Received: 30 June 2018 | Revised: 30 July 2018 | Accepted: 14 August 2018

DOI: 10.1002/joa3.12118

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

WILEY Journal of Arrhythmia Open Access

T_{peak}-T_{end}, T_{peak}-T_{end}/QT ratio and T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion for risk stratification in Brugada Syndrome: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Gary Tse MPH, PhD, FESC, FACC, FHRS, FRCP[1,2,3] | Mengqi Gong BS[4] | Christien Ka Hou Li[1,2,3,5] | Keith Sai Kit Leung BSc (Hons) LIBMS[1,2,3,6] | Stamatis Georgopoulos MD[7] | George Bazoukis MSc, MD[7] | Konstantinos P. Letsas MD, FESC, FEHRA[7] | Abhishek C. Sawant MD, MPH[8] | Giacomo Mugnai MD, PhD[9] | Martin C.S. Wong MPH, MD, FESC, FACC, FFPH[10] | Gan Xin Yan MD, PhD[11,12] | Pedro Brugada MD, PhD[9] | Gian-Battista Chierchia MD, PhD[9] | Carlo de Asmundis MD, PhD[9] | Adrian Baranchuk MD, FACC, FRCPC, FCCS[13] | Tong Liu MD, PhD[4] | International Health Informatics Study (IHIS) Network

[1]Department of Medicine and Therapeutics, Faculty of Medicine, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

[2]Li Ka Shing Institute of Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

[3]Shenzhen Research Institute, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China

[4]Tianjin Key Laboratory of Ionic-Molecular Function of Cardiovascular Disease, Department of Cardiology, Tianjin Institute of Cardiology, Second Hospital of Tianjin Medical University, Tianjin, China

[5]Faculty of Medicine, Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK

[6]Aston Medical School, Aston University, Birmingham, UK

[7]Second Department of Cardiology, Laboratory of Cardiac Electrophysiology, Evangelismos General Hospital of Athens, Athens, Greece

[8]Division of Cardiology, Department of Internal Medicine, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York

[9]Heart Rhythm Management Center, Postgraduate Program in Cardiac Electrophysiology and Pacing, Universitair Ziekenhuis Brussel-Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium

[10]JC School of Public Health and Primary Care, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

[11]Lankenau Institute for Medical Research and Lankenau Medical Center, Wynnewood, Pennsylvania

[12]Beijing Anzhen Hospital, Capital Medical University, Beijing, China

[13]Division of Cardiology, Kingston General Hospital, Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada

Correspondence
Gary Tse, Department of Medicine and Therapeutics, Faculty of Medicine, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China.
Email: tseg@cuhk.edu.hk

Funding information
Croucher Foundation, Grant/Award Number: Clinical Assistant Professorship

Abstract

Background: Brugada syndrome is an ion channelopathy that predisposes affected subjects to ventricular tachycardia/fibrillation (VT/VF), potentially leading to sudden cardiac death (SCD). T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals, (T_{peak}-T_{end})/QT ratio and T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion have been proposed for risk stratification, but their predictive values in Brugada syndrome have been challenged recently.

Methods: A systematic review and meta-analysis was conducted to examine their values in predicting arrhythmic and mortality outcomes in Brugada Syndrome.

PubMed and Embase databases were searched until 1 May 2018, identifying 29 and 57 studies.

Results: Nine studies involving 1740 subjects (mean age 45 years old, 80% male, mean follow-up duration was 68 ± 27 months) were included. The mean T_{peak}-T_{end} interval was 98.9 ms (95% CI: 90.5-107.2 ms) for patients with adverse events (ventricular arrhythmias or SCD) compared to 87.7 ms (95% CI: 80.5-94.9 ms) for those without such events, with a mean difference of 11.9 ms (95% CI: 3.6-20.2 ms, $P = 0.005$; $I^2 = 86\%$). Higher (T_{peak}-T_{end})/QT ratios (mean difference = 0.019, 95% CI: 0.003-0.036, $P = 0.024$; $I^2 = 74\%$) and T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion (mean difference = 7.8 ms, 95% CI: 2.1-13.4 ms, $P = 0.007$; $I^2 = 80\%$) were observed for the event-positive group.

Conclusion: T_{peak}-T_{end} interval, (T_{peak}-T_{end})/QT ratio and T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion were higher in high-risk than low-risk Brugada subjects, and thus offer incremental value for risk stratification.

