

## Section 9: Electrophysiology Testing and the Use of Devices in Heart Failure

### General Considerations

#### Recommendation

**9.1 It is recommended that the decision to undertake electrophysiologic (EP) intervention, including implantable cardioverter defibrillator (ICD) implantation, be made in light of functional status and prognosis based on severity of underlying HF and comorbid conditions. If an ICD is considered due to left ventricular (LV) dysfunction which is of recent onset, LV function should be reassessed, ideally after 3–6 months of optimal medical therapy. (Strength of Evidence = C)**

#### Background

Trials supporting the use of EP devices in HF for prevention of sudden cardiac death (SCD) typically have excluded patients with persistent New York Heart Association (NYHA) IV HF, patients in cardiogenic shock, those with irreversible brain damage, and those with comorbidities and an expected survival of < 1 year. Recent trials have excluded patients with a recent myocardial infarction (MI), a coronary revascularization procedure within 3 months or ongoing ischemia.<sup>1</sup> This allows adequate time from the index ischemic event for the appropriate application of pharmacologic therapy and for the beneficial effects of the primary therapeutic strategy to be manifest before consideration of device therapy. Patients are not good candidates for device implantation if they have significant psychiatric illness that may be aggravated by device implantation or are not expected to be compliant with systematic follow-up.

### EP Testing and Evaluation of Syncope

#### Recommendation

**9.2 Immediate evaluation is recommended in patients with HF who present with syncope. In the absence of a clear identifiable noncardiac cause, consultation with an EP specialist should be obtained. (Strength of Evidence = C)**

#### Background

Typically, ICD implantation is accepted as first-line therapy in patients presenting with syncope of unknown origin who have hemodynamically significant sustained ventricular tachycardia (VT) induced at EP study (EPS). This

indication is supported by substantial observational data showing an annual cardiovascular mortality of approximately 20% in such patients, much of which appears to result from sudden death.<sup>2–5</sup> A related indication includes patients with recurrent syncope of uncertain etiology in the presence of ventricular dysfunction when other causes of syncope are excluded. Such cases, usually associated with nonischemic dilated cardiomyopathy, may suffer a risk of SCD as high as 45%.

Few studies have been conducted in the setting of nonischemic dilated cardiomyopathy and syncope. One evaluated patients with syncope, inducible ventricular arrhythmias, and previously documented VT.<sup>6</sup> ICDs proved useful in reducing arrhythmic deaths. Another study compared dilated nonischemic cardiomyopathy patients with unexplained syncope and an ICD with a group of cardiac arrest survivors with ICDs.<sup>7</sup> It demonstrated that the number of appropriate ICD discharges in the syncope group were similar to those of the cardiac arrest group. Such data, although rudimentary, do provide insight into recommending strategies for clinical ICD implantation until more definitive evidence is available.

#### Recommendation

**9.3 Routine EP testing is not recommended in patients with LV systolic dysfunction who have asymptomatic nonsustained ventricular tachycardia (VT) in the absence of prior infarction. (Strength of Evidence = B)**

#### Background

The predictive accuracy of EP testing in nonischemic cardiomyopathy is limited.<sup>8–12</sup> On the one hand, when such patients present with spontaneous ventricular arrhythmias, ventricular arrhythmias can be induced in more than two-thirds.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand, EP testing is less likely to induce VT in patients with nonischemic dilated cardiomyopathy and a presentation of aborted SCD or nonsustained VT than in patients with underlying coronary artery disease.<sup>8,11,12</sup> Furthermore, EP can induce ventricular arrhythmias in 10% to 40% of these patients, even in the absence of previous clinical arrhythmias.<sup>8</sup> Thus EP testing is not useful for risk stratification in nonischemic cardiomyopathy. Overall, the magnitude of LV dysfunction remains the best predictor of both SCD and total mortality in this population.<sup>12</sup>

In the setting of ischemic cardiomyopathy and prior infarction, routine EP risk stratification is not recommended. EP testing followed by ICD implantation for inducible sustained VT can be considered for patients in whom there is concern that they are at risk for SCD, but who do not meet guidelines based on the severity of chronic LV dysfunction. This approach may be considered in patients with nonsustained VT who are more than 5 days after MI, or who have had recent revascularization, or who have LV ejection fraction (LVEF) > 0.35.<sup>13,14</sup>

## Prophylactic ICD Placement

### Recommendations

**9.4a Prophylactic ICD placement should be considered in patients with a LVEF  $\leq$ 35% and mild to moderate HF symptoms:**

- Ischemic etiology (Strength of Evidence = A)
  - Non-ischemic etiology (Strength of Evidence = B)
- See Recommendation 9.1 for additional criteria.

**9.4b In patients who are undergoing implantation of a biventricular pacing device according to the criteria in recommendations 9.7-9.8, use of a device that provides defibrillation should be considered. (Strength of Evidence = B)**

See Recommendation 9.1 for additional criteria.

