.98)**	**0.023**	0.91(0.81-1.01)	0.077	0.96(0.86-1.07)	0.470	0.93(0.81-1.06)	0.279
	VMQTi, per 1SD (80 mVms)	**0.88(0.79-0.98)**	**0.015**	0.90(0.80-0.999)	0.050	0.95(0.85-1.07)	0.374	0.91(0.79-1.05)	0.198
	Peak SVG azimuth, per 1SD (36°)	**1.11(1.001-1.23)**	**0.048**	1.08(0.98-1.20)	0.128	**1.11(1.004-1.24)**	**0.041**	1.11(0.999-1.23)	0.052
	Area SVG azimuth T1(-180-20)	1.21(0.96-1.52)	0.104	1.21(0.97-1.56)	0.085	1.13(0.89-1.44)	0.325	1.15(0.90-1.47)	0.270
	Area SVG azimuth T2(20-70)	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
	Area SVG azimuth T3(70-180)	1.26(0.998-1.59)	0.052	1.21(0.95-1.54)	0.115	1.19(0.94-1.51)	0.155	1.20(0.95-1.52)	0.145
	Area SVG azimuth Q1 (-180-0)	1.25(0.97-1.63)	0.089	1.25(0.95-1.63)	0.111	1.15(0.88-1.51)	0.316	1.15(0.88-1.52)	0.305
	Area SVG azimuth Q2 (0-50)	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
	Area SVG azimuth Q3 (50-90)	1.15(0.88-1.51)	0.298	1.10(0.84-1.44)	0.498	1.14(0.86-1.51)	0.351	1.12(0.84-1.48)	0.444
	Area SVG azimuth Q4 (90-180)	1.22(0.93-1.60)	0.145	1.14(0.86-1.50)	0.370	1.14(0.86-1.51)	0.353	1.13(0.85-1.50)	0.400
	Area SVG elevation, per 1SD (31°)	**1.12(1.03-1.23)**	**0.011**	**1.13(1.03-1.23)**	**0.010**	**1.15(1.05-1.26)**	**0.003**	**1.14(1.04-1.25)**	**0.005**
	Peak SVG elevation, per 1SD (25°)	1.09(0.99-1.20)	0.077	1.09(0.99-1.20)	0.083	**1.10(1.003-1.21)**	**0.045**	**1.10(1.001-1.22)**	**0.049**
	Area SVG magnitude, per 1SD(25mVms)	**0.72(0.64-0.80)**	**<0.0001**	**0.74(0.65-0.83)**	**<0.0001**	**0.77(0.68-0.87)**	**<0.0001**	**0.76(0.67-0.86)**	**<0.0001**
	Peak SVG magnitude, per 1SD (0.5mV)	0.92(0.83-1.02)	0.132	0.96(0.86-1.06)	0.425	0.97(0.87-1.08)	0.565	0.97(0.87-1.08)	0.562
Death without appropriate ICD therapies (401/2,251)	Area QRS-T angle, per 1SD (33°)	**1.18(1.05-1.32)**	**0.006**	**1.15(1.01-1.30)**	**0.033**	**1.19(1.04-1.35)**	**0.010**	**1.20(1.05-1.37)**	**0.008**
	Peak QRS-T angle, per 1SD (43°)	**1.19(1.06-1.33)**	**0.003**	**1.14(1.01-1.28)**	**0.031**	**1.18(1.04-1.32)**	**0.009**	**1.19(1.05-1.35)**	**0.007**
	SAIQRST, per 1SD (111mVms)	0.98(0.88-1.08)	0.645	0.98(0.88-1.10)	0.772	1.02(0.92-1.15)	0.677	1.03(0.90-1.18)	0.641
	VMQTi, per 1SD (80 mVms)	0.97(0.88-1.07)	0.533	0.98(0.87-1.09)	0.658	1.02(0.91-1.14)	0.766	1.02(0.89-1.17)	0.748
	Peak SVG azimuth, per 1SD (36°)	0.95(0.85-1.05)	0.292	**0.89(0.80-0.99)**	**0.032**	0.91(0.82-1.01)	0.064	0.91(0.82-1.01)	0.064
	Area SVG azimuth T1(-180-20)	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
	Area SVG azimuth T2(20-70)	1.20(0.92-1.55)	0.175	1.15(0.88-1.50)	0.316	1.21(0.92-1.59)	0.177	1.21(0.92-1.60)	0.172
	Area SVG azimuth T3(70-180)	**1.37(1.07-1.76)**	**0.012**	1.18(0.91-1.52)	0.213	1.23(0.95-1.60)	0.120	1.23(0.95-1.61)	0.117

Area SVG azimuth Q1 (-180-0)	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Area SVG azimuth Q2 (0-50)	1.11(0.82-1.50)	0.512	1.08(0.79-1.49)	0.627	1.13(0.81-1.56)	0.472	1.13(0.81-1.56)	0.471
Area SVG azimuth Q3 (50-90)	1.27(0.95-1.70)	0.109	1.08(0.79-1.46)	0.634	1.17(0.86-1.61)	0.317	1.18(0.86-1.62)	0.305
Area SVG azimuth Q4 (90-180)	**1.49(1.12-1.99)**	**0.006**	1.26(0.93-1.70)	0.133	1.32(0.97-1.79)	0.076	1.32(0.97-1.80)	0.073
Area SVG elevation, per 1SD (31°)	1.04(0.94-1.15)	0.446	1.01(0.91-1.12)	0.838	1.02(0.93-1.13)	0.637	1.03(0.93-1.14)	0.632
Peak SVG elevation, per 1SD (25°)	1.05(0.94-1.17)	0.364	1.00(0.90-1.12)	0.939	1.00(0.91-1.12)	0.863	1.01(0.90-1.13)	0.869
Area SVG magnitude, per 1SD(25mVms)	**0.81(0.72-0.92)**	**0.001**	**0.85(0.75-0.96)**	**0.010**	**0.87(0.77-0.99)**	**0.032**	**0.86(0.76-0.98)**	**0.025**
Peak SVG magnitude, per 1SD (0.5mV)	0.91(0.81-1.03)	0.141	1.01(0.90-1.14)	0.844	1.01(0.89-1.14)	0.901	1.01(0.89-1.14)	0.900