ECG Criteria for Left Ventricular Hypertrophy in Hypertensive Africans

Valeriya Nemtsova[1*], PhD; Annina Salome Vischer[1*],MD; Blaise Lukau[2], MD; Martin Rohacek, MD[3,4,5,6]; Jonathan Macko, BSc[1]; Johanna Oehri, MD[1,4,5]; Herry Mapesi, PhD[3,4,5]; Fiona Vanobberghen, PhD[4,5]; Andrew Katende, MD[3,6]; Ravi Gupta, MD[7]; Herieth Ismael Wilson, MD[3]; Alain Amstutz, PhD[8,9,10]; Josephine Muhairwe, MD[7,11]; Elizabeth Senkoro, MD[3]; Theonestina Byakuzana,Bsc[3]; Geofrey Mbunda, Dip[3]; Jamali Siru,Dip[3]; Winfrid Gingo, MD[6]; Niklaus Daniel Labhardt, MD[4,5,7,8,12], Maja Weisser, MD[3,4,5,12], Thilo Burkard, MD[1,13]

[1] Medical Outpatient Department and Hypertension Centre, ESH Hypertension Centre of Excellence, University Hospital Basel, Basel, Switzerland

[2]SolidarMed, Partnerships for Health, Maseru, Lesotho

[3]Ifakara Health Institute, Ifakara branch, Ifakara, United Republic of Tanzania

[4] Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Allschwil, Switzerland

[5]University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

[6]St. Francis Regional Referral Hospital, Ifakara, United Republic of Tanzania

[7]SolidarMed, Partnerships for Health, Maseru, Lesotho

[8]Division of Clinical Epidemiology, Department of Clinical Research; University Hospital Basel, Basel, Switzerland

[9] Oslo Centre for Biostatistics and Epidemiology, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway

[10] Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

[11]Agency for Development, Washington, DC, US

[12] Division of Infectious Diseases, University Hospital Basel, Basel, Switzerland

[13], Department of Cardiology, University Hospital Basel, Basel, Switzerland

***equal contribution**

Short title: ECG criteria for LVH in Hypertensive Africans

Corresponding author:

PD Dr. med. Thilo Burkard, FESC, ISHF

Thilo.Burkard@usb.ch

University Hospital Basel

Medical Outpatient Department and Hypertension Centre

Petersgraben 4

4031 Basel, Switzerland

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6373-9820

Co-corresponding author

PD Dr. med. Annina Vischer, FESC, ISHF

Annina.Vischer@usb.ch

University Hospital Basel

Medical Outpatient Department and Hypertension Centre

Petersgraben 4

4031 Basel, Switzerland

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5188-1723

Word count: 5593 words (Introduction to Acknowledgments)

Abstract

Background:

ECG criteria for detecting left ventricular hypertrophy (LVH) have been established and evaluated in populations with underrepresentation of Africans. We tested accuracy of LVH ECG criteria in a large population of black African adults with untreated, uncomplicated hypertension in comparison to LV mass determined with echocardiography.

Methods:

In this subanalysis of the CoArtHA (Identifying most effective Treatment Strategies to Control Arterial Hypertension in sub-Saharan Africa) we analysed the value of different ECG criteria compared to cardiac geometry assessed by echocardiography at baseline. LVH was defined as left ventricular mass indexed to body surface area (LVMI) >95g/m² in women, >115g/m² in men.

Results:

In 1125 treatment-naïve adults with uncomplicated hypertension (median age 53.4 years, 72 % women), echocardiographic LVH was present in 56 (5 %) participants. Strongest correlations with LVMI were observed for Cornell voltage product (rho = 0.373) and Cornell voltage criteria (rho = 0.327), all p < 0.001. Standard cut-offs yielded highest specificity for strain pattern (0.970) and Cornell product (0.923). Among continuous measures, the Cornell voltage product adjusted by +0.8 mV in women achieved the highest AUC (0.719), followed by its unadjusted form (AUC 0.651).

Conclusions:

The Cornell voltage product—particularly when adjusted by +0.8 mV in women—demonstrated the best overall diagnostic accuracy (AUC 0.719) for detecting LVH in this rural African hypertensive cohort, despite only moderate correlation with

echocardiographic LVMI. Its implementation as a first-line ECG criterion may help to stratify risk and prioritize patients for echocardiography in resource-limited settings.

Keywords: hypertension**,** left ventricular hypertrophy, echocardiography, electrocardiographic criteria, sub-Saharan Africa,

Trial registration: Clinicaltrials.gov NCT04129840. Registered on 17 October 2019 (https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/).

Clinical Perspective:

- In a large cohort of 1125 untreated black Africans with hypertension, the adjusted Cornell voltage product (+0.8 mV for women) was the most effective at discriminating between cases of echocardiographic left ventricular hypertrophy, outperforming a large number of different standard ECG parameters.
- Using the standard cut-off value of 243.6 mVms was in line with the best Youden index and offered the highest discriminatory properties (sensitivity 64.3%, specifity 79.6%), however, an adapted cut-off value of 277 mVms increased specificity to over 90% at a sensitivity of 42.9%.
- Adopting the adjusted Cornell voltage product in this population could streamline the detection of early left ventricular hypertrophy, enabling the efficient allocation of echocardiographic resources.

Nonstandard Abbreviations and Acronyms

BP	blood pressure
BSA	body surface area
LVH	left ventricular hypertrophy
LVM	left ventricular mass
LVMI	left ventricular mass indexed
MRI	magnet resonance imaging
NPV	negative predictive values
PPV	positive predictive values
RWT	relative wall thickness
fTTE	focused transthoracic echocardiography
TTE	transthoracic echocardiography

INTRODUCTION

Left ventricular hypertrophy (LVH) is a recognized complication of hypertension and associated with a worse prognosis, independent of ethnicity(1). While cardiac magnetic resonance has become the gold standard for quantifying cardiac structure and function in clinical trials, it is not available in remote areas. Transthoracic echocardiography (TTE) remains an accurate and readily available method for assessing left ventricular mass (LVM) in both clinical trials and clinical practice with the recommendation as preferable method in international guidelines(2, 3). Compared to TTE, electrocardiography (ECG) is less sensitive and specific for the detection of LVH (4), but has the advantage of being an inexpensive, fast and available routine investigation in the assessment of a patient with hypertension, especially in remote areas (5-7). Numerous signs and indices for the detection of LVH on ECG are described, but most of these criteria have been established and validated in Caucasian populations (8, 9). Only few studies have evaluated the suitability of the ECG criteria in comparison with echocardiographic criteria for the assessment of LVH in an adult black African population(6, 7). In the MESA (the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis) study, the MESA ECG-LVH index was the best at diagnosing LVH in the subgroup of African Americans when compared to cardiac magnet resonance imaging (MRI)(10).

The CoArtHa trial (Identifying most effective Treatment Strategies to control Arterial Hypertension in sub-Saharan Africa) was one of the largest hypertension trials conducted in Africa to date(11, 12). Within trial procedures focused TTE (fTTE) determining left ventricular geometry and left ventricular myocardial mass indexed (LVMI) to body surface area (BSA) and ECG were performed at enrolment before start of antihypertensive treatment.

Aim of the present analysis was to evaluate the diagnostic accuracy of ECG criteria for LVH in the CoArtHa trial population compared to LVMI by focused echocardiography and to identify ideal cut-off values for the diagnosis of LVH by ECG.

METHODS

Study design and population

The CoArtHA trial was an investigator-initiated, open-label, randomized controlled trial conducted in rural Tanzania and Lesotho to compare three antihypertensive treatment strategies. Detailed methods and eligibility criteria have been published previously (11, 12). In brief, black adult Africans (≥18 years) with untreated, uncomplicated hypertension were enrolled. Key exclusion criteria included symptomatic hypertension, recent cardiovascular events, severe comorbidities (e.g., infection, organ damage, or renal impairment), pregnancy, and inability to attend follow-up(11). At baseline all patients received standardized blood pressure measurement, an ECG and a fTTE. Study doctors and nurses were trained during a one-week course on how to perform these tests using a pre-specified standard operating procedure.

All participants gave written informed consent for the collection, storage and use of clinical data and sample specimens for research purposes within the CoArtHA trial. The study protocol of the CoArtHA trial was approved by the Institutional review board of the Ifakara Health Institute, the National Health Research Ethics Committee in Tanzania, the Tanzania Medicines and Medical Devices Authority, the National Health Research and Ethics Committee and Ministry of Health of Lesotho, as well as the Ethics committee of Northwest and Central Switzerland (11, 12).