KEYWORDS

Brugada syndrome, risk stratification, sudden cardiac death, T_{peak}-T_{end}, ventricular arrhythmia

1 | INTRODUCTION

Brugada syndrome is a used to describe the combination of specific ECG changes, the Brugada pattern, in addition to life threatening arrhythmias and sudden cardiac death (SCD).[1] Traditionally, it has been considered a congenital ion channelopathy linked to abnormalities in the cardiac sodium channel.[2,3] Recently, pathogenic mutations in other ion channels have been described. Mechanisms of arrhythmogenesis can be broadly divided into triggered activity and re-entry. Of these, re-entry is thought to be the predominant mechanism underlying increased arrhythmogenicity in Brugada syndrome requiring an increased spatial dispersion of repolarization. Such re-entrant activity may involve direct electrotonic activation during phase 2 of the cardiac action potential, as shown in pre-clinical studies using arterially perfused, canine wedge preparations,[4] or circus-type/spiral wave activity around an anatomical or functional obstacle. Regardless of the precise underlying mechanism for re-entry, this transmural dispersion of repolarization can be quantified electrocardiographically by the interval from the peak to the end of the T-wave (T_{peak}-T_{end} interval), (T_{peak}-T_{end})/QT ratio and T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion.[5,6]

However, not all studies have shown an association between higher T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals, (T_{peak}-T_{end})/QT ratio or T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion with an arrhythmogenic phenotype in Brugada Syndrome. Recently, Mugnai and colleagues conducted one of the largest retrospective studies to date, including a total of 448 patients with spontaneous or drug induced type 1 Brugada pattern.[7] They found no statistically significant difference in all three indices between asymptomatic subjects and patients with syncope and malignant arrhythmias. Morita and colleagues also found in 471 patients no difference in T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals between patients with syncope or VT/VF and those who were asymptomatic.[8] These findings contrast with a meta-analysis published previously by some members of our group, which extracted and pooled odds or hazard ratios for the relationship between T_{peak}-T_{end} and arrhythmic and/or mortality outcomes in various clinical conditions, including Brugada Syndrome.[9] This demonstrated prolonged T_{peak}-T_{end} interval was associated with an increased risk of ventricular arrhythmias and SCD in Brugada Syndrome.

However, our previous study did not determine the absolute mean values for T_{peak}-T_{end}, nor was it possible to include the largest dataset from Mugnai and colleagues. Moreover, it did not investigate the utility of other indices such as (T_{peak}-T_{end})/QT ratio or T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion. Therefore, we conducted a systematic review with meta-analysis into the relationships between T_{peak}-T_{end} interval, (T_{peak}-T_{end})/QT ratio and T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion and arrhythmic and/or mortality endpoints in Brugada Syndrome.

2 | METHODS

2.1 | Search strategy, inclusion and exclusion criteria

This study was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISM) statement. PubMed and Embase were searched for studies that investigated the association between T_{peak}-T_{end} or T_{peak}-T_{end} /QT with arrhythmic or mortality endpoints in Brugada syndrome. The following search terms were used for both databases: [“Tpeak-Tend” or “Tpeak-end” or “Tp-e” AND Brugada]. The databases were searched until 1 May 2018 without language restrictions. The following inclusion criteria were used: (a) the study was a case-control, prospective or

retrospective cohort study in human subjects with a Brugada phenotype, (b) T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals or (T_{peak}-T_{end}) /QT ratios were provided; (c) predefined adverse events (appropriate implantable cardioverter-defibrillator therapy [ICD], syncope, ventricular tachycardia/fibrillation [VT/VF], SCD, cardiovascular death [CVD], major adverse cardiac events [MACE]) or all-cause mortality were reported. In cases of incomplete data from the published studies, the original authors were contacted, but no replies were received.

The Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (NOS) was used for quality assessment of the included studies.[10] The NOS system evaluated the categories of study participant selection, results comparability, and quality of the outcomes. Specifically, the following characteristics were assessed: (a) representativeness of the exposed cohort; (b) selection of the non-exposed cohort; (c) ascertainment of exposure; (d) demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at the start of study; (e) comparability of cohorts based on study design or analysis; (f) assessment of outcomes; (g) follow-up periods that were sufficiently long for outcomes to occur; and (h) adequacy of follow-up of cohorts. This scale varied from zero to nine stars, which indicated that studies were graded as poor quality if the score was <5, fair if the score was 5-7, and good if the score was >8. Studies with a score equal to or higher than six were included. The details of the NOS quality assessment are shown in Tables S1 and S2.

2.2 | Data extraction and statistical analysis

Data from the different studies were entered in pre-specified spreadsheets in Microsoft Excel. All potentially relevant studies were retrieved as complete manuscripts, which were assessed fully to determine their compliance with the inclusion criteria. We extracted the following data from the included studies: (a) publication details: last name of first author, publication year and locations; (b) study design; (c) endpoint(s); (d) quality score; and (e) characteristics of the population including sample size, gender, age and number of subjects. Two reviewers (GT and MG) reviewed each included study independently. Disagreements were resolved by adjudication with input from a third reviewer (TL).

Adverse events were defined as ventricular arrhythmias (VT/VF), SCD, cardiovascular death, MACE or all-cause mortality. If more than one mortality endpoint was described, then SCD was preferentially used for analysis, followed by cardiovascular and all-cause mortality in this order. Mean differences between event-positive and event-negative groups, with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for T_{peak}-T_{end} interval, (T_{peak}-T_{end})/QT ratio and T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion were extracted and subsequently combined to generate a pooled estimate.