**9.5 ICD placement is not recommended in chronic, severe refractory HF when there is no reasonable expectation for improvement or in patients with a life expectancy of less than 1 year. (Strength of Evidence = C)**

### Background

More than 80 percent of patients who experience a life-threatening ventricular tachyarrhythmia do not survive to benefit from an ICD. Thus, the concept of the ICD for primary prevention of SCD has received considerable attention. Several large trials have been conducted to address primary prevention.<sup>14-19</sup> The Sudden Cardiac in Heart Failure Trial (SCD-HeFT)<sup>15</sup> tested the hypothesis that amiodarone or an ICD would improve survival compared with placebo in patients with HF. The study enrolled 2521 patients with NYHA II or III HF and an LVEF  $<$ 35% of either ischemic or nonischemic etiology. Patients were randomly allocated to treatment with an ICD, amiodarone, or placebo. Background therapy was strong: 87% were on angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors or angiotensin receptor blockers (ARBs) and 78% on beta blockers at last follow-up. ICD therapy decreased mortality by 23% compared with control, with an absolute reduction in mortality of 7% over a mean follow-up of 45 months. The ICD benefit was consistent across ischemic and nonischemic etiologies of HF. Subgroup analysis found benefit in NYHA Class II, but failed to demonstrate benefit from ICDs in patients with NYHA Class III, although such subgroup findings must be interpreted cautiously. A similar subgroup differentiation between NYHA class II and III has not been observed in any other ICD trial.<sup>1,20</sup> There was no benefit for amiodarone.

Trials in patients with ischemic cardiomyopathy, including patients with and without HF symptoms, but excluding Class IV HF, also support benefit of an ICD in reducing total mortality. The Multicenter Automatic Defibrillator Implantation Trial (MADIT)-I enrolled patients with a mean LVEF of 26%, a prior MI, unsustained VT, and

inducible VT at EPS. Those randomized to receive an ICD had a 54% reduction in total mortality at 27 months over those who had been given "conventional" antiarrhythmic therapy.<sup>14</sup> The Multicenter Unsustained Tachycardia Trial (MUSTT) randomized patients with an LVEF  $\leq$ 40% and an inducible sustained VT into a group receiving beta blockers and ACE inhibitors or a group receiving these agents plus antiarrhythmics or, if they did not respond, an ICD. Over a 5-year follow-up, those receiving the ICD experienced a 27% lower risk of arrhythmic death or cardiac arrest. Total mortality was reduced by 20%.<sup>18</sup> MADIT-II showed a significant survival benefit in patients with prior MI and LVEF  $\leq$ 30%, but also a trend toward increased HF episodes in patients receiving an ICD.<sup>1</sup> In contrast, a study of patients undergoing coronary artery bypass (CABG) surgery who have LV dysfunction and abnormal signal-averaged electrocardiograms, but no symptomatic ventricular arrhythmias, found no benefit for prophylactic ICD implantation.<sup>16</sup>

A trial of ICDs for patients with nonischemic dilated cardiomyopathy and nonsustained VT reported a favorable trend for mortality reduction that did not reach statistical significance. A meta-analysis of trials in patients with nonischemic cardiomyopathy and the SCD-Heft trial support a survival benefit for ICDs in patients with nonischemic cardiomyopathy.<sup>15,21</sup>

In evaluating these trial results, it must be remembered that numerous factors can impact ICD effectiveness, including the population tested, mode of implantation, concurrent risk of death (eg, concomitant CABG surgery and its inherent risk), background medical therapy, and the influence of ICDs on nonarrhythmic deaths. For example, only 5% of the control group in MADIT was on beta-antagonist therapy, compared with 27% in the treatment arm. It is likely that this contributed to the decrease in cardiac nonarrhythmic deaths in the ICD group.<sup>14</sup> These trials all exclude patients with severe NYHA functional class IV HF, although the Comparison of Medical Therapy, Pacing, and Defibrillation in Heart Failure (COMPANION) trial, examining biventricular pacing with or without concomitant ICD, included some NYHA class IV patients.<sup>17</sup> In such patients, ICD implantation is under consideration as a "bridge" to transplant.<sup>22</sup>

### Unresolved Issues

**Timing of ICD Placement.** Time on background therapy is a significant issue. All trials of ICDs have enrolled patients receiving stable doses of appropriate medical therapy, including beta-blockers and ACE inhibitors or ARBs. Furthermore, it is well known that treatment with these agents, particularly beta blockers, for a period of several months frequently results in reduction in LV volumes and improvement or normalization of LVEF. For these reasons, it is appropriate to delay consideration of ICD implant, particularly in the setting of newly diagnosed nonischemic dilated

cardiomyopathy, until after several months of appropriate medical therapy. Although there is no agreement regarding the ideal treatment duration prior to reevaluation of LVEF for consideration of ICD placement, data regarding the time course of reverse remodeling following institution of beta-blocker therapy support a period of 3 to 6 months. Although physicians may choose to place a prophylactic ICD in selected patients prior to such a course of therapy, studies to support such a practice are not available.