This was an exploratory analysis of the CoArtHA trial using fTTE and ECG data from baseline investigations. Patients for whom ECG or fTTE data were not available or of insufficient quality, were excluded (Figure 1).

Figure 1: *Study flow chart and selection of participants*



fTTE - focused echocardiography, ECG- electrocardiography

Study procedures

Blood pressure measurement

Blood pressure was determined following the European Society of Cardiology/European Society of Hypertension (ESC/ESH) 2018 guidelines(13). To measure BP, an Omron M6 Comfort [HEM-7321-E] blood pressure machine was used. BP was defined as the average of the last two out of three office BP measurements, and hypertension was defined as systolic BP values ≥140 mmHg and/or diastolic BP values ≥90 mmHg according to the same guidelines(13, 14).

Electrocardiography

A 12-lead ECG in every patient at baseline using a Schiller AT-1 electrocardiogram machine at 10 mm/mV calibration and at a speed of 25 mm/s was performed. All ECGs were printed out including an automated matrix analysis of times and amplitudes and inspected visually for technical errors or inadequate quality by experienced investigators blinded to clinical information. All automatic measurements were checked under the supervision of a cardiologist. Different commonly used ECG parameters were compared against each other. An overview of the used parameters, the definition for the calculation of the individual parameters as well as the cut-off values for general, sex and ethnicity adapted criteria for LVH are shown in Table 1.

For each ECG parameter included, we initially applied established dichotomous cut-off values to indicate the presence or absence of LVH (LVH yes/no), as outlined in Table 1. In a second step, we examined parameters as continuous variables as appropriate, to evaluate usability to detect LVH. Additionally, we evaluated the discriminative ability of each continuous parameter for LVH detection by calculating the area under the curve (AUC). The ECG parameters included in this analysis were: Sokolow-Lyon voltage, RaVL, Sokolow-Lyon voltage product, Cornell voltage criteria/Novacode 6.1 (identical formula), Cornell voltage product with different adjustments used in the literature, Framingham-adjusted Cornell voltage, General MESA ECG-LVH (same formula used for general and ethnicity- and gender-specific MESA ECG-LVH). Due to their dichotomous nature, strain pattern, Minnesota code 3.1, and Minnesota code 3.3 were excluded from the continuous variable analysis.

Table 1: *Characteristics of electrocardiographic indexes used in this study*

ECG index	Definition	Cut-off value
Cornell voltage criteria[10]	SV3 + RaVL	> 2,0 mV for women and > 2,8 mV for men.
Cornell voltage product[13]	(SV3 + RaVL)*QRS	> 244.0mVms[13] Or >243.6 mVms[15]
Cornell voltage product, adjusted for women 0.6 mV	Men: (SV3 + RaVL)*QRS Women: (SV3 + RaVL + 0.6 mV)*QRS	> 244.0mVms[2, 16] Or >243.6 mVms
Cornell voltage product, adjusted for women 0.8 mV	Men: (SV3 + RaVL)*QRS Women: (SV3 + RaVL + 0.8 mV)*QRS	> 244.0mVms[16] Or >243.6 mVms[17]
Novacode 6.1 LVH[18]	RaVL + SV3	≥ 2,600 µV in men ≥ 2,200 µV in women
RaVL[19, 20]		≥ 1.1 mV
general MESA ECG-LVH[21]	SV1 + SV2 + RV5	≥ 4.2 mV
Ethnicity- and gender- MESA ECG-LVH criterion[10]	SV1 + SV2 + RV5	≥ 4.8 in men ≥ 4.3 - in women
Sokolow-Lyon voltage[2]	SV1 + either RV5/RV6, (whichever is higher)	> 3.5 mV

Sokolow-Lyon voltage product [10]	SV_1 + (RV_5/RV_6)*QRS duration	≥ 371000 µVms (371 mVms)
Framingham-adjusted Cornell voltage[10, 22]	Men: [RaVL + SV_3 + 0.0174*(age – 49) + 0.191*(BMI – 26.5)]; Women: [RaVL + SV_3 + 0.0387*(age – 50) + 0.212*(BMI – 24.9)]	Men ≥ 2.8 mV Women ≥ 2.0 mV
Minnesota Code 3.1[23] (LVH without ST-T)	RV5/V6 or RI/II/III/aVF or RaVL	> 2.6 mV > 2 mV > 1.2 mV
Minnesota Code 3.3[23]	RI or R V5/V6 plus SV1; no MC 3.1	15 mm< or < 20 mm, > 35mm
Strain pattern(24, 25)	Coexistence in any of the leads I, II, avL, or V3 to V6: ST-segment horizontal or downward sloping depression >= 0.05 mV, plus negative T-wave; downsloping convex ST-segment with an inverted asymmetrical T-wave	Yes/No

	opposite to the QRS axis	

RaVL – R wave in aVL, BMI- body mass index, MC- Minnesota Code, ECG - electrocardiography, LVH – left ventricular hypertrophy, MESA- the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis

Focused transthoracic echocardiography

Parasternal long axis loops were acquired by specifically trained study personnel at baseline and at follow up. Loops were acquired using a Lumify® sector probe (Philips). Focused echocardiograms were centrally reviewed and analyzed under supervision of a board-certified cardiologist and by support of an automated, FDA approved, deep-learning workflow (Us2.ai, Singapore), which automatically classifies and analyzes TTE images and videos and which has recently proven to be non-inferior to expert human sonographers (26, 27). We measured LVM, LVM indexed by BSA and relative wall thickness (RWT). LVM was defined as 0.8x 1.04x [(IVS + LVID + PWT)^3-LVID^3] + 0.6 grams, where IVS is interventricular septum diastole (units mm), LVID is left ventricular end-diastolic diameter (units mm), and PWT is posterior wall diastole (units mm).

Determination of LVH

As gold standard for the determination of LVH, a LVMI >95g/m^2 in women, >115g/m^2 in men measured by fTTE was used (2). Left ventricular geometry was categorized by the combination of LVMI and RWT according to current guidelines (2, 28).

Statistics

For testing the normality of distribution, a Shapiro-Wilk test was used. Normal distribution was defined as a p-value ≥0.05. Continuous data were reported as median (interquartile range), categorical data as n (% of total). Differences between

groups were calculated using a Wilcoxon signed rank test for continuous data and using a chi-square test for categorical data.

Testing of ECG parameters

Correlations were calculated with the spearman method using the ggpubr-package (29). Correlations were ranked from (0.01-0.19) indicating no or negligible relationship, to (≥ 0.70) indicating a very strong relationship (Table S1)(30). For accuracy analyses, specificity as (true negative) / (true negative + false positive), sensitivity as (true positive) / (true positive + false negative) was calculated. The negative predictive value (NPV) was calculated as (true negative) / (true negative + false negative). The positive predictive value (PPV) was calculated as (true positive) / (true positive + false positive). The accuracy was calculated as (true positive + true negative) / N. Receiver operating characteristics (ROC) curves were plotted and area under the curves (AUCs) were calculated using the pROC package(31),(32). Discriminative property was graded: AUC of 0.5 suggested no discrimination, 0.7 to 0.8 was considered acceptable, 0.8 to 0.9 was considered excellent, and more than 0.9 was considered outstanding(32). All calculations were completed by using R (33).

Selection of the best ECG-parameters to improve cut-off values

The four best parameters were then selected according to their AUC for further evaluation regarding improved cut-off values for this cohort. Furthermore, the general MESA ECG-LVH index, as the best ECG-LVH parameter for African Americans in the Mesa Study was used(10). For each of the parameters test characteristics were calculated for the standard threshold, 90% and 95% accuracy, 90% and 95% sensitivity, 90% and 95% specificity and the highest Youden index (J), being defined as the point in the AUC curve with the farthest distance to the diagonal line; calculated as highest value (J) =sensitivity+specificity−1. Discriminative

performance for the new cutoffs of each of the parameters were calculated using the pROC package(31).

RESULTS

Characteristics of the Patient Cohort

Of 1268 participants enrolled into the CoArtHa trial, ECG and echocardiographic data were available and interpretable in 1125 participants (553/1125 [49.2%] from Tanzania and 572/1125 [50.8%] from Lesotho) (Figure 1). Demographic and clinical data for the selected cohort are summarised in Table 2. Overall, median age was 53.4 (IQR:44.6-64.4) years, 27.9% were male, and 37.6% were HIV positive. LVH by fTTE was identified in 56/1125 (4.98%) subjects of the selected population, 47/56 (83.9%) were from Tanzania, and 48/56 (85.7%) were female. Hypertensive patients with fTTE diagnosed LVH (fTTE-LVH) were significantly older and more likely to have been previously diagnosed with hypertension than those without fTTE-LVH. The mean levels of systolic and diastolic BP were significantly higher in patients with fTTE-LVH ($p< 0.001$ for both measures). The overall average body mass index was 26.4 kg/m2 (IQR:22.8 – 30.7) with significantly higher values in patients with fTTE-LVH ($p=0.032$).