Heterogeneity between studies was quantified using The Cochran's Q value and the I^2 statistic from the standard chi-square test, which describes the percentage of the variability in effect estimates resulting from heterogeneity. $I^2 > 50\%$ was considered to reflect significant statistical heterogeneity. A fixed effects model was used if $I^2 < 50\%$. The random-effect model using the inverse variance heterogeneity method was used when $I^2 > 50\%$. To locate the origin of the heterogeneity, sensitivity analysis by excluding one study at a time, and subgroup analyses based on different disease conditions and different endpoints were performed. Funnel plots, Begg and Mazumdar rank correlation test and Egger's test were used to detect publication bias.

3 | RESULTS

Figure 1 shows a flow diagram detailing the above search terms with inclusion and exclusion criteria. A total of 29 and 57 entries were retrieved from PubMed and Embase, respectively. Nine studies met the inclusion criteria and were included in our final meta-analysis.[6,7,11-17] In this meta-analysis, a total of 1740 subjects with Brugada Syndrome were included (mean age 45 years old, 80% male). The mean follow-up duration was 68 ± 27 months. Of the entire cohort, 40% had a spontaneous Type 1 pattern and 19% were positive for SCN5a mutation. The baseline characteristics of these studies and of the study populations are shown in Table 1.

3.1 | T_{peak}-T_{end}

For determining T_{end}, the tangent method and the return of the voltage to baseline method were used. T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals from different leads and the maximum of these measurements have been presented by most studies. Regarding maximum T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals, the mean value for the event-positive group was 98.9 ms (95% CI: 90.5-107.2 ms) (Figure 2A) and event-negative group was 87.7 ms (95% CI: 80.5-94.9 ms) (Figure 2B). Five studies reported longer values in the event-positive compared to event-negative groups, whereas four studies reported no significant difference (Figure 2C). T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals were 11.9 ms longer (95% CI: 3.6-20.2 ms, $P = 0.005$) in event-positive patients than in event-negative patients. The Cochran's Q value was greater than the degrees of freedom (56 vs 8), indicating that the true effect size was different between studies.



FIGURE 1 Flow diagram of the study selection process

TABLE 1 Characteristics of the nine studies included in this meta-analysis

First author/ year	Sample size (n)	T_{peak}-T_{end} measurement: method and leads	Age (SD)	No. of males (%)	No. of Sp. type 1 patients (%)	No. of SCN5a positive patients (%)	Endpoints	Comparisons	No. of patients with adverse events /without adverse events/%/% per year	Follow-up duration (months)	Quality score	Ref.
Morita 2017	471	Tangent method; V1, V2, V3, V5	47 (19)	447 (95)	118 (25)	27 (15)	Syncope or VT/VF	Syncope/VT/VF vs asymptomatic	145/326/31/4.09	91	7	16
Mugnai 2017	448	End of the T-wave; V1 to V6	45 (16)	273 (61)	96 (21)	55 (22)	Spontaneous VF or SCD	AT/SD vs asymptomatic	43/290/13/1.67	93	6	7
Kawazoe 2016	143	Tangent method; V1 to V6	46 (12)	140 (98)	84 (59)	–	VF	VF vs no VF	35/108/24/1.9	105	7	17
Zumhagen 2016	78	Tangent method; V1	45 (14)	57 (73)	22 (28)	17 (22)	Spontaneous VT/VF	VT/VF/aborted SCD vs asymptomatic/ syncope	22/54/29/-	–	6	14
Maury 2015	325	Tangent method; V1 to V4	47 (13)	260 (80)	143 (44)	43 (13)	Spontaneous VT/VF	AT/SD vs asymptomatic	26/226/10/2.50	48	7	11
Letsas 2010	23	End of the T-wave; V2, V6	43 (15)	19 (83)	10 (43)	–	Inducible VT/ VF	Inducible VT vs no inducible VT	17/6/74/16.15	55	6	12
Junttila 2008	200	End of the T-wave; V2, II	40 (16)	143 (72)	200 (100)	25 (50)	Syncope, VT/ VF, SCD	Syncope/VT/VF/ aborted SCD vs asymptomatic	66/134/33/-	–	7	15
Wang 2007	23	End of the T-wave; Max from V1 to V6	45 (8)	23 (100)	–	–	Spontaneous VT/VF	Syncope/VT/VF/ inducible VT vs asymptomatic	11/9/55/5.12	43	8	13
Castro Hevia 2006	29	Tangent method, Max from V1 to V6	41 (12)	25 (86)	15 (52)	–	Spontaneous VT/VF	Presyncope/syncope/ aborted SCD vs asymptomatic	12/17/41/3.81	43	8	6

SCD: sudden cardiac death; VT: ventricular tachycardia; VF: ventricular fibrillation; Sp.: spontaneous.