**Background Therapy.** Device effectiveness generally is studied in patients already on background medical therapy. Studies establishing the additional benefit of new agents change the definition of standard or optimal background medical therapy. For example, a recent study of an aldosterone antagonist showed a 15% reduction in total mortality and a 17% reduction in cardiovascular mortality on top of standard medical therapy, mainly because of a 21% reduction in SCD.<sup>23</sup>

**Significance of Arrhythmias Detected by ICDs.** Trials of prophylactic ICDs have shown that the occurrence of an episode of VT or ventricular fibrillation (VF) is a marker for increased mortality and HF hospitalizations despite effective termination of VT/VF by the ICD.<sup>24–27</sup> VT may be a marker for deterioration of ventricular function. When a patient experiences sustained VT detected by the ICD a careful evaluation and reassessment of HF status and therapy is warranted. The impact of therapies to reduce VT episodes is not clear, although ICD shocks reduce quality of life, and prevention is warranted.

**Family History of Sudden Death.** There are no systematic data to guide therapy when there is a family history of SCD. This includes patients with familial cardiomyopathy with a history of SCD in 1 or more sibling or parent. In such patients routine implantation of an ICD cannot be routinely recommended, but implantation may be considered on an individual basis after careful consideration of the circumstances.

## Recommendation

**9.6 ICD implantation is recommended for survivors of cardiac arrest from ventricular fibrillation or hemodynamically unstable sustained VT that is not due to a transient, potentially reversible cause, such as acute MI. (Strength of Evidence = A)**

## Background

Several studies have shown that ICDs reduce mortality in SCD survivors to a greater extent than antiarrhythmic drug therapy.<sup>28–30</sup> The largest of these trials enrolled 1016 patients who survived cardiac arrest, sustained VT with syncope, or sustained VT in the presence of an LVEF <40% and symptoms suggesting severe hemodynamic compromise. Patients were randomized to receive

therapy with either an ICD or an antiarrhythmic drug, generally amiodarone. Survival throughout the trial was superior for patients randomized to ICD therapy. A second study randomized survivors of cardiac arrest equally among 4 treatment arms: ICD, amiodarone, metoprolol, or propafenone. The propafenone arm was terminated prematurely because of excessive mortality. The 2-year mortality was similar for patients randomized to metoprolol and amiodarone (19.6%) but significantly lower in patients randomized to ICD therapy (12.1%).

Many patients in these trials had reduced LVEF and HF. The mean LVEF in one was 39%; in another it was 32%. The survival benefit of ICD was greatest in patients with an LVEF <35%.

A meta-analysis grouping the results of these three trials indicates that therapy with ICDs resulted in a 27% reduction in total mortality.<sup>31</sup> This mortality reduction is due exclusively to a reduction in arrhythmic deaths, particularly in the presence of LV dysfunction.<sup>32</sup>

## Biventricular Resynchronization Pacing

### Recommendations

- 9.7 Biventricular pacing therapy is recommended for patients in sinus rhythm with a widened QRS interval ( $\geq 120$  ms) and severe LV systolic dysfunction LVEF ( $\leq 35\%$ ) who have persistent, moderate to severe HF (NYHA III) despite optimal medical therapy. (Strength of Evidence = A)**
- 9.8 Biventricular pacing therapy may be considered for patients with atrial fibrillation with a widened QRS interval ( $\geq 120$  ms) and severe LV systolic dysfunction LVEF ( $\leq 35\%$ ) who have persistent, moderate to severe HF (NYHA III) despite optimal medical therapy. (Strength of Evidence = B)**
- 9.9 Selected ambulatory NYHA IV patients in sinus rhythm with QRS  $\geq 120$  ms and LV systolic dysfunction may be considered for biventricular pacing therapy. (Strength of Evidence = B)**
- 9.10 Biventricular pacing therapy may be considered in patients with reduced LVEF and QRS  $\geq 150$  ms who have NYHA I or II HF symptoms. (Strength of Evidence = B)**
- 9.11 In patients with reduced LVEF who require chronic pacing and in whom frequent ventricular pacing is expected, biventricular pacing may be considered. (Strength of Evidence = C)**

## Background

Large observational studies performed in patients with advanced HF have demonstrated that right ventricular (RV) pacing results in worsening symptoms and long-term outcome.<sup>33</sup> This is most likely because of the

development of RV pacing-induced left bundle branch block, resulting in intra- and interventricular dyssynchrony with resultant worsening of left and RV systolic and diastolic function. An analogous phenomenon is seen in patients with advanced HF and bundle branch block. Indeed, the majority of patients with HF have interventricular conduction delay, and up to 30% to 50% have manifest bundle branch block caused by direct pathologic involvement of specialized conduction or by scarring of the myocardium.<sup>34</sup> In those with conduction delay, pacing from the LV or simultaneously from the basal-lateral LV and RV can reduce the delay between septal and posterolateral contraction, to “resynchronize ventricular contraction.” Cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT) seeks to normalize depolarization to improve the efficiency of ventricular contraction and ventricular septal motion, decrease atrioventricular (AV) valve regurgitation, and increase diastolic filling time.<sup>35</sup>