Table 2: Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics of the study sample, overall and regarding subgroups with echocardiographic signs for LVH

Variables	Overall (n=1125)	fTTE- LVH present (n=56)	fTTE- LVH absent (n=1069)	p-value
Tanzania, n (%)	553 (49.2)	47 (83.9)	506 (47.3)	< 0.001
Lesotho, n (%)	572 (50.8)	9 (16.1)	563 (52.7)	<0.001
Age, years, median (IQR)	53.4 (44.6 – 64.4)	59.0 (49.1 – 68.1)	53.2 (44.3 – 64.3)	0.009
Male, n (%)	314 (27.9)	8 (14.3)	306 (28.6)	0.029
HIV-positive, n (%)	423 (37.6)	10 (17.9)	413 (38.6)	0.003
Previously diagnosed HT, n (%)	469 (41.7)	34 (60.7)	435 (40.7)	0.012
Diabetes, n (%)	22 (2.0)	0	22 (2.1)	0.323
Diabetes never checked, n (%)	102 (9.1)	3 (5.4)	99 (9.3)	
BMI, (kg/m^2), median (IQR)	26.4 (22.8 – 30.7)	25.1 (21.5 – 28.1)	26.5 (22.8 – 30.7)	0.032
BSA, (m^2), median (IQR)	1.71 (1.55 – 1.85)	1.57 (1.47 – 1.76)	1.70 (1.56 – 1.85)	0.001
Systolic BP (mmHg), median (IQR)	149 (141 – 163)	165 (152 – 182)	148 (140 – 161)	<0.001

Diastolic BP (mmHg), median (IQR)	99 (93 – 106)	104 (98 – 116)	98 (93 – 105)	<0.001

fTTE - focused echocardiography, HT – hypertension, LVH-left ventricular hypertrophy, BMI - body mass index, BP- blood pressure, BSA- body surface area

Prevalence of LVH ECG markers

The overall prevalence of positive ECG markers according to the presence of echocardiographic signs for LVH is shown in Table 3. The highest prevalence of positive ECG LVH markers was observed with the general MESA ECG-LVH criterion (633/1125 [56.3%]) participants), the ethnicity- and gender-specific MESA ECG-LVH criterion (566/1125 [50.3%]) participants) and Sokolow-Lyon voltage index (390/1125 [34.7%]) participants. There were no significant differences in the prevalence of positive values of these criteria, as well as for the Framingham-adjusted Cornell voltage index, and Minnesota Code 3.3, between the group of patients fTTE - LVH and the patients without fTTE-LVH (p>0.05).

Table 3. *Prevalence of positive ECG markers in the entire cohort, as well as separated for the group with echocardiographic signs of LVH and those without.*

Index	Overall (n=1125)	Echocardio-graphic signs for LVH (n=56)	No echo-cardiographic signs for LVH (n=1070)	p-value
Cornell voltage criteria, > 2.0 mV (women), > 2.8 mV	256 (22.8)	28 (50.0)	228 (21.3)	< 0.001

(men), n (%)				
Cornell voltage product ≥ 243.6 mVms, n (%)	103 (9.2)	21 (37.5)	82 (7.7)	< 0.001
Cornell voltage product ≥ 244 mVms, n (%)	100 (8.9)	21 (37.5)	79 (7.4)	< 0.001
Cornell voltage product ≥ 243.6 mVms, n (%), adjusted 0.6mV (women)	203 (18.0)	30 (53.6)	173 (16.2)	< 0.001
Cornell voltage product ≥ 244 mVms, n (%), adjusted 0.6 mV (women)	197 (17.5)	30 (53.6)	167 (15.6)	< 0.001
Cornell voltage product ≥ 243.6 mVms, n (%), adjusted 0.8 mV (women)	255 (22.7)	36 (64.3)	219 (20.5)	< 0.001
Cornell voltage product ≥ 244 mVms, n (%), adjusted 0.8 mV (women)	249 (22.1)	34 (60.7)	215 (20.1)	< 0.001
Novacode 6.1 LVH, ≥ 2.2 mV (women), ≥ 2.6 mv (men), n (%)	240 (21.3)	30 (53.6)	210 (19.6)	< 0.001
RaVL ≥ 1.1 mV, n (%)	190 (16.9)	23 (41.1)	167 (15.6)	< 0.001
general MESA ECG-LVH, ≥ 4.2 mV, n (%)	633 (56.3)	33 (58.9)	600 (56.1)	0.784
Ethnicity- and gender-specific MESA ECG-LVH	566 (50.3)	30 (53.6)	536 (50.1)	0.716

criterion (African American), ≥ 4.3 mV (women), ≥ 4.8 mV (men), n (%)				
Sokolow-Lyon voltage > 3.5 mV, n (%)	390 (34.7)	29 (51.8)	361 (33.8)	0.009
Sokolow-Lyon voltage product, ≥ 371 mVms, n (%)	172 (15.3)	24 (42.9)	148 (13.8)	< 0.001
Framingham-adjusted Cornell voltage, ≥ 2.0 mV (women), ≥ 2.8 mV (men), n (%)	564 (50.1)	34 (60.7)	530 (49.6)	0.179
Minnesota Code 3.1 (LVH without ST-T), n (%)	270 (24.0)	30 (53.6)	240 (22.5)	< 0.001
Minnesota Code 3.3, n (%)	205 (18.2)	4 (7.1)	201 (18.8)	0.419
Strain pattern, n (%)	44 (3.9)	12 (21.4)	32 (3.0)	< 0.001

ECG- electrocardiography, LVH- left ventricular hypertrophy, MESA- the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis

Characteristics of ECG parameters

Median values of the continuous ECG criteria in the group of participants with fTTE-LVH were significantly higher than in the group without fTTE-LVH, except for the General and male specific MESA ECG-LVH criterion and the male and female specific Framingham-adjusted Cornell voltage (Table S2).

Correlations between LVMI and ECG-LVH criteria

Continuous LVH ECG criteria were compared with continuous LVMI to determine the degree of correlation between these methods and to evaluate the extent to which ECG parameters can serve as markers for echocardiographic changes (Figure S1). Significant, weak to moderate, positive correlations were found between continuous LVMI and all ECG indices, with the highest correlations observed for unadjusted Cornell voltage product, Cornell voltage criteria, 0.6mV adjusted Cornell voltage product and R amplitude aVL (rho = 0.373, rho = 0.327, rho = 0.324 and rho = 0.304, respectively; $p < 0.001$ for all). The MESA ECG-LVH criteria showed a significant positive but very weak correlation with LVMI (rho = 0.179, $p < 0.001$).

Diagnostic performance of ECG-LVH criteria

Sensitivity, specificity, positive (PPV) and negative (NPV) predictive values and the AUC for LVH were calculated for each ECG criterion with recommended standard cut-off values in comparison to echocardiographic signs of LVH (Table 4). Highest specificity was observed for Strain pattern (0.970), unadjusted Cornell voltage product ≥ 243.6 mVms (0.923) and unadjusted Cornell voltage product ≥ 244 mVms (0.926) and R-amplitude aVL (0.844). Sensitivity was low to moderate for all criteria tested, with the best sensitivity for Cornell voltage product adjusted with 0,8 mV (women) ≥ 243.6 mVms (0.643) and ≥ 244 mVms (0.607), and Framingham-adjusted Cornell voltage (0.607), and general MESA ECG-LVH (0.589). Lowest sensitivity was found for Minnesota code 3.3 (0.154), Strain pattern (0.214) and unadjusted Cornell voltage product (0.375).

All the tested indices in standard cut-off values showed high NPV, with the highest for Cornell voltage product adjusted with 0,8 mV (women) ≥ 243.6 mVms (0.977) and ≥ 244 mVms (0.975), and Cornell voltage product, adjusted with 0,6 mV

(women) (0.972). In contrast, Strain pattern, and unadjusted Cornell voltage product ≥ 243.6 mVms and ≥ 244 mVms, had the highest PPV (0.272, 0.204 and 0.210, respectively), the highest accuracy (0.932, 0.896 and 0,899, respectively) as well as high NPV.