I^2 took a value of 86%, suggesting the presence of substantial heterogeneity. A funnel plot plotting standard errors against differences in means is shown in Figure S1. Begg and Mazumdar rank correlation analysis demonstrated that Kendall's Tau took a value of 0.3 with P = 0.30, which suggests no significant publication bias. Egger's test demonstrated no significant asymmetry (intercept 2.4, t-value 1.2; P = 0.25). To identify the source of the heterogeneity, sensitivity analysis was performed by removing one study at a time, but this did not significantly influence the mean difference (Figure S2), suggesting that no single study was responsible for the heterogeneity observed in this meta-analysis. Subgroup analysis based on the method of T_{end} determination was performed. For the tangent method, the T_{peak}-T_{end} mean difference was 15.5 ms (95% CI: 3.9-27.2 ms; P = 0.009) and I^2 remained high at 90%. For full recovery of voltage to baseline, the mean difference was 6.0 ms (95% CI: 0.7-11.4 ms; P = 0.006) and I^2 remained high at 76%. Therefore, different methods of T_{end} determination did not introduce significant heterogeneity to the pooled effect estimate.

3.2 | (T_{peak}-T_{end})/QT ratio

Regarding maximum (T_{peak}-T_{end})/QT ratio, the mean value for the event-positive group was 0.221 (95% CI: 0.208-0.234) (Figure 3A) and event-negative group was 0.210 (95% CI: 0.205-0.214) (Figure 3B). Two studies reported higher values in Brugada subjects with positive events compared to those without such events, whereas four studies demonstrated no significance between the groups (Figure 3C). Pooling of the mean values demonstrated significantly higher (T_{peak}-T_{end})/QT ratios in the event-positive group than in the event-negative group (mean difference = 0.019, 95% CI: 0.003-0.036, P = 0.024). The Cochran's Q value was greater than the degrees of freedom (19 vs 5), indicating that the true effect size was different between studies. I^2 took a value of 74%, suggesting significant heterogeneity. A funnel plot plotting standard errors against differences in means is shown in Figure S3. Begg and Mazumdar rank correlation analysis demonstrated that Kendall's Tau took a value of 0.07 with P = 1, which suggested no significant publication bias. Egger's test demonstrated no significant asymmetry (intercept 3.5, t-value 1.1; P = 0.31). To identify the source of the heterogeneity, sensitivity analysis was performed by removing one study at a time, but this did not significantly influence the mean difference (Figure S4), suggesting that no single study was responsible for the heterogeneity observed in this meta-analysis. Subgroup analysis based on the method of T_{end} determination was performed. For the tangent method, the mean difference of (T_{peak}-T_{end})/QT ratio was 0.03 (95% CI: 0.01-0.05; $P < 0.05$) and I^2 was lowered to 55%. For full recovery of voltage to baseline, the mean difference was only 0.004 (95% CI: −0.03 to 0.03 ms; P = 0.81) and I^2 remained high at 74%. Therefore, different method of T_{end} determination appeared to contribute partially to the heterogeneity of the pooled effect estimate. Moreover, statistical significance was achieved when the tangent method was used, but was lost when the return to baseline method was used, which may suggest the former approach may be more sensitive.

3.3 | T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion

Regarding maximum T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion, the mean value for the event-positive group was 40.8 ms (95% CI: 26.9-54.8 ms) (Figure 4A) and event-negative group was 29.7 ms (95% CI: 24.5-34.8 ms) (Figure 4B). Regarding T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion, two studies reported longer values in event-positive group compared to event-negative groups, whereas three studies found no significant difference (Figure 4C). Overall, pooling of the data showed that T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion was significantly higher in the event-positive than in the event-negative groups (mean difference = 7.8 ms, 95% CI: 2.1 to 13.4 ms, P = 0.007). The Cochran's Q value was greater than the degrees of freedom (20 vs 4), indicating that the true effect size was different between studies. I^2 took a value of 80%, suggesting significant heterogeneity. A funnel plot plotting standard errors against differences in means is shown in Figure S5. Begg and Mazumdar rank correlation analysis demonstrated that Kendall's Tau took a value of −2 with P = 0.62, which suggests no significant publication bias. Egger's test demonstrated no significant asymmetry (intercept −5.4, t-value 0.8; P = 0.48). To identify the source of the heterogeneity, sensitivity analysis was performed by removing one study at a time, but this did not significantly influence the mean difference between event-positive and event-negative groups (Figure S6), suggesting that no single study was responsible for the heterogeneity observed in this meta-analysis. Subgroup analysis based on the method of T_{end} determination was performed. For the tangent method, the mean difference of T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion was 16.2 ms (95% CI: 7.9-24.5 ms; $P < 0.0001$) and I^2 was 65%. For full recovery of voltage to baseline, the mean difference was 0.4 ms (95% CI: −7.3 to 8.2 ms; P = 0.91) and I^2 was reduced to 19%. Therefore, different method of T_{end} determination contributed heterogeneity to the pooled effect estimate. Moreover, statistical significance was achieved when the tangent method was used, but was lost when the return to baseline method was used, which may suggest the former approach may be more sensitive.