**Isolated Biventricular Pacing.** The early promise of biventricular pacing<sup>34,35</sup> was tested in the Multicenter InSync Clinical Study (MIRACLE),<sup>36</sup> which randomized 453 patients to activation or nonactivation of cardiac resynchronization, using a double-blind study design. Inclusion criteria were NYHA III/IV, QRS > 130 ms, LVEF < 35%, and LV end-diastolic dimension > 55 mm, as determined by echocardiography. Patients were required to be on optimal medical therapy, defined as ACE inhibitors and beta blockers, for 1 to 3 months before inclusion. Resynchronization improved symptoms, quality of life, and exercise capacity, while reducing LV dimension and improving LVEF at 6 months. Hospitalization or intravenous medications for HF treatment were both reduced by approximately 50%. There was no difference in cardiac or all-cause mortality. This study was not subjected to an intention-to-treat analysis, because randomization occurred only after successful device implantation. The Cardiac Resynchronization-Heart Failure (CARE-HF) study enrolled 813 patients with NYHA class III-IV HF resulting from LV systolic dysfunction and cardiac dyssynchrony with an LVEF ≤ 35% and a QRS duration ≥ 120 ms despite standard medical therapy.<sup>37</sup> After a follow up of just under 30 months, the CRT-treated patients showed a significant benefit in terms of the primary end point of all-cause mortality and unplanned hospitalization (HR 0.63,  $P < .001$ ) and the secondary end point of all-cause mortality (HR 0.64,  $P < .002$ ). Those in the CRT group also showed improved LVEF, NYHA class, end-systolic volume, mitral valve function, blood pressure, and quality-of-life indices. It should be noted that for those patients with a QRS lengthening of 120–149 ms, echocardiographic confirmation of mechanical dyssynchrony was required. This subselection criterion could have favorably influenced the outcomes by preferential enrollment of those more likely to respond to CRT. It is not known how many patients were excluded by this criterion.

Virtually all randomized trials of CRT have required subjects to be in sinus rhythm at the time of randomization. Thus few data are available to determine the benefits of

CRT in patients with atrial fibrillation. Retrospective studies and a meta-analysis suggest that patients with chronic atrial fibrillation may benefit from CRT though the benefits may be less than in patients with sinus rhythm.<sup>38</sup> Patients with previous AV nodal ablation and RV pacing may be most likely to benefit from CRT.<sup>39</sup> Prior to considering CRT in a patient with atrial fibrillation, it is important to determine if rate control is adequate to allow biventricular pacing.<sup>40</sup>

**Biventricular Pacing With ICD.** Initial studies of biventricular pacing with an ICD<sup>41</sup> led to the COMPANION trial,<sup>17</sup> which enrolled patients with HF and NYHA Class III or IV symptoms despite maximized medical therapy. Inclusion criteria included a QRS duration ≥ 120 ms and a PR interval > 150 ms. The trial had 3 treatment arms: optimal pharmacologic therapy (OPT), optimal pharmacologic therapy plus biventricular pacing (CRT), and biventricular pacing plus backup ICD therapy (CRTD). In contrast to all others, this study was powered to evaluate a primary endpoint of combined all cause mortality and hospitalization. Data were analyzed using an “intention to treat” statistical approach. Of the 1580 patients randomized, 1080 were implanted with a CRT pacemaker or defibrillator (CRTD). As compared with patients treated with medical therapy only, there was a statistically significant event rate reduction in the primary combined endpoint of total hospitalization and total mortality at 1 year in the CRT and CRTD groups, as well as in the combined endpoint of death and hospitalization for HF. There was a trend toward reduced mortality in the CRT-alone group, although this finding did not reach statistical significance.

**Asymptomatic or Mild HF symptoms.** MADIT-CRT enrolled and followed 1820 patients with ischemic or nonischemic cardiomyopathy, a LVEF of 30% or less, a QRS duration of 130 msec or more, and NYHA class I or II symptoms.<sup>42</sup> Patients were randomly assigned to receive CRT plus an ICD or an ICD alone. The primary end point was death from any cause or a nonfatal heart-failure event (whichever came first). The primary end point occurred in 17.2% of the CRT-ICD group and 25.3% of the ICD only group (hazard ratio in the CRT-ICD group, 0.66; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.52 to 0.84;  $P = 0.001$ ). The superiority of CRT was present in patients with both ischemic and non-ischemic cardiomyopathy and resulted from a 41% reduction in the risk of heart-failure events, a finding that was evident primarily in a prespecified subgroup of patients with a QRS duration of 150 msec or more. CRT was associated with a significant reduction in LV volumes and improvement in the LVEF. There was no significant difference between the two groups in the overall risk of death, with a 3% annual mortality rate in each treatment group.<sup>42</sup>

