Initial experience with dual-sensor rate-responsive pacemakers in children
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The efficacy of a new single-chamber, rate-responsive pacemaker that utilizes information from two sensors, activity and stimulus to T wave, was evaluated in 15 children during a mean follow-up period of 10.3 ± 3.3 months (range 5–16 months). There were 10 males and five females, with a mean age of 5.9 ± 3.8 years (range 9 months–16 years). The indication for pacing was high grade atrioventricular block in 10 (eight postoperative, two congenital), and sinus node dysfunction in five patients.

In endocardial implants the mean T wave amplitude was 2.48 ± 0.7 mV, and mean T wave sensing 91 ± 6.3%, whereas in epicardial implants T wave amplitude and sensing were inadequate. Each patient underwent 24-h Holter monitoring and 10 performed a graded treadmill test in three sensor-blending modes (Stimulus-T=Activity, Stimulus-T>Activity, Stimulus-T<Activity), using the chronotropic assessment exercise protocol. Sensor cross-checking was analysed by continuous tapping over the pacemaker. Holter monitoring demonstrated that pacing rate variations were closely related to daily activity. At the initial phases of exercise testing, the mean percentage of increase in pacing rate was significantly lower in Stimulus-T>Activity mode, when compared to Stimulus-T=Activity (P<0.01); however, the initial disparity among the three modes disappeared halfway through the exercise and similar heart rate changes were observed thereafter. Continuous tapping over the pacemaker in Stimulus-T=Activity mode caused an initial increase in pacing rate, and inappropriate responses were quickly corrected by sensor cross-checking.

Rate modulation with a single-chamber, dual-sensor pacemaker is adequate and safe in children, and may offer significant advantages over single-sensor devices in endocardial implants.
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Introduction

The advantages of rate responsive ventricular (VVIR) pacing over fixed rate ventricular pacing (VVI) are well established[1,2]. Several different sensors, including central venous temperature, oxygen saturation, pH value, stimulus to T wave, body activity, respiratory rate, right ventricular dP/dt, minute ventilation, stroke volume, evoked potentials and atrial rate have been used for rate modulated pacing[3-12]. However, each sensor has its advantages and disadvantages and no single pacing device can adapt its pacing rate appropriately to all changing circumstances.

Recent developments in pacing provided the opportunity to combine information from two sensors into a rate-adaptive algorithm, which may offer advantages over individual sensors. Thus, a new single-chamber rate-responsive pacemaker (Topaz, Vitatron Medical, The Netherlands) became available that utilizes information from two sensors, activity and stimulus to T wave[13].

There are several reports about the efficacy of this new device in adults, but there is limited information about its use in children[14-16]. The aim of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and reliability of this dual-sensor pacing system in children.

Methods

Patients

The Topaz models 500 or 515 were implanted in 15 children. There were 10 males and five females whose mean age was 5.9 ± 3.8 years (range 9 months–14 years) at the time of implantation. Indications for permanent cardiac pacing were high grade atrioventricular block in 10 patients (eight postoperative, two congenital), and sinus node dysfunction in five patients.
Seven patients underwent an initial implant and eight had depleted generators replaced. In five patients the epicardial implants were inserted by a cardiovascular surgeon, and in 10 insertion was via percutaneous transvenous endocardial implantation by puncture of the subclavian vein and took place in the cardiac catheterization laboratory. The generators were positioned in the subpectoral area in the latter group. The electrodes were unipolar and bipolar in epicardial and endocardial implants, respectively.

Pacing device

The implanted device (Topaz, Vitatron) is the first available single-chamber, dual-sensor rate-responsive pacemaker\textsuperscript{13}. It utilizes information derived from the stimulus to the T wave, and from an activity-sensing piezoelectric crystal to determine pacing rate. The contribution of each sensor (sensor blending) is programmable for each patient and if there is disagreement between the two sensors with regard to the optimum pacing rate, 'sensor cross checking' is designed to correct any inappropriately high pacing rate.