The highest AUC was achieved by the Cornell voltage product ≥ 243.6 mVms and ≥ 244 mVms, adjusted for women 0.8 mV, and Cornell voltage product ≥ 244 mVms, adjusted for women with 0.6 mV (0.719, 0.703 and 0.690, respectively) showing a better overall diagnostic accuracy compared to the other criteria. The ROC- curves of the Minnesota Code 3.3, general MESA ECG-LVH and the ethnicity- and gender- MESA ECG-LVH criteria lie close to the line of no discrimination and had the lowest AUC (0.456, 0.514 and 0.517 respectively), indicating that these indices lack significant predictive value in this population.

Table 4: Performance of standard ECG LVH criteria in overall study population.

Criteria	Overall (n=1125)					
	AUC	Specificity	Sensitivity	NPV	PPV	accuracy
Cornell voltage criteria, > 2.0 mV (women), > 2.8 mV (men)	0.643	0.787	0.500	0.968	0.109	0.772
Cornell voltage product, ≥ 243.6 mVms, unadjusted	0.649	0.923	0.375	0.966	0.204	0.896
Cornell voltage product, ≥ 244 mVms, unadjusted	0.651	0.926	0.375	0.966	0.210	0.899
Cornell voltage product, ≥ 243.6 mVms, adjusted 0.6	0.687	0.838	0.535	0.972	0.148	0.823

mV						
Cornell voltage product, ≥ 244 mVms, adjusted 0.6 mV	0.690	0.844	0.536	0.972	0.152	0.828
Cornell voltage product, ≥ 243.6 mVms, adjusted 0.8 mV	0.719	0.795	0.643	0.977	0.141	0.788
Cornell voltage product, ≥ 244 mVms, adjusted 0.8 mV	0.703	0.799	0.607	0.975	0.137	0.789
Novacode 6.1 LVH, ≥ 2.2 mV (women), ≥ 2.6 mv (men)	0.670	0.804	0.536	0.971	0.125	0.790
R amplitude aVL ≥ 1.1 mV	0.627	0.844	0.411	0.965	0.121	0.822
general MESA ECG-LVH, ≥ 4.2 mV	0.514	0.439	0.589	0.953	0.052	0.446
Ethnicity- and gender-MESA ECG-LVH criterion (African American), ≥ 4.3 mV (women), ≥ 4.8 mV (men)	0.517	0.499	0.536	0.953	0.053	0.500
Sokolow-Lyon voltage > 3.5 mV	0.590	0.662	0.518	0.963	0.074	0.655
Sokolow-Lyon voltage product, ≥ 371 mVms	0.645	0.862	0.429	0.966	0.140	0.840
Framingham-adjusted Cornell voltage, ≥ 2.0 mV	0.556	0.504	0.607	0.960	0.060	0.509

(women), ≥ 2.8 mV (men)						
Minnesota Code 3.1 (LVH without ST-T)	0.656	0.775	0.536	0.970	0.111	0.764
Minnesota Code 3.3	0.456	0.758	0.154	0.966	0.020	0.739
Strain pattern	0.592	0.970	0.214	0.959	0.272	0.932

AUC: area under the curve; tn: true negative count, tp: true positive count, fn: false negative, fp: false positive. Specificity: tn / (tn + fp); Sensitivity: tp / (tp + fn); negative predictive value (NPV): tn / (tn + fn); positive predictive value (PPV): tp / (tp + fp) ; accuracy: (tp + tn) / N. Colours indicate first, second, third highest (dark green, green, light green) and lowest (orange) values per column.

Analysis of continuous ECG parameters to identify most promising ECG parameter as an indicator for LVH Detection

The ROC plot in Figure 2 provides a comparative analysis of the diagnostic performance of the studied ECG criteria as continuous values with regard to the presence of LVH to see if an improvement of the cut-off values would be possible. Among the indexes investigated, compared to the 'neutral' AUC value of 0.5, the Cornell voltage product adjusted with 0.8mV and 0.6mV (women), the unadjusted Cornell voltage product, and the R wave amplitude in aVL had the highest AUC values (0.765, 0.761, 0.738, and 0.708, respectively) with an acceptable discriminative property (32). The MESA ECG-LVH index showed the lowest AUC of the tested parameters (0.577).

Figure 2. ROC plot with area under the curve (AUC) for continuous electrocardiography (ECG) parameters.



ECG- electrocardiography, LVH- left ventricular hypertrophy, MESA- the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis

Alternative cut off values for selected ECG parameters

Based on the previous results, we selected the three best criteria for further evaluation: Cornell voltage criteria, Cornell voltage product, and R amplitude aVL, as well as the MESA ECG-LVH index. We analysed both standard and optimized thresholds for these ECG LVH criteria to identify the most clinically applicable

thresholds (Table S3, Figure S2). Considering the limited number of men diagnosed with fTTE- LVH in our cohort, we evaluated novel thresholds for the Cornell voltage criteria without sex-specific adjustments. Figure S2 illustrates the discriminative performance of each parameter using both traditional cut-off values and thresholds optimized for maximal Youden's index. It also reports the AUCs corresponding to cut-offs that achieve sensitivity, specificity, or accuracy greater than 90% and 95%, respectively (Table S3). Highest AUC (0.719) was calculated for the traditional cut-off of the Cornell voltage product adjusted with 0.8 mV (women). Figure 3 summarizes the best test and cut-off values for highest Youden index/AUC, sensitivity >90% and specifity >90% for the Cornell voltage product adjusted with 0.8 mV (women), despite AUC for sensitivity >90% was numerically higher for the unadjusted Cornell voltage product (0.599 vs. 0.620).

Figure 3. Discriminative performance of the Cornell voltage product adjusted with 0.8 mV (women) at the highest Youden index/AUC derived cut-offs and sensitivity >90% and specifity >90% cut-offs.



DISCUSSION

In this sub-analysis of data from the CoArtha trial we assessed the diagnostic utility of standard ECG criteria of LVH in a large sample of black Africans living in Tanzania

or Lesotho compared to focused echocardigraphy. Our study provides several observations and insights regarding the potential use of ECG in black African patients.

First, LVH ECG criteria showed a weak to moderate correlation to LVMI with the highest correlation coefficients for unadjusted Cornell voltage product and Cornell voltage criteria, while the Framingham-adjusted Cornell voltage had a very low correlation. Second, using traditional cut-off values, the highest discriminative properties were found for the Cornell voltage product with 0.8 mV adjustment for women at a cut-off of 243.6 mVms, followed by the cuf-off of 244 mVms. Third, the limited sensitivity of ECG in diagnosing LVH highlights the need for tests with higher sensitivity and acceptable specificity. Rodrigues et al e.g. proposed lowering sex-specific thresholds for the Cornell voltage criteria to improve sensitivity(34). The CoArtHa study also aimed to enhance ECG criteria for LVH in African populations, supporting ethnic-specific thresholds. The Youden index is commonly used to identify optimal cut-off values, minimizing both false positives and negatives (35). Within our cohort novel cut-off values only have better discriminative properties than standard cut-offs, when high sensitivities or specifities are aimed for. Interestingly, the highest AUC for the detection of LVH was reached at the best Youden Index with the Cornell voltage product with adjustment of 0.8 mV for women at the cut-off of 243.6 mVms, showing a sensitivity of 64.3% and specifity of 79.6%. ECG criteria for LVH were originally designed to reach a specificity as high as 90% to 95%, which in our cohort was achieved only by the unadjusted Cornell voltage product and Strain pattern at standard cut-offs, with the latter having a lower sensitivity of 21% compared to 37.5% (36). An adapted best threshold for > 90% specifity could be using the Cornell voltage product adjusted with 0.8 mV for women at >277 mVms with a sensitivity of 42.9%. Regarding Cornell voltage criteria best Youden index at 2.25 mV showed

higher AUC values and improved sensitivity to 53.6%, while maintaining specificity at a level of 79.4%. Further studies are needed to confirm the clinical usefulness of these thresholds for diagnosing LVH in Black African hypertensive patients.

The obtained data allows us to conclude that in our population of treatment-naive, hypertensive participants in Tanzania and Lesotho, in terms of simplicity, correlation, and discriminative test properties, the Strain pattern and Cornell voltage product with a 0.8 mV adjustment for women could be the prefered ECG parameters to detect LVH, whereas unadjusted Cornell voltage product correlated best with LVMI.

Several aspects of the present study deserves to be mentioned.

The weak to moderate correlation to LVMI of most of the studied ECG indexes within participants of the CoArtHa trial are broadly comparable with evidence from other studies (37-40). For instance, a similar finding was presented by Schillaci et al. in a study including 923 individuals with hypertension, in whom the Cornell voltage criteria correlation coefficient was 0.48 and in a study by Rodrigues et al., where the Cornell voltage criteria correlation coefficient was 0.37 (34, 41).