3.4 | Comparisons between patients with and without SCN5A mutations

SCN5A is the commonest ion channel gene that is mutated in Brugada syndrome.[2,3] Separate meta-analyses were conducted to compare the different T_{peak}-T_{end} parameters between patients with and without SCN5A mutations. Two of the included studies provided sufficient information for such analyses.[7,14] No significant difference in T_{peak}-T_{end} (mean difference = 8.2 ms, 95% CI: −6.7 to 23.2 ms, P = 0.28; I^2 = 59%; Figure S7), T_{peak}-T_{end}/QT ratio (mean difference = −0.006 ms, 95% CI: −0.023 to 0.011 ms, P = 0.47; I^2 = 24%; Figure S8) or T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion (mean difference = 5.2 ms, 95% CI: −2.9 to 13.2 ms, P = 0.21; I^2 = 31%; Figure S9) was observed between patients with and without SCN5A mutations.



FIGURE 2 Forest plot demonstrating T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals obtained from event-positive (A) and event-negative (B) groups and the mean difference between both groups (C) in Brugada Syndrome

4 | DISCUSSION

The main findings of our meta-analysis, which included 1597 Brugada subjects, are (a) T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals, (b) (T_{peak}-T_{end})/QT ratio and (c) T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion are higher in Brugada subjects with adverse cardiac events (ventricular tachy-arrhythmias and SCD) when compared to Brugada subjects free from such events.

The presence of pre-existing electrophysiological heterogeneities is important for mediating the normal, unidirectional spread of action potentials in the heart.[18,19] These are attributed to differences in repolarization times of the different cell types, which are responsible for generation of the T-wave on the electrocardiogram (ECG).[20,21] However, exacerbation of such differences has been associated with ventricular tachy-arrhythmias in different conditions, thereby generating a pro-arrhythmic phenotype. These include congenital ion channelopathies such as long QT syndrome and Brugada syndrome[22-24] and acquired cardiac diseases such as myocardial infarction.[25,26] These heterogeneities can occur locally or across the



FIGURE 3 Forest plot demonstrating T_{peak}-T_{end}/QT ratios obtained from event-positive (A) and event-negative (B) groups and the mean difference between both groups (C) in Brugada Syndrome

myocardial wall,[27] potentially causing arrhythmias by inducing unidirectional conduction block and therefore circus-type or spiral wave re-entry.[28,29] Moreover, a greater epicardial-endocardial repolarization time difference may increase the propensity of phase 2 re-entry, which is hypothesized to generate extrasystolic activity in Brugada syndrome.[30] This occurs when sites with an action potential dome to sites which a dome morphology, leading to direct depolarization of the downstream sites.[31] Once an extrasystole is generated, together with a favorable re-entrant substrate, ventricular tachycardia and fibrillation can result.[32]

A number of electrocardiographic indices have been proposed for stratification of arrhythmic or mortality risk.[33,34] Of these, Yan and Antzelevitch were the first to propose the use of the difference between the peak and the end of the T-wave (the T_{peak}-T_{end} interval) as a measure of transmural dispersion of repolarization.[20,35-37] Subsequent clinical studies have demonstrated that, confirmed recently in a systematic review and meta-analysis from our group,[9] that T_{peak}-T_{end} prolongation significantly elevated the risk of ventricular tachyarrhythmias and/or SCD in heart failure, ischemic heart disease, Brugada syndrome, hypertension, and the general population. Recently, Mugnai and colleagues in a total of 448 subjects found no significant differences T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals, (T_{peak}-T_{end})/QT ratio or T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion between patients with VT/VF requiring anti-tachycardia pacing or with sudden death, and those who were asymptomatic.[7] Similarly, in a separate population of 471 subjects, Morita and colleagues found no significance difference in T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals



FIGURE 4 Forest plot demonstrating T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion obtained from event-positive (A) and event-negative (B) groups and the mean difference between both groups (C) in Brugada Syndrome

between patients with syncope or VT/VF and asymptomatic patients.[16] Publication of these two studies prompted us to conduct this meta-analysis, which confirms the value of T_{peak}-T_{end} interval, (T_{peak}-T_{end})/QT ratio and T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion, in distinguishing high-risk patients from low-risk patients.

In the Mugnai study, the largest study to date, the percentage of patients with adverse events were the lowest at 13%.[7] Male gender, a spontaneous Type 1 Brugada pattern and SCN5a mutation positive status were significantly associated with ventricular arrhythmias.[38] Therefore, the lower percentage of patients with adverse events can be explained by the lower percentage of Type 1 Brugada patients (21% vs 28%-100% in the remaining studies) and lower percentage male patients (61% vs 72%-100%) despite similar percentage with SCN5a positive status (22% vs 13%-50%). While these differences in patient characteristics affect the likelihood of adverse events occurring, they should not explain the lack of difference in T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals between event-positive and event-negative groups in the Morita study[16] or the Mugnai study. Interestingly, Mugnai and colleagues found a non-statistically significant lower T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals in event-positive groups. Of the remaining six studies, five studies had reported significantly higher T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals and one study reported no difference.[15] A recent epidemiological study reported a U-shaped relationship between T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals and increased mortality.[39] Autonomic modulation, which is part of Coumel's triad for arrhythmogenesis,[40] is known to modulate the re-entrant substrate. Increased activity of the parasympathetic nervous system may reduce T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals, which may also be pro-arrhythmic.[41] By contrast, exercise, during which sympathetic activity is increased, can exacerbate pre-existing heterogeneities, such as producing conduction slowing[42] and increasing the dispersion of repolarization.[43]

