Relation between QT interval variability and cardiac sympathetic activity in hypertension
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Baumert M, Schlaich MP, Nalivaiko E, Lambert E, Ika Sari C, Kaye DM, Elser MD, Sanders P, Lambert G. Relation between QT interval variability and cardiac sympathetic activity in hypertension. Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol 300: H1412–H1417, 2011. First published January 21, 2011; doi:10.1152/ajpheart.01184.2010.—Elevated QT interval variability is a predictor of malignant ventricular arrhythmia, but the underlying mechanisms are incompletely understood. Besides electrical restitution, which reflects the intrinsic adaptation of the action potential duration to changes in cycle length (14), the autonomic nervous system is thought to play a key role in the genesis of beat-to-beat QT interval variability. Previous studies addressing this issue have provided conflicting results. A recent study in dogs showed that QT variability was related to left stellate-ganglion activity, but only after the dogs had developed heart failure (28). In healthy humans, pharmacological activation or blockade of β-adrenoceptors augmented and reduced QT variability, respectively (23, 35). Cardiac norepinephrine (NE) spillover, the most direct index of cardiac sympathetic activity, had no association with QT variability in patients with panic disorder and depression, patients who were free of current underlying cardiovascular disease (2). To gain further insight into the role of cardiac sympathetic activity in the genesis of QT interval variability in humans, we measured cardiac NE spillover and QT variability in patients with essential hypertension. Hypertension is associated with increased cardiac and vascular sympathetic activity as well as with an increased risk for arrhythmia (12, 16, 22) and therefore provides a suitable model to study the relationship between QT interval variability and cardiac sympathetic activation.

METHODS

Subjects. The study cohort comprised a subsample of 23 patients with essential hypertension and 9 normotensive subjects who were drawn from an earlier study examining sympathetic activation in hypertension (31). Demographic data are summarized in Table 1. None of the patients had accelerated hypertension, clinical coronary artery disease, heart failure, history of stroke, renal insufficiency, or diabetes mellitus. A previous use of antihypertensive therapy was reported in 11 hypertensive subjects. Antihypertensive therapy was discontinued for at least 4 wk before the study.

Normotensive subjects underwent careful clinical evaluation and serum biochemistry measurements to exclude renal and hepatic disease. None of the subjects had a history of incidental disease or blood pressure (BP) >140/85 mmHg.

BP readings were taken according to World Health Organization recommendations (1). During screening, subjects were classified as normotensive if the average of four casual BP measurements taken in our outpatient clinic were <140 mmHg systolic and <90 mmHg diastolic on two different occasions. Subjects were classified as hypertensive if the mean of four casual BP measurements taken in the outpatient clinic was >140 mmHg systolic or >90 mmHg diastolic on
two different occasions. These were confirmed by intra-arterial BP measurements during catheterization. The study protocol was approved by the Alfred Hospital Ethics Review Committee, and all participants provided written informed consent.

The study commenced in the morning after an overnight fasting period >12 h with abstinence from smoking, alcohol, tea, and coffee.

**Echocardiography.** Two-dimensional-guided M-mode echocardiography was performed in all subjects, using a Sonos5500 (Agilent Technologies). LV dimensions and mass were quantified according to the recommendations of the American Society of Echocardiography (7). LV mass was corrected following the suggestions of Devereux et al. (10). Detailed results of the echocardiographic assessment have been previously presented (31).

**Cardiac NE spillover measurement.** This procedure has been previously described in detail (13). Participants received a tracer infusion of $^3$H]NE (specific activity of 11–25 Ci/mmol; New England Nuclear) via a peripheral vein at 0.6 to 0.8 µCi/min, after a priming bolus of 12 µCi under local anesthesia. The radial artery was cannulated for arterial BP monitoring and blood sampling. A venous introducer sheath was placed in the antecubital fossa, and a coronary sinus sheath was placed in the coronary sinus for blood sampling. For the coronary sinus NE plasma concentration, arterial NE plasma concentration, pg/ml 198 ± 253.7

Table 2. NE plasma kinetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>EH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial NE plasma concentration, pg/ml</td>
<td>198 ± 42</td>
<td>260 ± 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary sinus NE plasma concentration, pg/ml</td>
<td>194 ± 55</td>
<td>253.7 ± 104*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary sinus plasma flow, ml/min</td>
<td>82.6 ± 16.6</td>
<td>90.6 ± 29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fractional transcardiac $^3$H]NE extraction, %</td>
<td>0.69 ± 0.11</td>
<td>0.59 ± 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE plasma clearance, ml/min</td>
<td>1,302 ± 520</td>
<td>1,557 ± 620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole body NE spillover, ng/min</td>
<td>254 ± 115</td>
<td>402 ± 209*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac NE spillover, ng/min</td>
<td>12.2 ± 6.5</td>
<td>20.7 ± 14.7*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are means ± SD; n, number of subjects. NE, norepinephrine. *P < 0.05.
Subgroup correlation analysis between QTVN and RRVN revealed a significant association between both in hypertensive patients ($r^2 = 0.33$, $P = 0.004$) but not in normotensive patients (Fig. 3). There was no significant correlation between RRVN and cardiac NE spillover.