Our findings of a variable and low to moderate sensitivity (0.154 - 0.589) with higher specifity (0.439 - 0.970) are in line with previous studies conducted in African hypertensive adult populations, which noted that traditional ECG criteria had low sensitivity with generally good specificity (6, 7, 36, 42, 43). In a study conducted in Nigeria in 90 subjects evaluating four ECG criteria, Cornell criterion and Sokolow-Lyon criterion showed a lower accuracy than our results, but the defined cut off for LVH in TTE was >125/m^2 for both sexes which is higher than the recommended gender-specific cutoff values we used(6). In a subgroup of 120 African American participants of the LIFE study, Sokolow-Lyon overestimated and Cornell voltage

criteria underestimated the presence of LVH relative to white participants compared to TTE, in terms of sensitivity and specifity – but not in terms of overall test performance in ROC curve analysis(44). In line with our results, Cornell voltage product had the highest numerical AUC value of 0.665 in the LIFE study(44). Interestingly and in contrast to a study by Jain et al, comparing ECG parameter to cardiac MRI in several ethnicities within the MESA study and deriving the MESA ECG-LVH criteria, the general MESA ECG-LVH and the ethnicity- and gender-specific MESA ECG-LVH criterion had a low specificity and sensitivity in our cohort.(10) Within the MESA cohort and when applying ethnicity and gender specific cut-offs, specifity and sensitivity for the participants of African American descent was 90% and 37-39%, respectively with an ROC AUC of 0.64.In addition to the geographical differences of the trials namely United States versus sub saharan Africa, there were also differences between the cohorts with a 50% proportion of males and a higher prevalence of MRI-LVH of 11% in the MESA study. Additionally participants were older and had an higher BMI. Another reason for the discrepancy may be the differences between MRI and TTE, but again in the MESA study, the agreement for LVH between the imaging modalities ranged from 77-98% with a kappa coefficient from 0.1-0.76(45). To our knowledge, the MESA criteria had not been externally validated.

Generally, in the CoArtHa study three particular ECG criteria (Cornell voltage criteria, Cornell voltage product (especially with adjustment), and R amplitude aVL) had better discriminative properties and were more sensitive than other criteria. This aligns with other studies in different ethnic populations that demonstrated that the Cornell-based criteria had superior diagnostic performance compared to Sokolov-Lyon, and other criteria (34, 43, 46, 47).

Regarding the prognostic value, presence of LVH is an important marker for mortality, especially in African American patients, making screening of this condition even more relevant(44, 48, 49). This is true not only for LVH diagnosed by TTE or MRI but also for LVH detected by ECG criteria in different settings, even though the prevalence of LVH by ECG is higher than by imaging.

For example, within the LIFE study, regression of LVH defined by Cornell voltage criteria, Sokolov-Lyon voltage criteria or ECG Strain pattern was associated with an improved cardiovascular outcome independent of BP reduction (50). Additionally, presence of these markers at baseline or development of new Strain pattern over time were predictors of cardiovascular events (50). Moreover, in a meta-analysis conducted by Zhigang You et al, Cornell voltage criteria had a stronger predictive value for cardiovascular risk than the Sokolov-Lyon index and Cornell voltage product in general populations, without studies coming from the African continent. (51).

Of note, there is evidence that the information from TTE and ECG may complement each other, with, however, a higher impact of the TTE diagnosis. A study by Seko and colleagues evaluated the prognostic relevance of presence and absence of LVH in TTE and ECG by using Cornell product in hospitalized asian participants. When considering the resulting four possible patterns of TTE/ECG, namely +/+, +/-, -/+ and -/-, the hazard ratio for major adverse cardiovascular events over 3 years was 1.63 (1.16-2.28), 1.68 (1.23-2.30) and 1.09 (0.85-1.41) compared to patients no evidence of LVH(52). Therefore, ECG remains a useful tool for risk stratification in hypertension not only in countries where poor technical provision and costs may limit the use of echocardiography. Therefore, it may be clinically feasible to use ECG with tailored cutoff values to identify a group of patients at lower risk for LVH and deprioritise them for further imaging.

Our study has several limitations. Firstly, in our cohort of treatment-naïve adults with hypertension, the prevalence of fTTE LVH was 5%, resulting in 56 participants with LVH only. The low number, together with the overrepresentation of female participants within the study as well as within those with a echocardiographically confirmed LVH, makes it difficult to generalize the results, especially to men, speaking for the need of a validation in other cohorts in Africa. Secondly, the prevalence of echocardiographic LVH in hypertension varies based on LVM indexation and cut-off values. Adebiyi et al. examined different echocardiographic thresholds in 457 hypertensive native Africans, finding LVH prevalence ranged from 30.9% to 56.0%(38, 53) . The highest was with LVM indexed to height$^{2.7}$ (49.2 g/ht$^{2.7}$ in men, 46.7 g/ht$^{2.7}$ in women), and the lowest with BSA indexation (125 g/m^2 for both sexes)(53) . This aligns with studies in southwestern Nigeria and the MAVI (MAssa Ventricolare sinistra nel soggetto Iperteso) study, which used a higher LVMI cut-off (>125 g/m^2) and reported LVH prevalence of 32.2% and 27.2%, respectively(4, 6). Our analysis applies the American Society of Echocardiography definition (>115 g/m^2 in men, >95 g/m^2 in women), widely used in clinical practice and linked to adverse cardiovascular outcomes(28).

Thirdly, the fTTE in our study were not performed by fully trained cardiologists, but by doctors and nurses after a short-time training, possibly resulting in differences when compared to board certified cardiologists or cardiac sonographer. However, analyses of echocardiographies were done in a central site with the support of an artificial intelligence algorithm and interpretation of cardiologists. This approach was used also in a population-based survey by our group and has been proven to be feasible(27, 54). Additionally there is evidence that TTE image quality has limited influence on the reliability and performance of LVM assessment, when compared to

cMRI(45). Finally, we could not analyse a correlation of ECG parameter with outcomes such as morbidity or mortality.

In conclusion, in this population of treatment-naïve Black Africans with uncomplicated and untreated hypertension in rural Africa, the Cornell voltage product with adjustment of 0.8 mV for women had the best diagnostic properties when compared to alternative LVH ECG criteria, with a moderate association with left ventricular myocardial mass measured by focused echocardiography, indexed to body surface area and should be the preferred ECG parameter when full or point-of-care echocardiography is not available. We found, that application of standard cut-offs are in line with best Youden Index. Specificity can be increased to 90% using a cut-off value of 277 mVms. Implementing ECG and using the best performing criteria in routine clinical care may contribute to improve the diagnosis of the LVH at screening stage and may allow to identify a group of patients at lower or higher risk for hypertension-mediated cardiac damage to de-or prioritize for further echocardiography. However, given the rapid advancements in imaging technology, the increasing integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and a more comprehensive and dynamic assessment of cardiac function by fTTE, it is plausible that ECG may be gradually supplanted by fTTE in the coming years in the context of LVH.

Perspectives: Given the rapid advancements in imaging technology, the increasing integration of artificial intelligence (AI), and the more comprehensive and dynamic assessment of cardiac function provided by fTTE, it is plausible that ECG may be gradually supplanted by fTTE in the coming years for the evaluation of left ventricular hypertrophy (LVH). Nonetheless, ECG remains a widely accessible, cost-effective, and non-invasive screening tool. In this context, continued optimization of ECG criteria—particularly through ethnicity-specific cutoffs—and the integration of AI-

driven algorithms hold promise for enhancing its diagnostic accuracy and clinical utility.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank all investigators, staff, and participants of the CoArtHA study for their valuable contributions.

Sources of Funding

This trial was funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant 32003B185263/1). Additional funding for focused echocardiography analysis was granted by the Cardiovascular Research Foundation Basel

Disclosures: PD Annina Salome Vischer has received personal fees from Bristol Myers Squibb, Amarin, Servier, Medtronic, Vifor, NovoNordisk, AstraZeneca outside the submitted work. Dr Mapesi reported being employed by Roche outside the submitted work. Prof Rohacek reported receiving grants from Else Kröner Fresenius Foundation outside the submitted work. Prof Labhardt reported receiving travel support from Gilead Sciences and ViiV outside the submitted work. PD Burkard reported receiving grants from Swiss National Science Foundation, Cardiovascular Research Foundation Basel, AstraZeneca, Daiichi Sankyo, Medtronic, Roche Diagnostics, Novartis, Novo Nordisk, Collabree, and Preventicus and lecture and/or travel fees paid to institution from Servier, Medtronic, Sanofi, Novartis, and Daiichi Sankyo outside the submitted work. Prof Weisser reported receiving grants from the Swiss National Science Foundation for implementation and conduct of the study and travel grants for conference attendance from MSD and Gilead. Dr. Oehri reported

funds from Goldschmidt-Jacobsen Stiftung outside the submitted work. No other disclosures were reported.