In our previous meta-analysis pooling together studies that reported odds ratios or hazard ratios, the average cut-off for T_{peak}-T_{end} was 95.8 ms across different clinical conditions.[9] The present meta-analysis pooling mean values for event-positive and -negative groups clearly indicates that the 100 ms cut-off is too high for Brugada syndrome. Our data would support a lower cut-off value between 88 and 99 ms to be used. This cut-off will also be method-dependent for determining T_{end} in the case of the T_{peak}-T_{end} intervals. Previously, it was shown that in a cohort of high-risk Brugada subjects, only 10 of 16 studies reported a T_{peak}-T_{end} longer than 100 ms, supporting our notion that this cut-off value may be too high.[44] Moreover, different studies measured T_{peak}-T_{end} from different leads. Some had measured it from all 12 leads and taken the mean values while others have done so for V1 to V3 only. While there is no consensus as to which leads are most appropriate for measurement, obtaining it from all 12 leads is likely to be less useful clinically due to the time-consuming nature. To simplify T_{peak}-T_{end} determination, we would thus propose measuring it from the right precordial leads given BrS is primarily a right ventricular disorder.

While it may appear that the difference in T_{peak}-T_{end} between high-risk and low-risk Brugada patients was only small, at around 12 ms, it should be emphasized that increased transmural dispersion of repolarization is only one mechanism by which re-entrant arrhythmogenesis is generated. Other mechanisms, such as reduced conduction velocity, increased dispersion of conduction[45] or dynamic substrates such as steep action potential restitution,[46] in which normal T_{peak}-T_{end} interval, T_{peak}-T_{end}/QT ratio or T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion may be observed, also contribute to arrhythmogenesis in Brugada syndrome. Therefore, better risk stratification scores will need to incorporate a combination of repolarization and conduction indices. Moreover, some of these dynamic changes may not be detectable on the ECG and may require additional tests such as non-invasive ECG imaging (ECGi),[43] or only becomes detectable only under stressful conditions such as exercise.[43]

4.1 | Limitations

The following limitations of this meta-analysis should be noted. First, there is marked heterogeneity between the included studies. The method of T_{peak}-T_{end} determination across the studies was split even between the tangent method and full recovery of the voltage to baseline. Subgroup analysis based on the method used did not reduce the heterogeneity observed. Therefore, measurement method was unlikely to have significantly contributed to the heterogeneity observed. Moreover, the Letsas 2010 study[12] used a different endpoint of inducible VT compared to the remaining studies, but its exclusion did not significant affect the mean T_{peak}-T_{end} values for event-positive group, event-negative group, and mean difference between these groups. Second, retrospective studies may have more bias than prospective studies. Finally, it should be acknowledged that there is overlap between event-postiive and event-negative groups irrespective of the method of measuring T_{end}. This would suggest as a single measurement, T_{peak}-T_{end} is unlikely to be useful in its own right. Indeed, accurate risk stratification will require a composite scoring system assessing not only dispersion of repolarization, but that of conduction, clinical symptoms, family history, the type of Brugada pattern, genetic background, electrical and drug provocation testing as well as electrophysiological mapping.[38,41,45,47-49]

5 | CONCLUSIONS

T_{peak}-T_{end} interval, T_{peak}-T_{end}/QT ratio and T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion were higher in high-risk than low-risk Brugada subjects, and thus offer incremental value for risk stratification.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

GT thanks the Croucher Foundation of Hong Kong for the support of a clinical assistant professorship.

CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS

Authors declare no Conflict of Interests for this article.

ORCID

Gary Tse http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5510-1253
George Bazoukis http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1009-9772
Giacomo Mugnai http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4733-9418
Carlo de Asmundis http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9351-0760
Adrian Baranchuk http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3042-6569

REFERENCES

1. Brugada P, Brugada J. Right bundle branch block, persistent ST segment elevation and sudden cardiac death: a distinct clinical and electrocardiographic syndrome. A multicenter report. J Am Coll Cardiol. 1992;20(6):1391–1396.
2. Chen Q, Kirsch GE, Zhang D, et al. Genetic basis and molecular mechanism for idiopathic ventricular fibrillation. Nature. 1998;392(6673):293–296.
3. Yan GX, Antzelevitch C. Cellular basis for the Brugada syndrome and other mechanisms of arrhythmogenesis associated with ST-segment elevation. Circulation. 1999;100(15):1660–1666.
4. Burashnikov A, Antzelevitch C. Differences in the electrophysiologic response of four canine ventricular cell types to alpha 1-adrenergic agonists. Cardiovasc Res. 1999;43(4):901–908.
5. Xia Y, Liang Y, Kongstad O, Holm M, Olsson B, Yuan S. Tpeak-Tend interval as an index of global dispersion of ventricular repolarization: evaluations using monophasic action potential mapping of the epi- and endocardium in swine. J Interv Card Electrophysiol. 2005;14(2):79–87.
6. Castro Hevia J, Antzelevitch C, Tornes Barzaga F, et al. Tpeak-Tend and Tpeak-Tend dispersion as risk factors for ventricular tachycardia/ventricular fibrillation in patients with the Brugada syndrome. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2006;47(9):1828–1834.
7. Mugnai G, Hunuk B, Hernandez-Ojeda J, et al. Role of electrocardiographic Tpeak-Tend for the prediction of ventricular arrhythmic events in the Brugada syndrome. Am J Cardiol. 2017;120(8):1332–1337.