**Biventricular Pacing when Conventional Pacing is Indicated.** There are few data concerning the use of CRT in either patients with reduced LVEF HF and a QRS ≥ 120 msec who have an additional indication for

ventricular pacing or for those who would likely have a significant burden of RV pacing following ICD implantation. However, substantial data exist to suggest that CRT rather than conventional RV pacing may be considered in these patients. The Homburg Biventricular Pacing Evaluation (HOBIPACE) prospectively randomized 30 subjects with standard indications for pacing and reduced LV function as determined by an LVEF  $\leq 40\%$  or an LV end diastolic diameter  $\geq 60$  mm to RV or biventricular pacing.<sup>43</sup> Peak oxygen consumption, BNP levels, and LVEF were improved in the CRT group compared to the RV pacing group. In another study, patients with chronic atrial fibrillation who had AV junction ablation were randomized to either RV or biventricular pacing. At 6 months post-ablation, patients treated with cardiac resynchronization had a significant improvement in 6-minute walk distance, (31%) above baseline (82.9  $\pm$  94.7 m), compared to patients receiving RV pacing, (24%) above baseline (61.2  $\pm$  90.0 m) ( $P = 0.04$ ). There were no significant differences in the quality-of-life parameters. At 6 months post-ablation, the LVEF in the biventricular group (0.46  $\pm$  0.13) was significantly greater in comparison to patients receiving RV pacing (0.41  $\pm$  0.13,  $P = 0.03$ ). Patients with a LVEF  $\leq 45\%$  or with NYHA Class II/III symptoms appeared to have the most benefit.<sup>44</sup> Other studies have demonstrated an improvement in symptoms and LVEF in patients with reduced LVEF and chronic RV pacing with an upgrade to CRT.<sup>45–47</sup>

### Unresolved Issues With Biventricular Pacing

The evidence supporting CRT in severe HF is compelling. However, device placement exerts a substantial “placebo” response of improved functional capacity and quality of life parameters in those randomized to the control group, and it is hampered by a significant nonresponder rate.<sup>48,49</sup> Most trials of CRT have excluded patients with atrial fibrillation. Thus the benefit of biventricular pacing in these patients remains unknown.

Should resynchronization be done in isolation or must it be accompanied by an ICD device? The findings in SCD-HeFT and COMPANION suggest that CRT therapy ideally should be accompanied by ICD placement in patients with NYHA III symptoms. When considering resynchronization in patients with more severe HF, the appropriateness of ICD implantation is uncertain. A recent analysis of ambulatory NYHA class IV patients in the COMPANION trial demonstrated a benefit of CRT and CRTD, but one year mortality remained high.<sup>50</sup>

**Patients With a QRS Duration 120–150 ms.** A substantial number of potential candidates for CRTs will have a QRS duration between 120 and 150 ms. Although such patients were entered in the clinical trials assessing efficacy of CRT, the average QRS duration was in the range of 160–170 ms and there are concerns that patients with moderate prolongation of the QRS interval may not derive the same benefit as those with more marked prolongation. Although CRT reduced the primary endpoint of time to death or all cause

hospitalization compared to patients randomized to optimal medical treatment by 19% ( $P = .014$ ) in the COMPANION Trial, a significant risk reduction was seen only in patients whose QRS was  $> 168$  ms.<sup>17</sup> Patients whose QRS was  $\leq 147$  ms demonstrated essentially no benefit of treatment, whereas CRT had an intermediate effect in the patients whose QRS duration fell in between these groups. In CARE-HF, there was a benefit of CRT in subjects with a QRS duration of 120–149 msec, but to be enrolled in the study these patients had to have two of three criteria for dyssynchrony (an aortic pre-ejection delay of more than 140 msec, an interventricular mechanical delay of more than 40 msec, or delayed activation of the posterolateral LV wall).<sup>37</sup>

There is no universally accepted method for measuring dyssynchrony, the methods may be operator or equipment dependent, and the strategy of using echocardiographic methods has not been tested against the well-studied strategy of using QRS duration. Therefore, caution should be applied when attempting to interpret echocardiographic measures of dyssynchrony in patients who meet standard criteria for CRT; in particular, caution should be applied when considering patients who do not meet criteria shown to benefit in randomized clinical trials (e.g. narrow QRS duration). Ongoing investigations will likely clarify use of imaging strategies for assessing dyssynchrony in the future.

### Dual Chamber Pacemakers

#### Recommendation

**9.12 The routine use of dual atrioventricular (AV) chamber pacemakers for HF in the absence of symptomatic bradycardia or high-grade AV block is not recommended. (Strength of Evidence = A)**

#### Background

Abnormalities in AV conduction can contribute to a reduction in atrial contribution to ventricular filling and prolong the duration of mitral regurgitation into diastole. Restoration of these 2 hemodynamic phenomena provided the rationale for the potential benefits of AV synchronized pacing with optimal AV delay. Initial success showed a beneficial effect of cardiac pacing with a short AV delay in patients with HF.<sup>51</sup> Subsequent acute<sup>52–54</sup> and chronic studies<sup>55–60</sup> assessing the effect of shortening the AV delay in patients with impaired ventricular function showed mixed results. Three well-designed and randomized studies failed to show any consistent improvements in HF with shortening of the programmed AV delay. Another concluded that for patients with standard indications for ICD therapy, no indication for cardiac pacing, and an LVEF of 40% or less, dual-chamber pacing offers no clinical advantage over ventricular backup pacing and may be detrimental by increasing the combined end point of death or hospitalization for HF.<sup>61</sup>