Stepwise multiple linear regression analysis with QTVN as the dependent variable and all other measures obtained in this study as independent variables identified only cardiac NE spillover ($\beta = 0.54$, $t = 3.6$, $P < 0.002$) and RRVN ($\beta = 0.43$, $t = 2.8$, $P = 0.01$) as independent predictors, resulting in a significant model with an adjusted $R^2 = 0.51$ (ANOVA; $P < 0.001$).

**DISCUSSION**

Our major novel finding is the relationship between directly assessed cardiac sympathetic activity and beat-to-beat QT variability in humans. The amount of cardiac NE spillover is correlated to the magnitude of beat-to-beat fluctuations of the QT interval in patients with hypertension.

In our cohort of hypertensive patients, QTVi and cardiac NE spillover were elevated compared with normotensive subjects, demonstrating that ventricular repolarization lability and cardiac sympathetic activation are increased, which is in line with previous findings (26). Moreover, a correlation analysis of our data provides the first direct evidence that the magnitude of QT variability is related to cardiac sympathetic activation in hypertensive patients. QT variability was also partially correlated with systolic BP, possibly demonstrating the relationship between myocardial contractility and QT variability.

**Table 3. QT interval variability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>EH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTm, ms</td>
<td>395 ± 51</td>
<td>397 ± 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTc, ms</td>
<td>409 ± 39</td>
<td>403 ± 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTvi</td>
<td>$-1.75 ± 0.36$</td>
<td>$-1.42 ± 0.50^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT/RR coherence</td>
<td>0.49 ± 0.22</td>
<td>0.36 ± 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTVN × 1,000</td>
<td>0.09 ± 0.06</td>
<td>0.13 ± 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRVN × 1,000</td>
<td>5.02 ± 4.60</td>
<td>4.22 ± 5.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are means ± SD; $n$, number of subjects. QTm, mean QT interval; QTc, corrected QT interval; QTvi, QT variability index; QTVN, QT variability; RRVN, RR variability. *$P < 0.05$. 

---

Fig. 1. Relationship between cardiac norepinephrine (NE) spillover and systolic blood pressure (BP; A) and between systolic BP and QT interval variability (QTVN; B).

Fig. 2. Relationship between QTVN and cardiac NE spillover in hypertensive patients (A) and normotensive subjects (B).
It is well established that the average QT interval of the body surface ECG is modulated by the autonomic nervous system (11, 37), and our data suggest that this autonomic influence extends to beat-to-beat fluctuations of the QT interval. Although the underlying mechanisms are currently unknown, the lack of homogeneity of β-adrenoceptors and variable arborization of the sympathetic nerves (25, 37) may contribute to spatial dispersion in the action potential duration in the ventricular myocardium and thereby increase QT interval variability during periods of higher sympathetic activity. In support of this view, patients with autonomic failure and heterogeneous autonomic denervation showed prolonged QT intervals and increased spatial QT dispersion (8). β-Adrenoceptor activation by isoprotenerol has been shown to increase beat-to-beat QT variability in healthy subjects during sinus rhythm (35), and β-adrenoceptor blockade with propranolol decreased QT variability in normal subjects (29). Furthermore, multiscale entropy and detrended fluctuation analyses of the QT time series revealed markedly different temporal organization and complexity compared with the RR time series and provided additional evidence for the weak dependence of beat-to-beat QT variability on RR variability and respiration and is possibly related to sympathetic activation (30). Alternatively, an additional change in the cardiac substrate might be necessary for the correlation between cardiac NE spillover and QT variability to occur. In line with this view, dogs displayed a relationship between left stellate-ganglion activity and QT variability, but only after they developed heart failure (28), suggesting that myocardial structural damage as well as sympathetic activation may be required.

The mechanisms by which subjects develop an association between cardiac sympathetic activity and QT variability are not clear. Results from selective versus combined pharmacological block of slow and rapid outward potassium currents in rabbits and dogs imply that a reduction in repolarization reserve may be an important mechanism for augmenting QT variability (21). A study of isolated canine myocytes found that isoproterenol infusion during slow delayed rectifier K+ current block increased the beat-to-beat variability of repolarization (18). There are several lines of evidence for an association between sympathetic activation and subclinical organ damage in humans (19). Sympathetic activation promotes LV hypertrophy (31) and LV diastolic dysfunction (16). In particular, the density and distribution of adrenoceptors throughout the ventricular myocardium might be altered. Global and regional cardiac [123I]metaiodobenzylguanidine uptake was shown to be altered in hypertensive patients with LV hypertrophy compared with normotensive subjects (15).