Statistical analysis

Data are expressed as mean ± SD. Differences in heart rate increase during exercise testing among three sensor-blending modes were examined by Kruskal–Wallis one-way ANOVA (analysis of variance). When there was a significant difference among three groups, the Mann–Whitney U test was performed to compare two groups. A value of $P<0.05$ was considered significant.

Results

At the time of implantation, the pacing threshold was <1.3 volts (V) in all but one of the patients with an epicardial electrode, whose pulse amplitude threshold was 2.7 V. The mean pulse width was 0.41 ms (median = 0.40), the mean ventricular impedance was 437 ± 100 \( \Omega \) (median = 400 \( \Omega \)), and the mean refractory period was 328.5 ± 7.1 ms (median = 330 ms) (Table 1). The programmed mean lower rate and mean upper rate were 64.3 ± 9.2 (median = 60) and 146.6 ± 11 (median = 150),

### Table 1 Initial and final data of the patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmed values</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensor blending</td>
<td>QT = ACT (M:60)</td>
<td>QT = ACT (n:6), QT &lt; ACT (n:9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity threshold</td>
<td>medium (M:150)</td>
<td>med (n:10), med-low (n:3),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal rate (ppm)</td>
<td>64.3 ± 9.2 (M:60)</td>
<td>64.3 ± 9.2 (M:60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximal rate (ppm)</td>
<td>146.6 ± 11 (M:150)</td>
<td>146.6 ± 11 (M:150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>auto</td>
<td>auto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity (mV)</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.3 (M:2)</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.3 (M:2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse duration (ms)</td>
<td>0.41 ± 0.03 (M:0.04)</td>
<td>0.41 ± 0.03 (M:0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refractory period (ms)</td>
<td>328.5 ± 7.1 (M:330)</td>
<td>328.5 ± 7.1 (M:330)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse amplitude (V)</td>
<td>4.78 ± 0.69 (M:5.3)</td>
<td>3.9 ± 0.62 (M:5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measured data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amplitude threshold (volt)</td>
<td>&lt;1.3</td>
<td>&lt;1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse duration threshold (ms)</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead impedance (ohm)</td>
<td>437 ± 101 (M:400)</td>
<td>437 ± 101 (M:400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paced ventricular rate (%)</td>
<td>85.5 ± 20 (M:95)</td>
<td>86 ± 20 (M:95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T wave amplitude (mV)*</td>
<td>2.48 ± 0.07 (M:2.8)</td>
<td>2.77 ± 0.07 (M:2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T wave sensing (%)</td>
<td>91 ± 6.3 (M:94)</td>
<td>73.4 ± 3.2 (M:94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACT = activity; M = median; med = medium, n = number of patients, QT = stimulus to T wave; * = in endocardial implants.
respectively. Most of the patients had completely paced cardiac rhythm and the mean paced ventricular rate was 85.5 ± 20% (median = 95%). The initial activity threshold was programmed to medium, and sensor blending to Stimulus-T=Activity mode.

The mean T wave amplitude in endocardial implants was 2.48 ± 0.7 mV (range 1.3-3.1 mV), but it was undetectable in epicardial implants. T wave sensing was 91 ± 6.3% (range 44-99%) in the former group, but inadequate in the latter group. During follow-up, a slight decrease in mean T wave sensing was observed (to 73.4 ± 32.2%; median 85%), due to a significant decrease in T wave sensing in one of the patients. The other parameters remained stable throughout the follow-up period.

Results of 24-h Holter monitoring demonstrated that the increases in pacing rate were closely related to daily activity (Fig. 1), but none of the patients reached the programmed maximal heart rate level during daily activity. Minimal, maximal and the mean heart rates are illustrated in Table 2.

**Exercise testing**

Exercise testing was performed in 10 patients with three different sensor blending modes (Stimulus-T=Activity, Stimulus-T>Activity, Stimulus-T<Activity). The mean duration of exercise was similar in the three modes. Furthermore, the mean value of the maximal pacing rate and the mean percentage of total pacing rate change at the end of the exercise test were not significantly different. However, the mean percentage of increase in pacing rates at the initial phases of the treadmill test was significantly different in three sensor blending modes (Table 3). In the Stimulus-T<Activity mode there was a slower initial increase in pacing rate at the beginning of the exercise test, whereas in Stimulus-T=Activity mode a faster increase in pacing rate was achieved (P<0.01).