## References

- Moss AJ, Zareba W, Hall WJ, Klein H, Wilber DJ, Cannom DS, et al. Prophylactic implantation of a defibrillator in patients with myocardial infarction and reduced ejection fraction. *N Engl J Med* 2002;346:877–83.
- Fruhwald FM, Eber B, Schumacher M, Zweiker R, Watzinger N, Klein WW. Syncope in dilated cardiomyopathy is a predictor of sudden cardiac death. *Cardiology* 1996;87:177–80.
- Komajda M, Jais JP, Reeves F, Goldfarb B, Bouhour JB, Juilleries Y, et al. Factors predicting mortality in idiopathic dilated cardiomyopathy. *Eur Heart J* 1990;11:824–31.
- Kushner JA, Kou WH, Kadish AH, Morady F. Natural history of patients with unexplained syncope and a nondiagnostic electrophysiologic study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1989;14:391–6.
- Middlekauff HR, Stevenson WG, Stevenson LW, Saxon LA. Syncope in advanced heart failure: high risk of sudden death regardless of origin of syncope. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1993;21:110–6.
- Fazio G, Veltri EP, Tomaselli G, Lewis R, Griffith LS, Guarnieri T. Long-term follow-up of patients with nonischemic dilated cardiomyopathy and ventricular tachyarrhythmias treated with implantable cardioverter defibrillators. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol* 1991;14:1905–10.
- Knight BP, Goyal R, Pelosi F, Flemming M, Horwood L, Morady F, et al. Outcome of patients with nonischemic dilated cardiomyopathy and unexplained syncope treated with an implantable defibrillator. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1999;33:1964–70.
- Das SK, Morady F, DiCarlo L Jr, Baerman J, Krol R, De BM, et al. Prognostic usefulness of programmed ventricular stimulation in idiopathic dilated cardiomyopathy without symptomatic ventricular arrhythmias. *Am J Cardiol* 1986;58:998–1000.
- Liem LB, Swerdlow CD. Value of electropharmacologic testing in idiopathic dilated cardiomyopathy and sustained ventricular tachyarrhythmias. *Am J Cardiol* 1988;62:611–6.
- Milner PG, DiMarco JP, Lerman BB. Electrophysiological evaluation of sustained ventricular tachyarrhythmias in idiopathic dilated cardiomyopathy. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol* 1988;11:562–8.
- Poll DS, Marchlinski FE, Buxton AE, Josephson ME. Usefulness of programmed stimulation in idiopathic dilated cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 1986;58:992–7.
- Turitto G, Ahuja RK, Caref EB, el-Sherif N. Risk stratification for arrhythmic events in patients with nonischemic dilated cardiomyopathy and nonsustained ventricular tachycardia: role of programmed ventricular stimulation and the signal-averaged electrocardiogram. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1994;24:1523–8.
- Epstein AE, DiMarco JP, Ellenbogen KA, Estes NA III, Freedman RA, Gettes LS, et al. ACC/AHA/HRS 2008 Guidelines for Device-Based Therapy of Cardiac Rhythm Abnormalities: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Writing Committee to Revise the ACC/AHA/NASPE 2002 Guideline Update for Implantation of Cardiac Pacing and Antiarrhythmia Devices): developed in collaboration with the American Association for Thoracic Surgery and Society of Thoracic Surgeons. *Circulation* 2008;117:e350–408.
- Moss AJ, Hall WJ, Cannom DS, Daubert JP, Higgins SL, Klein H, et al. Improved survival with an implanted defibrillator in patients with coronary disease at high risk for ventricular arrhythmia. Multicenter Automatic Defibrillator Implantation Trial Investigators. *N Engl J Med* 1996;335:1933–40.
- Bardy GH, Lee KL, Mark DB, Poole JE, Packer DL, Boineau R, et al. Amiodarone or an implantable cardioverter-defibrillator for congestive heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352:225–37.
- Bigger JT Jr. Prophylactic use of implanted cardiac defibrillators in patients at high risk for ventricular arrhythmias after coronary-artery bypass graft surgery. Coronary Artery Bypass Graft (CABG) Patch Trial Investigators. *N Engl J Med* 1997;337:1569–75.
- Bristow MR, Saxon LA, Boehmer J, Krueger S, Kass DA, De MT, et al. Cardiac-resynchronization therapy with or without an implantable defibrillator in advanced chronic heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2004;350:2140–50.