8. Morita H, Watanabe A, Kawada S, et al. Identification of electrocardiographic risk markers for the initial and recurrent episodes of ventricular fibrillation in patients with Brugada syndrome. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. 2018;29(1):107–114.
9. Tse G, Gong M, Wong WT, et al. The Tpeak – Tend interval as an electrocardiographic risk marker of arrhythmic and mortality outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Heart Rhythm. 2017;14(8):1131–1137.
10. Marshall SC, Molnar F, Man-Son-Hing M, et al. Predictors of driving ability following stroke: a systematic review. Top Stroke Rehabil. 2007;14(1):98–114.
11. Maury P, Sacher F, Gourraud JB, et al. Increased Tpeak-Tend interval is highly and independently related to arrhythmic events in Brugada syndrome. Heart Rhythm. 2015;12(12):2469–2476.
12. Letsas KP, Weber R, Astheimer K, Kalusche D, Arentz T. Tpeak-Tend interval and Tpeak-Tend/QT ratio as markers of ventricular tachycardia inducibility in subjects with Brugada ECG phenotype. Europace. 2010;12(2):271–274.
13. Wang JF, Shan QJ, Yang B, et al. Tpeak-Tend interval and risk of cardiac events in patients with Brugada syndrome. Zhonghua Xin Xue Guan Bing Za Zhi. 2007;35(7):629–632.
14. Zumhagen S, Zeidler EM, Stallmeyer B, Ernsting M, Eckardt L, Schulze-Bahr E. Tpeak-Tend interval and Tpeak-Tend/QT ratio in patients with Brugada syndrome. Europace. 2016;18(12):1866–1872.
15. Junttila MJ, Brugada P, Hong K, et al. Differences in 12-lead electrocardiogram between symptomatic and asymptomatic Brugada syndrome patients. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. 2008;19(4):380–383.
16. Morita H, Watanabe A, Kawada S, et al. Identification of electrocardiographic risk markers for the initial and recurrent episodes of ventricular fibrillation in patients with Brugada syndrome. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol 2017;29:107–114.
17. Kawazoe H, Nakano Y, Ochi H, et al. Risk stratification of ventricular fibrillation in Brugada syndrome using noninvasive scoring methods. Heart Rhythm. 2016;13(10):1947–1954.
18. Nerbonne JM, Kass RS. Molecular physiology of cardiac repolarization. Physiol Rev. 2005;85(4):1205–1253.
19. Nerbonne JM, Guo W. Heterogeneous expression of voltage-gated potassium channels in the heart: roles in normal excitation and arrhythmias. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. 2002;13(4):406–409.
20. Antzelevitch C. Heterogeneity and cardiac arrhythmias: an overview. Heart Rhythm. 2007;4(7):964–972.
21. Antzelevitch C, Shimizu W, Yan GX, Sicouri S. Cellular basis for QT dispersion. J Electrocardiol. 1998;30(Suppl):168–175.
22. Antzelevitch C, Yan GX, Ackerman MJ, et al. J-Wave syndromes expert consensus conference report: emerging concepts and gaps in knowledge: endorsed by the Asia Pacific Heart Rhythm Society (APHRS), the European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA), the Heart Rhythm Society (HRS), and the Latin American Society of Cardiac Pacing and Electrophysiology (Sociedad Latinoamericana de Estimulacifin Cardiaca y Electro fi siologia [SOLAECE]). Europace. 2017;19(4):665–694.
23. Liu T, Zheng J, Yan GX. J wave syndromes: history and current controversies. Korean Circ J. 2016;46(5):601–609.
24. Tse G, Chan YW, Keung W, Yan BP. Electrophysiological mechanisms of long and short QT syndromes. Int J Cardiol Heart Vasc. 2017;14:8–13.
25. Erikssen G, Liestol K, Gullestad L, Haugaa KH, Bendz B, Amlie JP. The terminal part of the QT interval (T peak to T end): a predictor of mortality after acute myocardial infarction. Ann Noninvasive Electrocardiol. 2012;17(2):85–94.
26. Jani Y, Kamberi A, Xhunga S, et al. The influence of type 2 diabetes and gender on ventricular repolarization dispersion in patients with sub-clinic left ventricular diastolic dysfunction. Am J Cardiovas Dis. 2015;5(4):155–166.
27. Dogan M, Yiginer O, Degirmencioglu G, Un H. Transmural dispersion of repolarization: a complementary index for cardiac inhomogeneity. J Geriatr Cardiol. 2016;13(1):99–100.
28. Shaw RM, Rudy Y. The vulnerable window for unidirectional block in cardiac tissue: characterization and dependence on membrane excitability and intercellular coupling. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. 1995;6(2):115–131.