References:

1. Havranek EP, Froshaug DB, Emserman CD, Hanratty R, Krantz MJ, Masoudi FA, et al. Left ventricular hypertrophy and cardiovascular mortality by race and ethnicity. Am J Med. 2008;121(10):870-5.

2. Mancia G, Kreutz R, Brunstrom M, Burnier M, Grassi G, Januszewicz A, et al. 2023 ESH Guidelines for the management of arterial hypertension The Task Force for the management of arterial hypertension of the European Society of Hypertension Endorsed by the International Society of Hypertension (ISH) and the European Renal Association (ERA). J Hypertens. 2023.

3. McEvoy JW, McCarthy CP, Bruno RM, Brouwers S, Canavan MD, Ceconi C, et al. 2024 ESC Guidelines for the management of elevated blood pressure and hypertension. Eur Heart J. 2024;45(38):3912-4018.

4. Verdecchia P, Dovellini EV, Gorini M, Gozzelino G, Lucci D, Milletich A, et al. Comparison of electrocardiographic criteria for diagnosis of left ventricular hypertrophy in hypertension: the MAVI study. Ital Heart J. 2000;1(3):207-15.

5. Chapman JN, Mayet J, Chang CL, Foale RA, Thom SA, Poulter NR. Ethnic differences in the identification of left ventricular hypertrophy in the hypertensive patient. Am J Hypertens. 1999;12(5):437-42.

6. Ogunlade O, Akintomide AO. Assessment of voltage criteria for left ventricular hypertrophy in adult hypertensives in south-western Nigeria. J Cardiovasc Dis Res. 2013;4(1):44-6.

7. Jingi AM, Noubiap JJ, Kamdem P, Kingue S. Determinants and improvement of electrocardiographic diagnosis of left ventricular hypertrophy in a black African population. PLoS One. 2014;9(5):e96783.

8. Sokolow M, Lyon TP. The ventricular complex in left ventricular hypertrophy as obtained by unipolar precordial and limb leads. Am Heart J. 1949;37(2):161-86.

9. Romhilt DW, Estes EH, Jr. A point-score system for the ECG diagnosis of left ventricular hypertrophy. Am Heart J. 1968;75(6):752-8.

10. Jain A, Tandri H, Dalal D, Chahal H, Soliman EZ, Prineas RJ, et al. Diagnostic and prognostic utility of electrocardiography for left ventricular hypertrophy defined by magnetic resonance imaging in relationship to ethnicity: the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis (MESA). Am Heart J. 2010;159(4):652-8.

11. Mapesi H, Gupta R, Wilson HI, Lukau B, Amstutz A, Lyimo A, et al. The coArtHA trial-identifying the most effective treatment strategies to control arterial hypertension in sub-Saharan Africa: study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. Trials. 2021;22(1):77.

12. Mapesi H, Rohacek M, Vanobberghen F, Gupta R, Wilson HI, Lukau B, et al. Treatment Strategies to Control Blood Pressure in People With Hypertension in Tanzania and Lesotho: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Cardiol. 2025.

13. Williams B, Mancia G, Spiering W, Agabiti Rosei E, Azizi M, Burnier M, et al. 2018 ESC/ESH Guidelines for the management of arterial hypertension. Eur Heart J. 2018;39(33):3021-104.

14. Belghazi J, El Feghali RN, Moussalem T, Rejdych M, Asmar RG. Validation of four automatic devices for self-measurement of blood pressure according to the International Protocol of the European Society of Hypertension. Vasc Health Risk Manag. 2007;3(4):389-400.

15. Alchaghouri S, Wong KY, Perry RA, Ramsdale DR, Somauroo JD, Pyatt JR. QT peak prolongation is not associated with left ventricular hypertrophy in teenage professional football players. Ann Noninvasive Electrocardiol. 2007;12(2):104-10.

16. Alfakih K, Walters K, Jones T, Ridgway J, Hall AS, Sivananthan M. New gender-specific partition values for ECG criteria of left ventricular hypertrophy: recalibration against cardiac MRI. Hypertension. 2004;44(2):175-9.

17. Molloy TJ, Okin PM, Devereux RB, Kligfield P. Electrocardiographic detection of left ventricular hypertrophy by the simple QRS voltage-duration product. J Am Coll Cardiol. 1992;20(5):1180-6.

18. Rautaharju PM, Park LP, Chaitman BR, Rautaharju F, Zhang Z-M. The novacode criteria for classification of ECG abnormalities and their clinically significant progression and regression. Journal of Electrocardiology. 1998;31(3):157-87.

19. Levy D, Labib SB, Anderson KM, Christiansen JC, Kannel WB, Castelli WP. Determinants of sensitivity and specificity of electrocardiographic criteria for left ventricular hypertrophy. Circulation. 1990;81(3):815-20.

20. Mancia G, Fagard R, Narkiewicz K, Redon J, Zanchetti A, Bohm M, et al. 2013 ESH/ESC guidelines for the management of arterial hypertension: the Task Force for the Management of Arterial Hypertension of the European Society of Hypertension (ESH) and of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). Eur Heart J. 2013;34(28):2159-219.

21. Sparapani R, Dabbouseh NM, Gutterman D, Zhang J, Chen H, Bluemke DA, et al. Detection of Left Ventricular Hypertrophy Using Bayesian Additive Regression Trees: The MESA. J Am Heart Assoc. 2019;8(5):e009959.

22. Norman JE, Jr., Levy D, Campbell G, Bailey JJ. Improved detection of echocardiographic left ventricular hypertrophy using a new electrocardiographic algorithm. J Am Coll Cardiol. 1993;21(7):1680-6.

23. Prineas RJ, Crow RS, Zhang Z-M. The Minnesota Code Manual of Electrocardiographic Findings2010.

24. Inoue YY, Soliman EZ, Yoneyama K, Ambale-Venkatesh B, Wu CO, Sparapani R, et al. Electrocardiographic Strain Pattern Is Associated With Left Ventricular Concentric Remodeling, Scar, and Mortality Over 10 Years: The Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis. J Am Heart Assoc. 2017;6(9).

25. Okin PM, Oikarinen L, Viitasalo M, Toivonen L, Kjeldsen SE, Nieminen MS, et al. Prognostic Value of Changes in the Electrocardiographic Strain Pattern During Antihypertensive Treatment The Losartan Intervention for End-Point Reduction in Hypertension Study (LIFE). Circulation. 2009;119(14):1883-91.

26. Tromp J, Bauer D, Claggett BL, Frost M, Iversen MB, Prasad N, et al. A formal validation of a deep learning-based automated workflow for the interpretation of the echocardiogram. Nat Commun. 2022;13(1):6776.

27. Firima E, Gonzalez L, Manthabiseng M, Bane M, Lukau B, Leigh B, et al. Implementing focused echocardiography and AI-supported analysis in a population-based survey in Lesotho: implications for community-based cardiovascular disease care models. Hypertens Res. 2024;47(3):708-13.

28. Lang RM, Badano LP, Mor-Avi V, Afilalo J, Armstrong A, Ernande L, et al. Recommendations for cardiac chamber quantification by echocardiography in adults: an update from the American Society of Echocardiography and the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging. J Am Soc Echocardiogr. 2015;28(1):1-39 e14.

29. Kassambara A. ggpubr: 'ggplot2' Based Publication Ready Plots. R package version 0.6.0 ed2023.

30. Leclezio L, Jansen A, Whittemore VH, de Vries PJ. Pilot validation of the tuberous sclerosis-associated neuropsychiatric disorders (TAND) checklist. Pediatr Neurol. 2015;52(1):16-24.

31. Robin X, Turck N, Hainard A, Tiberti N, Lisacek F, Sanchez JC, et al. pROC: an open-source package for R and S+ to analyze and compare ROC curves. BMC Bioinformatics. 2011;12:77.

32. Mandrekar JN. Receiver operating characteristic curve in diagnostic test assessment. J Thorac Oncol. 2010;5(9):1315-6.