- Buxton AE, Lee KL, Fisher JD, Josephson ME, Prystowsky EN, Hafley G. A randomized study of the prevention of sudden death in patients with coronary artery disease. Multicenter Unsustained Tachycardia Trial Investigators. *N Engl J Med* 1999;341:1882–90.
- Buxton AE, Lee KL, Hafley GE, Wyse DG, Fisher JD, Lehmann MH, et al. Relation of ejection fraction and inducible ventricular tachycardia to mode of death in patients with coronary artery disease: an analysis of patients enrolled in the multicenter unsustained tachycardia trial. *Circulation* 2002;106:2466–72.
- Kadish A, Dyer A, Daubert JP, Quigg R, Estes NA, Anderson KP, et al. Prophylactic defibrillator implantation in patients with nonischemic dilated cardiomyopathy. *N Engl J Med* 2004;350:2151–8.
- Desai AS, Fang JC, Maisel WH, Baughman KL. Implantable defibrillators for the prevention of mortality in patients with nonischemic cardiomyopathy: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *JAMA* 2004;292:2874–9.
- Saba S, Atiga WL, Barrington W, Ganz LI, Kormos RL, MacGowan GA, et al. Selected patients listed for cardiac transplantation may benefit from defibrillator implantation regardless of an established indication. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2003;22:411–8.
- Pitt B, Remme W, Zannad F, Neaton J, Martinez F, Roniker B, et al. Eplerenone, a selective aldosterone blocker, in patients with left ventricular dysfunction after myocardial infarction. *N Engl J Med* 2003;348:1309–21.
- Goldenberg I, Moss AJ, Hall WJ, McNitt S, Zareba W, Andrews ML, et al. Causes and consequences of heart failure after prophylactic implantation of a defibrillator in the multicenter automatic defibrillator implantation trial II. *Circulation* 2006;113:2810–7.
- Mark DB, Anstrom KJ, Sun JL, Clapp-Channing NE, Tsiatis AA, Vidson-Ray L, et al. Quality of life with defibrillator therapy or amiodarone in heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2008;359:999–1008.
- Poole JE, Johnson GW, Hellkamp AS, Anderson J, Callans DJ, Raitt MH, et al. Prognostic importance of defibrillator shocks in patients with heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2008;359:1009–17.
- Saxon LA, Bristow MR, Boehmer J, Krueger S, Kass DA, De MT, et al. Predictors of sudden cardiac death and appropriate shock in the Comparison of Medical Therapy, Pacing, and Defibrillation in Heart Failure (COMPANION) Trial. *Circulation* 2006;114:2766–72.
- Connolly SJ, Gent M, Roberts RS, Dorian P, Roy D, Sheldon RS, et al. Canadian implantable defibrillator study (CIDS): a randomized trial of the implantable cardioverter defibrillator against amiodarone. *Circulation* 2000;101:1297–302.
- Cooper LT Jr, Berry GJ, Shabetai R. Idiopathic giant-cell myocarditis—natural history and treatment. Multicenter Giant Cell Myocarditis Study Group Investigators. *N Engl J Med* 1997;336:1860–6.
- Kuck KH, Cappato R, Siebels J, Ruppel R. Randomized comparison of antiarrhythmic drug therapy with implantable defibrillators in patients resuscitated from cardiac arrest: the Cardiac Arrest Study Hamburg (CASH). *Circulation* 2000;102:748–54.
- Connolly SJ, Hallstrom AP, Cappato R, Schron EB, Kuck KH, Zipes DP, et al. Meta-analysis of the implantable cardioverter defibrillator secondary prevention trials. AVID, CASH and CIDS studies. Antiarrhythmics vs Implantable Defibrillator study. Cardiac Arrest Study Hamburg. Canadian Implantable Defibrillator Study. *Eur Heart J* 2000;21:2071–8.
- Lee DS, Green LD, Liu PP, Dorian P, Newman DM, Grant FC, et al. Effectiveness of implantable defibrillators for preventing arrhythmic events and death: a meta-analysis. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2003;41:1573–82.
- Cazeau S, Ritter P, Bakdach S, Lazarus A, Limousin M, Henao L, et al. Four chamber pacing in dilated cardiomyopathy. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol* 1994;17:1974–9.
- Cazeau S, Ritter P, Lazarus A, Gras D, Backdach H, Mundler O, et al. Multisite pacing for end-stage heart failure: early experience. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol* 1996;19:1748–57.