29. Tse G, Wong ST, Tse V, Lee YT, Lin HY, Yeo JM. Cardiac dynamics: alternans and arrhythmogenesis. J Arrhythm. 2016;32(5):411–417.
30. Tse G, Liu T, Li KH, et al. Electrophysiological mechanisms of Brugada syndrome: insights from pre-clinical and clinical studies. Front Physiol. 2016;7:467.
31. Shimizu W, Aiba T, Kamakura S. Mechanisms of disease: current understanding and future challenges in Brugada syndrome. Nat Clin Pract Cardiovasc Med. 2005;2(8):408–414.
32. Rodriguez-Manero M, Sacher F, de Asmundis C, et al. Monomorphic ventricular tachycardia in patients with Brugada syndrome: a multicenter retrospective study. Heart Rhythm. 2016;13(3):669–682.
33. Robyns T, Lu HR, Gallacher DJ, et al. Evaluation of index of cardioelectrophysiological balance (iCEB) as a new biomarker for the identification of patients at increased arrhythmic risk. Ann Noninvasive Electrocardiol. 2016;21(3):294–304.
34. Tse G. Both transmural dispersion of repolarization and of refractoriness are poor predictors of arrhythmogenicity: a role for iCEB (QT/QRS)? J Geriatr Cardiol. 2016;13(9):813–814.
35. Shimizu W, McMahon B, Antzelevitch C. Sodium pentobarbital reduces transmural dispersion of repolarization and prevents torsades de Pointes in models of acquired and congenital long QT syndrome. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. 1999;10(2):154–164.
36. Emori T, Antzelevitch C. Cellular basis for complex T waves and arrhythmic activity following combined I(Kr) and I(Ks) block. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. 2001;12(12):1369–1378.
37. Yan GX, Antzelevitch C. Cellular basis for the normal T wave and the electrocardiographic manifestations of the long-QT syndrome. Circulation. 1998;98(18):1928–1936.
38. Letsas KP, Asvestas D, Baranchuk A, et al. Prognosis, risk stratification, and management of asymptomatic individuals with Brugada syndrome: a systematic review. Pacing Clin Electrophysiol. 2017;40(12):1332–1345.
39. Bachmann TN, Skov MW, Rasmussen PV, et al. Electrocardiographic Tpeak-Tend interval and risk of cardiovascular morbidity and mortality: results from the Copenhagen ECG study. Heart Rhythm. 2016;13(4):915–924.
40. Coumel P. Cardiac arrhythmias and the autonomic nervous system. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. 1993;4(3):338–355.
41. Lambiase PD. Tpeak – Tend interval and Tpeak – Tend /QT ratio as markers of ventricular tachycardia inducibility in subjects with Brugada ECG phenotype. EP Europace. 2010;12(2):158–159.
42. Amin AS, de Groot EA, Ruijter JM, Wilde AA, Tan HL. Exercise-induced ECG changes in Brugada syndrome. Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol. 2009;2(5):531–539.
43. Leong KM, Ng FS, Roney C, et al. Repolarization abnormalities unmasked with exercise in sudden cardiac death survivors with structurally normal hearts. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. 2017;29:115–126.
44. Rivard L, Roux A, Nault I, et al. Predictors of ventricular arrhythmias and sudden death in a Quebec cohort with Brugada syndrome. Can J Cardiol. 2016;32(11):1355.e1–1355.e7.
45. Meng L, Letsas KP, Baranchuk A, et al. Meta-analysis of fragmented QRS as an electrocardiographic predictor for arrhythmic events in patients with Brugada syndrome. Front Physiol. 2017;8:678.

46. Lambiase PD, Ahmed AK, Ciaccio EJ, et al. High-density substrate mapping in Brugada syndrome: combined role of conduction and repolarization heterogeneities in arrhythmogenesis. Circulation. 2009;120(2):106–117, 1-4.
47. Asvestas D, Tse G, Baranchuk A, et al. High risk electrocardiographic markers in Brugada syndrome. IJC Heart Vasc. 2018;18:58–64.
48. Bayoumy A, Gong MQ, Christien Li KH, et al. Spontaneous type 1 pattern, ventricular arrhythmias and sudden cardiac death in Brugada Syndrome: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. J Geriatr Cardiol. 2017;14(10):639–643.
49. Nunn L, Bhar-Amato J, Lambiase P. Brugada syndrome: controversies in risk stratification and management. Indian Pacing Electrophysiol J. 2010;10(9):400–409.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

How to cite this article: Tse G, Gong M, Li CKH, et al. T_{peak}-T_{end}, T_{peak}-T_{end}/QT ratio and T_{peak}-T_{end} dispersion for risk stratification in Brugada Syndrome: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Arrhythmia*. 2018;34:587–597. https://doi.org/10.1002/joa3.12118