33. Team RC. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria2024.

34. Rodrigues SL, D'Angelo L, Pereira AC, Krieger JE, Mill JG. Revision of the Sokolow-Lyon-Rappaport and cornell voltage criteria for left ventricular hypertrophy. Arq Bras Cardiol. 2008;90(1):46-53.

35. Hajian-Tilaki K. The choice of methods in determining the optimal cut-off value for quantitative diagnostic test evaluation. Stat Methods Med Res. 2018;27(8):2374-83.

36. Jaggy C, Perret F, Bovet P, van Melle G, Zerkiebel N, Madeleine G, et al. Performance of classic electrocardiographic criteria for left ventricular hypertrophy in an African population. Hypertension. 2000;36(1):54-61.

37. RB. CPND. Eletrocardiographic detection of left ventricular hypertrophy development and prospective validation of improved criteria. J Am Coll Cardiol. 1985;6:572-80.

38. Dada A, Adebiyi AA, Aje A, Oladapo OO, Falase AO. Standard electrocardiographic criteria for left ventricular hypertrophy in Nigerian hypertensives. Ethnic Dis. 2005;15(4):578-84.

39. Lv T, Yuan Y, Yang J, Wang G, Kong L, Li H, et al. The association between ECG criteria and Echo criteria for left ventricular hypertrophy in a general Chinese population. Ann Noninvasive Electrocardiol. 2021;26(5):e12880.

40. Su FY, Li YH, Lin YP, Lee CJ, Wang CH, Meng FC, et al. A comparison of Cornell and Sokolow-Lyon electrocardiographic criteria for left ventricular hypertrophy in a military male population in Taiwan: the Cardiorespiratory fitness and HospItalization Events in armed Forces study. Cardiovasc Diagn Ther. 2017;7(3):244-51.

41. Schillaci G, Verdecchia P, Borgioni C, Ciucci A, Guerrieri M, Zampi I, et al. Improved electrocardiographic diagnosis of left ventricular hypertrophy. Am J Cardiol. 1994;74(7):714-9.

42. Bombelli M, Vanoli J, Cuspidi C, Dell'Oro R, Facchetti R, Mancia G, et al. Comparison of electrocardiographic versus echocardiographic detection of left ventricular mass changes over time and evaluation of new onset left ventricular hypertrophy. J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich). 2023;25(4):343-9.

43. Abiodun OO, Anya T, Adekanmbi VT. Electrocardiographic Abnormalities in Nigerian Hypertensives With Echocardiographic Left Ventricular Hypertrophy. Cureus. 2024;16(5):e60170.

44. Okin PM, Wright JT, Nieminen MS, Jern S, Taylor AL, Phillips R, et al. Ethnic differences in electrocardiographic criteria for left ventricular hypertrophy: the LIFE study. Losartan Intervention For Endpoint. Am J Hypertens. 2002;15(8):663-71.

45. Armstrong AC, Gjesdal O, Almeida A, Nacif M, Wu C, Bluemke DA, et al. Left ventricular mass and hypertrophy by echocardiography and cardiac magnetic resonance: the multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis. Echocardiography. 2014;31(1):12-20.

46. Ricciardi D, Vetta G, Nenna A, Picarelli F, Creta A, Segreti A, et al. Current diagnostic ECG criteria for left ventricular hypertrophy: is it time to change paradigm in the analysis of data? J Cardiovasc Med (Hagerstown). 2020;21(2):128-33.

47. Park JK, Shin JH, Kim SH, Lim YH, Kim KS, Kim SG, et al. A comparison of cornell and sokolow-lyon electrocardiographic criteria for left ventricular hypertrophy in korean patients. Korean Circ J. 2012;42(9):606-13.

48. Levy D, Garrison RJ, Savage DD, Kannel WB, Castelli WP. Prognostic implications of echocardiographically determined left ventricular mass in the Framingham Heart Study. N Engl J Med. 1990;322(22):1561-6.

49. Koren MJ, Devereux RB, Casale PN, Savage DD, Laragh JH. Relation of left ventricular mass and geometry to morbidity and mortality in uncomplicated essential hypertension. Ann Intern Med. 1991;114(5):345-52.

50. Bang CN, Devereux RB, Okin PM. Regression of electrocardiographic left ventricular hypertrophy or strain is associated with lower incidence of cardiovascular morbidity and mortality in hypertensive patients independent of blood pressure reduction - A LIFE review. J Electrocardiol. 2014;47(5):630-5.

51. You Z, He T, Ding Y, Yang L, Jiang X, Huang L. Predictive value of electrocardiographic left ventricular hypertrophy in the general population: A meta-analysis. J Electrocardiol. 2020;62:14-9.

52. Seko Y, Kato T, Yamaji Y, Haruna Y, Nakane E, Haruna T, et al. Discrepancy between left ventricular hypertrophy by echocardiography and electrocardiographic hypertrophy: clinical characteristics and outcomes. Open Heart. 2021;8(2).

53. Adebiyi AA, Ogah OS, Aje A, Ojji DB, Adebayo AK, Oladapo OO, et al. Echocardiographic partition values and prevalence of left ventricular hypertrophy in hypertensive Nigerians. BMC Med Imaging. 2006;6:10.

54. Firima E, Gonzalez L, Khan MA, Manthabiseng M, Sematle MP, Bane M, et al. High Rates of Undiagnosed Target Organ Damage Among Adults with Elevated Blood Pressure or Diabetes Mellitus in a Community-Based Survey in Lesotho. J Epidemiol Glob Health. 2023;13(4):857-69.

Supplementary Material.

Table S1. Interpretation Table of Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficients (30)

Spearman ρ	**Correlation**
≥0.70	Very strong relationship
0.40-0.69	Strong relationship
0.30-0.39	Moderate relationship
0.20-0.29	Weak relationship
0.01-0.19	No or negligible relationship

Note: This descriptor applies to both positive and negative relationships.

Table S2: Median values (IQR) for different continuous ECG parameters overall and in participants with and without echocardiographic LVH

Index	Overall (n=1125)	Echocardiographic signs for LVH (n=56)	No echocardiographic signs for LVH (n=1070)	p
Cornell voltage criteria, mV	1.7 (1.3 – 2.2)	2.3 (1.7 – 2.8)	1.7 (1.3 – 2.1)	<0.001
Cornell voltage product, mVms, unadjusted	142. 8 (103.2 – 188.6)	199.2 (150.8 – 267.8)	140.4 (101.4 – 182.4)	<0.001
Cornell voltage product, mVms, adjusted 0.6 mV (women)	177.6 (140.4 – 223.6)	246.0 (201.6 – 320.4)	176.0 (139.4 – 220.8)	<0.001

Cornell voltage product, mVms, adjusted 0.8 mV (women)	192.4 (150.4 – 240.0)	206.2 (217.3 – 337.2)	189.2 (148.2 – 235.6)	<0.001
R amplitude aVL, mV	0.6 (0.3 – 0.9)	0.9 (0.6 – 1.4)	0.6 (0.3 – 0.9)	<0.001
general MESA ECG-LVH, mV	4.3 (3.5 – 5.4)	4.8 (3.7 – 6.4)	4.3 (3.4 – 5.3)	0.051
Sokolow-Lyon voltage, mV	3.1 (2.5 – 3.8)	3.6 (2.9 – 4.9)	3.1 (2.5 – 3.8)	0.003
Sokolow-Lyon voltage product, mVms	263.2 (207.2 – 328.0)	318.4 (250.3 – 429.4)	259.0 (205.2 – 327.6)	<0.001
Framingham-adjusted Cornell voltage, mVms	2.2 (1.2 – 3.3)	2.7 (1.7 – 3.8)	2.2 (1.2 – 3.2)	0.011

ECG- electrocardiography, LVH- left ventricular hypertrophy, MESA- the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis

Table S3: Diagnostic performance of selected ECG LVH criteria at different cut-off values.