Although cardiac NE spillover was the main contributor to QT variability in our hypertensive patients, it explained only around 30% of its variance. Stepwise linear regression analysis further identified RR variability as an independent contributor to QT variability that accounts for a small portion of variance (≈15%) and most likely reflects electrical restitution (14). The relationship between cycle length and action potential duration is complex and involves long-lasting adjustments (14), and therefore the association between QT variability and RR variability is rather weak. Dynamic linear parametric modeling of the RT-RR relationship suggests that, in particular, very low frequency power of RT variability is largely independent of RR variability in normal subjects (29). Furthermore, multiscale entropy and detrended fluctuation analyses of the QT time series revealed markedly different temporal organization and complexity compared with the RR time series and provided additional evidence for the weak dependence of beat-to-beat QT variability on RR variability and respiration and is possibly related to sympathetic activation (30). Alternatively, an additional change in the cardiac substrate might be necessary for the correlation between cardiac NE spillover and QT variability to occur. In line with this view, dogs displayed a relationship between left stellate-ganglion activity and QT variability, but only after they developed heart failure (28), suggesting that myocardial structural damage as well as sympathetic activation may be required.

The mechanisms by which subjects develop an association between cardiac sympathetic activity and QT variability are not clear. Results from selective versus combined pharmacological block of slow and rapid outward potassium currents in rabbits and dogs imply that a reduction in repolarization reserve may be an important mechanism for augmenting QT variability (21). A study of isolated canine myocytes found that isoproterenol infusion during slow delayed rectifier K+ current block increased the beat-to-beat variability of repolarization (18). There are several lines of evidence for an association between sympathetic activation and subclinical organ damage in humans (19). Sympathetic activation promotes LV hypertrophy (31) and LV diastolic dysfunction (16). In particular, the density and distribution of adrenoceptors throughout the ventricular myocardium might be altered. Global and regional cardiac [123I]metaiodobenzylguanidine uptake was shown to be altered in hypertensive patients with LV hypertrophy compared with normotensive subjects (15).

Although cardiac NE spillover was the main contributor to QT variability in our hypertensive patients, it explained only around 30% of its variance. Stepwise linear regression analysis further identified RR variability as an independent contributor to QT variability that accounts for a small portion of variance (≈15%) and most likely reflects electrical restitution (14). The relationship between cycle length and action potential duration is complex and involves long-lasting adjustments (14), and therefore the association between QT variability and RR variability is rather weak. Dynamic linear parametric modeling of the RT-RR relationship suggests that, in particular, very low frequency power of RT variability is largely independent of RR variability in normal subjects (29). Furthermore, multiscale entropy and detrended fluctuation analyses of the QT time series revealed markedly different temporal organization and complexity compared with the RR time series and provided additional evidence for the weak dependence of beat-to-beat QT variability on RR variability and respiration and is possibly related to sympathetic activation (30). Alternatively, an additional change in the cardiac substrate might be necessary for the correlation between cardiac NE spillover and QT variability to occur. In line with this view, dogs displayed a relationship between left stellate-ganglion activity and QT variability, but only after they developed heart failure (28), suggesting that myocardial structural damage as well as sympathetic activation may be required.
variability on RR variability (M. Baumert, M. Javorka, A. Seeck, R. Faber, and A. Voss; unpublished observations).

In clinical research, beat-to-beat QT variability is often considered in its normalized form QT Vi, i.e., as the ratio of QT variability to RR variability, both divided by the squared means of QT and RR intervals, respectively. The interpretation of this simple index is rather difficult. Instead of removing the part of QT variability that is attributed to heart rate, RR variability is explicitly introduced into the equation. Consequently, a change in QT Vi can be caused by a change in QT variability and/or RR variability. As the magnitude of RR variability is usually higher than that of QT variability and resting RR variability is not correlated with cardiac NE spillover (3, 24), the lack of association between QT Vi and cardiac NE spillover is not unexpected.

Technical considerations and limitations. Beat-to-beat fluctuations in the QT interval are typically small, and measurement noise might have a considerable impact on QT variability measures. In this study we were only able to record one ECG lead. Because QT variability is dependent on the recording site, we consistently used lead III. Because of the invasive nature of the study, the control group was relatively small, which limited the statistical power of our study. We therefore cannot exclude the possibility of a weak correlation between cardiac NE spillover and QT Vi in normal subjects. One subject in the hypertensive group had very high QT Vi and cardiac NE spillover values and might have been the major driver of the significant correlation. However, the correlation between cardiac NE spillover and QT Vi remained significant when excluding this subject from the analysis.

Conclusions. A cross-sectional analysis of patients with hypertension shows a moderate yet significant correlation between cardiac NE spillover and beat-to-beat QT variability. QT interval variability in patients with cardiovascular disease may therefore partly reflect cardiac sympathetic activation.
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