35. Leclercq C, Cazeau S, Le BH, Ritter P, Mabo P, Gras D, et al. Acute hemodynamic effects of biventricular DDD pacing in patients with end-stage heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1998;32:1825–31.
36. Abraham WT, Fisher WG, Smith AL, Delurgio DB, Leon AR, Loh E, et al. Cardiac resynchronization in chronic heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2002;346:1845–53.
37. Cleland JG, Daubert JC, Erdmann E, Freemantle N, Gras D, Kappenberger L, et al. The effect of cardiac resynchronization on morbidity and mortality in heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352:1539–49.
38. Schutte F, Ludorff G, Grove R, Kranig W, Thale J. Atrioventricular node ablation is not a prerequisite for cardiac resynchronization therapy in patients with chronic atrial fibrillation. *Cardiol J* 2009;16:246–9.
39. Gasparini M, Steinberg JS, Arshad A, Regoli F, Galimberti P, Rosier A, et al. Resumption of sinus rhythm in patients with heart failure and permanent atrial fibrillation undergoing cardiac resynchronization therapy: a longitudinal observational study. *Eur Heart J* 2010;31:976–83.
40. Gasparini M, Regoli F, Galimberti P, Ceriotti C, Cappelleri A. Cardiac resynchronization therapy in heart failure patients with atrial fibrillation. *Europace* 2009;11(Suppl. 5):v82–v86.
41. Young JB, Abraham WT, Smith AL, Leon AR, Lieberman R, Wilkoff B, et al. Combined cardiac resynchronization and implantable cardioversion defibrillation in advanced chronic heart failure: the MIRACLE ICD Trial. *JAMA* 2003;289:2685–94.
42. Moss AJ, Hall WJ, Cannom DS, Klein H, Brown MW, Daubert JP, et al. Cardiac-resynchronization therapy for the prevention of heart-failure events. *N Engl J Med* 2009;361:1329–38.
43. Kindermann M, Hennen B, Jung J, Geisel J, Bohm M, Frohlig G. Biventricular versus conventional right ventricular stimulation for patients with standard pacing indication and left ventricular dysfunction: the Homburg Biventricular Pacing Evaluation (HOBIPACE). *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2006;47:1927–37.
44. Doshi RN, Daoud EG, Fellows C, Turk K, Duran A, Hamdan MH, et al. Left ventricular-based cardiac stimulation post AV nodal ablation evaluation (the PAVE study). *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol* 2005;16:1160–5.
45. Leon AR, Greenberg JM, Kanuru N, Baker CM, Mera FV, Smith AL, et al. Cardiac resynchronization in patients with congestive heart failure and chronic atrial fibrillation: effect of upgrading to biventricular pacing after chronic right ventricular pacing. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2002;39:1258–63.
46. Baker CM, Christopher TJ, Smith PF, Langberg JJ, Delurgio DB, Leon AR. Addition of a left ventricular lead to conventional pacing systems in patients with congestive heart failure: feasibility, safety, and early results in 60 consecutive patients. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol* 2002;25:1166–71.
47. Leclercq C, Cazeau S, Lellouche D, Fossati F, Anselme F, Davy JM, et al. Upgrading from single chamber right ventricular to biventricular pacing in permanently paced patients with worsening heart failure: The RD-CHF Study. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol* 2007;30(Suppl. 1):S23–30.
48. Bradley DJ, Bradley EA, Baughman KL, Berger RD, Calkins H, Goodman SN, et al. Cardiac resynchronization and death from progressive heart failure: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *JAMA* 2003;289:730–40.
49. Mehra MR, Greenberg BH. Cardiac resynchronization therapy: caveat medicus!. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2004;43:1145–8.
50. Lindenfeld J, Feldman AM, Saxon L, Boehmer J, Carson P, Ghali JK, et al. Effects of cardiac resynchronization therapy with or without a defibrillator on survival and hospitalizations in patients with New York Heart Association class IV heart failure. *Circulation* 2007;115:204–12.
51. Hochleitner M, Hortnagl H, Ng CK, Hortnagl H, Gschnitzer F, Zechmann W. Usefulness of physiologic dual-chamber pacing in drug-resistant idiopathic dilated cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 1990;66:198–202.
52. Brecker SJ, Xiao HB, Sparrow J, Gibson DG. Effects of dual-chamber pacing with short atrioventricular delay in dilated cardiomyopathy. *Lancet* 1992;340:1308–12.
53. Nishimura RA, Hayes DL, Holmes DR Jr, Tajik AJ. Mechanism of hemodynamic improvement by dual-chamber pacing for severe left ventricular dysfunction: an acute Doppler and catheterization hemodynamic study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1995;25:281–8.
54. Shinbane JS, Chu E, DeMarco T, Sobol Y, Fitzpatrick AP, Lau DM, et al. Evaluation of acute dual-chamber pacing with a range of atrioventricular delays on cardiac performance in refractory heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1997;30:1295–300.
55. Capucci A, Romano S, Puglisi A, Santini M, Pagani M, Cazzini R, et al. Dual chamber pacing with optimal AV delay in congestive heart failure: a randomized study. *Europace* 1999;1:174–8.
56. Gold MR, Feliciano Z, Gottlieb SS, Fisher ML. Dual-chamber pacing with a short atrioventricular delay in congestive heart failure: a randomized study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1995;26:967–73.
57. Guardigli G, Ansani L, Percoco GF, Toselli T, Spisani P, Braggion G, et al. AV delay optimization and management of DDD paced patients with dilated cardiomyopathy. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol* 1994;17:1984–8.
58. Hochleitner M, Hortnagl H, Hortnagl H, Fridrich L, Gschnitzer F. Long-term efficacy of physiologic dual-chamber pacing in the treatment of end-stage idiopathic dilated cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 1992;70:1320–5.
59. Innes D, Leitch JW, Fletcher PJ. VDD pacing at short atrioventricular intervals does not improve cardiac output in patients with dilated heart failure. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol* 1994;17:959–65.
60. Linde C, Gadler F, Edner M, Nordlander R, Rosenqvist M, Ryden L. Results of atrioventricular synchronous pacing with optimized delay in patients with severe congestive heart failure. *Am J Cardiol* 1995;75:919–23.
61. Wilkoff BL, Cook JR, Epstein AE, Greene HL, Hallstrom AP, Hsia H, et al. Dual-chamber pacing or ventricular backup pacing in patients with an implantable defibrillator: the Dual Chamber and VVI Implantable Defibrillator (DAVID) Trial. *JAMA* 2002;288:3115–23.