Criteria	Threshold	AUC	Specificity	Sensitivity	NPV	PPV	accuracy
Cornell voltage criteria	> 2.0 mV (women), > 2.8 mV (men)	0.643	0.787	0.500	0.968	0.109	0.772
Youden	2.25	0.665	0.794	0.536	0.970	0.120	0.781
90 % Accuracy	2.85	0.592	0.930	0.286	0.961	0.176	0.898
95% Accuracy	infinite	0.500	0.999	0.036	0.952	0.667	0.951
90% Sensitivity	1.25	0.579	0.247	0.911	0.981	0.060	0.280
95% Sensitivity	1.05	0.564	0.163	0.964	0.989	0.057	0.203
90% Specificity	2.65	0.626	0.912	0.339	0.963	0.168	0.884
95% Specificity	2.95	0.581	0.949	0.214	0.958	0.179	0.912
Cornell voltage product, unadjusted	≥ 244 mVms	0.651	0.926	0.375	0.966	0.210	0.899
	≥ 243.6 mVms	0.649	0.923	0.375	0.966	0.204	0.896
Youden	183.2	0.689	0.752	0.625	0.975	0.117	0.746

90 % Accuracy	245.4	0.643	0.928	0.357	0.965	0.206	0.900
95% Accuracy	426.5	0.508	0.999	0.018	0.951	0.500	0.950
90% Sensitivity	117.3	0.620	0.348	0.893	0.984	0.067	0.375
95% Sensitivity	94.3	0.577	0.207	0.946	0.987	0.059	0.244
90% Specificity	231.2	0.656	0.901	0.411	0.967	0.178	0.876
95% Specificity	262.8	0.627	0.950	0.304	0.963	0.243	0.918
Cornell voltage product, adjusted 0.6 mV (women)	≥ 244 mVms	0.690	0.844	0.536	0.972	0.152	0.828
	≥ 243.6 mVms	0.687	0.838	0.535	0.972	0.148	0.823
Youden	222.6	0.666	0.766	0.661	0.977	0.129	0.761
90 % Accuracy	281.8	0.583	0.928	0.393	0.967	0.222	0.901
95% Accuracy	422.3	0.508	0.997	0.054	0.953	0.500	0.950
90% Sensitivity	143.4	0.644	0.285	0.893	0.981	0.061	0.316

95% Sensitivity	121.4	0.625	0.176	0.946	0.984	0.057	0.214
90% Specificity	263.6	0.627	0.900	0.411	0.967	0.178	0.876
95% Specificity	296.4	0.560	0.949	0.321	0.964	0.250	0.918
Cornell voltage product, adjusted 0.8 mV (women)	≥ 244 mVms	0.703	0.799	0.607	0.975	0.137	0.789
	≥ 243.6 mVms	0.719	0.795	0.643	0.977	0.142	0.788
Youden	243.6	0.650	0.796	0.643	0.977	0.142	0.788
90 % Accuracy	297.3	0.560	0.927	0.375	0.966	0.212	0.900
95% Accuracy	440.1	0.509	0.997	0.054	0.953	0.500	0.950
90% Sensitivity	156.4	0.665	0.304	0.893	0.982	0.063	0.333
95% Sensitivity	121.4	0.625	0.136	0.946	0.980	0.054	0.176
90% Specificity	277.8	0.589	0.900	0.429	0.968	0.183	0.876
95% Specificity	310.0	0.537	0.950	0.339	0.965	0.264	0.920

R amplitude aVL	≥ 1.1 mV	0.627	0.844	0.411	0.965	0.121	0.822
Youden	0.65	0.641	0.567	0.714	0.974	0.080	0.574
90 % Accuracy	1.25	0.629	0.920	0.339	0.964	0.181	0.891
95% Accuracy	1.95	0.525	0.997	0.054	0.953	0.500	0.950
90% Sensitivity	0.35	0.598	0.284	0.911	0.984	0.063	0.316
95% Sensitivity	0.25	0.579	0.194	0.964	0.990	0.059	0.232
90% Specificity	1.15	0.623	0.889	0.357	0.963	0.144	0.862
95% Specificity	1.35	0.614	0.942	0.286	0.962	0.205	0.909
general MESA ECG-LVH	≥ 4.2 mV	0.514	0.439	0.589	0.953	0.052	0.446
Youden	5.15	0.600	0.718	0.482	0.964	0.082	0.707
90 % Accuracy	6.85	0.567	0.938	0.196	0.957	0.143	0.901
95% Accuracy	9.65	0.508	0.999	0.018	0.951	0.500	0.950
90%	2.35	0.485	0.059	0.911	0.926	0.048	0.101

Sensitivity							
95% Sensitivity	1.25	0.486	0.007	0.964	0.800	0.048	0.055
90% Specificity	6.35	0.574	0.897	0.250	0.958	0.123	0.864
95% Specificity	7.05	0.563	0.948	0.179	0.957	0.152	0.909

AUC, area under the curve; NPV - negative predictive value, PPV - positive predictive value

Figure S1. Scatter plots showing correlation between continuous ECG parameters and LV mass index from TTE parameters.



Panel A: Cornell voltage criteria; Panel B: unadjusted Cornell voltage product; Panel C: Cornell voltage product, adjusted for women 0.6 mV; Panel D: Cornell voltage product, adjusted for women 0.8 mV; Panel E: R amplitude in lead aVL; Panel F: General MESA ECG-LVH; Panel G: Sokolow-Lyon voltage; Panel H: Sokolow-Lyon product; Panel I: Framingham-adjusted Cornell voltage

Figure S2: Comparison of AUCs for traditional vs. Youden-index-derived cut-offs, and AUCs at sensitivity, specificity, or accuracy levels exceeding 90% and 95%.


A
Overall
sensitivity
1-specificity
cutoff Cornell criteria
Traditional > 2.0 mV (f), > 2.8 mV (m)
Youden > 2.5 mV
Sensitivity 90% > 1.25 mV
Sensitivity 95% > 1.05 mV
Specificity 90% > 2.65 mV
Specificity 95% > 2.95 mV
Accuracy 90% > 2.85 mV
Accuracy 95% infinite
AUC: 0.643
AUC: 0.665
AUC: 0.579
AUC: 0.564
AUC: 0.626
AUC: 0.581
AUC: 0.592
AUC: 0.500
B
Overall
sensitivity
1-specificity
cutoff Cornell product unadjusted
Traditional ≥ 244 mVms
Traditional ≥ 243.6 mVms
Youden > 183.2 mVms
Sensitivity 90% > 117.3 mVms
Sensitivity 95% > 94.3 mVms
Specificity 90% > 231.2 mVms
Specificity 95% > 262.8 mVms
Accuracy 90% > 245.4 mVms
Accuracy 95% > 426.5 mVms
AUC: 0.651
AUC: 0.649
AUC: 0.689
AUC: 0.620
AUC: 0.577
AUC: 0.656
AUC: 0.627
AUC: 0.643
C
Overall
sensitivity
1-specificity
cutoff Cornell product adjusted 0.6mV
Traditional ≥ 244 mVms
Traditional ≥ 243.6 mVms
Youden > 222.6 mVms
Sensitivity 90% > 143.4 mVms
Sensitivity 95% > 121.4 mVms
Specificity 90% > 263.6 mVms
Specificity 95% > 296.4 mVms
Accuracy 90% > 281.8 mVms
Accuracy 95% > 422.3 mVms
AUC: 0.690
AUC: 0.687
AUC: 0.713
AUC: 0.589
AUC: 0.561
AUC: 0.658
AUC: 0.635
AUC: 0.660
D
Overall
sensitivity
1-specificity
cutoff Cornell product adjusted 0.8mV
Traditional ≥ 244 mVms
Traditional ≥ 243.6 mVms
Youden > 243.6 mVms
Sensitivity 90% > 156.4 mVms
Sensitivity 95% > 121.4 mVms
Specificity 90% > 277.8 mVms
Specificity 95% > 310.0 mVms
Accuracy 90% > 297.3 mVms
Accuracy 95% > 440.1 mVms
AUC: 0.703
AUC: 0.719
AUC: 0.719
AUC: 0.599
AUC: 0.541
AUC: 0.664
AUC: 0.645
AUC: 0.651
E
Overall
sensitivity
1-specificity
cutoff R amplitude aVL
Traditional ≥ 1.1 mV
Youden > 0.65 mV
Sensitivity 90% > 0.35 mV
Sensitivity 95% > 0.25 mV
Specificity 90% > 1.15 mV
Specificity 95% > 1.35 mV
Accuracy 90% > 1.25 mV
Accuracy 95% > 1.95 mV
AUC: 0.627
AUC: 0.641
AUC: 0.598
AUC: 0.579
AUC: 0.623
AUC: 0.614
AUC: 0.629
AUC: 0.525
F
Overall
sensitivity
1-specificity
cutoff MESA ECG LVH
Traditional ≥ 4.2 mV
Youden > 5.15 mV
Sensitivity 90% > 2.35 mV
Sensitivity 95% > 1.25 mV
Specificity 90% > 6.35 mV
Specificity 95% > 7.05 mV
Accuracy 90% > 6.85 mV
Accuracy 95% > 9.65 mV
AUC: 0.514
AUC: 0.600
AUC: 0.485
AUC: 0.486
AUC: 0.574
AUC: 0.563
AUC: 0.567
AUC: 0.508