Heart rate response to exercise was not statistically significant in Stimulus-T=Activity and Stimulus-T<Activity modes. The initial disparity among the three modes disappeared halfway through the exercise and similar heart rate changes were observed thereafter (Fig. 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Results of 24-h Holter monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean heart rate (ppm)</td>
<td>77.3 ± 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal rate (ppm)</td>
<td>64.2 ± 11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximal rate (ppm)</td>
<td>122.8 ± 11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sensor cross-checking**

Continuous gentle tapping on the pacemaker in the Stimulus-T=Activity mode in endocardial implants caused an initial increase in pacing rate from 66 ± 5 ppm to a peak of 98 ± 13 ppm. The maximum acceleration of 14.8% was achieved 2.4 min after the beginning of tapping, and afterwards the pacing rate decreased to the initial level at the 12th min of tapping (Fig. 3).
Topaz is a new single-chamber rate-responsive pacemaker that utilizes information from two sensors, activity and stimulus to T wave, and can programme the contribution of each sensor to the overall rate response.

In our study, to find the optimal sensor-blending mode, exercise testing was performed using three different sensor blendings (Stimulus-T=Activity, Stimulus-T>Activity, Stimulus-T<Activity), in each patient. The initial rate response in Stimulus-T>Activity mode was too slow, whereas rate responses in Stimulus-T=Activity and Stimulus-T<Activity were appropriate during exercise testing. Although rate variations might be expected, in this study no significant differences in rate response in Stimulus-T=Activity and Stimulus-T<Activity modes were detected. With the contribution of both sensors we prevented non-physiological responses that were too fast or too slow, but achieved an appropriate heart rate increase at the onset of exercise testing. However, we evaluated only the chronotropic response to exercise but not workload. Therefore, further studies are needed in children to determine the optimum sensor blending mode that causes rate response proportional to the level of workload.

It is well known that programmed exercise protocols may not simulate daily activity exactly, since daily life includes bursts of activity, mental stress and intellectual effort in addition to graded physical stress. Hence 24-h Holter monitoring may be more demonstrative of the daily use of the sensor function. When we examined the results of 24-h Holter monitoring we found that the changes in pacing rate were closely related to daily activity.

Sensor cross-checking is an important feature of this device. We tested it by continuous tapping on the generator, with the pacemaker programmed to Stimulus-T=Activity mode. This procedure produced an initial increase in pacing rate because of activity sensing, but within a few minutes the inappropriate response was corrected by cross-checking from the Stimulus-T sensors.

Our study demonstrated that T wave sensing was satisfactory both at implantation and during follow-up in endocardial implants. However, due to inadequate T wave sensing, a T wave-sensing pacemaker may not respond well to mental stress or isometric exercise where there are few body movements. On the other hand, physiological sensors, such as stimulus to T wave, temperature, pH, respiratory rate or oxygen saturation, may vary their pacing rate in accordance with physiological demand, though their rate of adaptation at the beginning of exercise is often poor.
wave sensing, dual-sensor pacemakers may not offer significant advantages over single-sensor devices in epicardial implants. Therefore, in epicardial implants, an activity-only device may be more suitable in order to save the extra expenditure of the dual-sensor system. However, if dual-sensor devices are preferred, sensor blending should be programmed to either activity-only or to Stimulus-T<Activity in these patients.

In conclusion, single-chamber, dual-sensor ventricular rate-responsive pacing appears to be efficacious and safe in children. The system is very easy to use and the default setting of the activity threshold to medium, and the sensor blending to Stimulus-T<Activity or Stimulus-T=Activity were appropriate for most of the patients. We think that combining and cross-checking data from the two rate-response sensors utilized the advantages of each system, while eliminating the disadvantages of each separate system.
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