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Abstract
Objective—To compare symptoms and exercise tolerance during dual chamber universal (DDD) and ventricular rate response (VVIR) pacing in elderly (≥75) patients.

Design—Randomised, double blind, crossover study.

Setting—Regional cardiac department.

Patients—Twenty elderly patients (mean age 80.5 ± 1 years) with high grade atrioventricular block and sinus rhythm. Patients with pre-existing risk factors for the pacemaker syndrome and chronotropic incompetence were excluded.

Intervention—After four weeks of VVI pacing following pacemaker implantation, patients underwent consecutive two week periods of VVIR and DDD pacing.

Main outcome measures—Patient preference, symptom scores, “daily activity exercises,” and perceived level of exercise (Borg score).

Results—Eleven patients preferred DDD mode to either VVI or VVIR mode. Mean (SE) total symptom scores during VVI, VVIR, and DDD pacing were 5·9 (1·1), 6·1 (1·0), and 3·5 (0·9) respectively (P < 0·01). The corresponding mean (SE) pacemaker syndrome symptom scores were 4·8 (0·7), 5·2 (0·8), and 2·9 (0·8) (P < 0·05). Symptom scores during VVI and VVIR pacing were not significantly different. Exercise performance and Borg scores were significantly worse during VVI pacing compared with VVIR or DDD pacing but did not significantly differ between VVIR and DDD modes.

Conclusions—In active elderly patients with complete heart block both DDD and VVIR pacing are associated with improved exercise performance compared with fixed rate VVI pacing. The convenience and reduced cost of VVIR systems, however, may be offset by a higher incidence of the pacemaker syndrome. In elderly patients with complete heart block VVIR pacing results in suboptimal symptomatic benefit and should not be used instead of DDD pacing.
Table 1  Characteristics of study patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Other medical conditions</th>
<th>Drug treatment</th>
<th>Ejection fraction (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Claudication, osteoarthritis</td>
<td>Aspirin</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Osteoarthritis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Asthma, hypertension, previous mild stroke</td>
<td>Bronchodilators, aspirin</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Hypertension, atrioventricular conduction</td>
<td>Carvedilol , furosemide</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6†††</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Emphysema</td>
<td>Bronchodilators, steroids</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8‡‡‡</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Gout, hypertension</td>
<td>Nifedipine</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9†††</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Angina</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>Nifedipine, bendrofluzide</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Rheumatoid arthritis, diabetes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>Enalapril</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14‡‡</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Osteoarthritis, hypertension</td>
<td>Enalapril, bendrofluzide</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17‡‡</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Mild asthma</td>
<td>Bronchodilators</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Gout</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Osteoarthritis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed retrograde conduciton. ††Early crossover for VVIR. †††Developed 1:1 antegrade atrioventricular conduciton before first visit.

Patients and methods

We studied 20 consecutive patients aged 75–89 (mean 80.5 ± 1.0 years; 14 men) who had been referred for permanent pacemaker implantation. Patients were eligible if (a) they were aged over 75, (b) an electrocardiogram before implantation showed sinus rhythm and complete heart block of at least 7 days’ duration, and (c) they had previously been able to carry out independently the daily activity tests described below. Exclusion criteria included pre-existing indications for the maintenance of atrial synchrony—for example, left ventricular dysfunction—evidence of retrograde atrioventricular conduction at implantation, and chronotropic incompetence. Informed consent was obtained from each patient, and the study was approved by the local research ethics committee. Basic demographic data are presented in table 1.

STUDY DESIGN

The study was a double blind, two period, crossover comparison of DDD and VVIR pacing modes. Eligible patients received a Biotronic Ergos 03 dual chamber pacemaker (DDDR) and were discharged from hospital with it in VVI pacing mode. After a month each patient returned to be assessed by questionnaire and to undertake exercise testing in VVI mode in order to familiarise themselves with the study protocol and provide baseline data. Patients also underwent a symptom limited treadmill test (modified Bruce protocol) in DDD pacing mode to assess the chronotropic response to exercise. Patients with chronotropic incompetence were withdrawn. Patients were then randomly allocated either VVIR or DDD pacing (mode 1). After two weeks their response to mode 1 was assessed by questionnaire and exercise testing before their pacemakers were reprogrammed to the alternative mode (mode 2). At the final visit exercise testing and questionnaires were repeated and the patients were asked which study period, if any, they had preferred. Finally, patients were returned to DDD mode and echocardiography was performed. The ejection fraction was calculated by the area-length method.

PACEMAKER PROGRAMMING

In all three modes the lower and upper rates were set, when applicable, at 72 and 125 beats/minute respectively. The a-v delay was set at 175 ms. In VVIR mode the rate response threshold was set at medium and the curve between 6 and 8. The final setting was determined by the sinus response during treadmill exercise (visit 1).

SYMPTOM QUESTIONNAIRES

At each visit patients were asked by questionnaire whether they had experienced symptoms during the preceding two weeks and, if so, to what extent. Symptoms suggestive of the pacemaker syndrome (breathlessness, pulsation, dizziness, blackout, wheeze, fatigue, palpitation, and cough) were included in a list with control symptoms (headache, chest pain, diarrhoea, vomiting, apprehension, leg cramps, cough, dysuria). Patients were asked to indicate the severity of each symptom on an analogue scale marked from 0 to 5 (0, none; 1, very mild; 2, mild; 3, moderate; 4, quite severe; 5, very severe).

EXERCISE TESTING

At each visit patients underwent three simple exercise tests corresponding to the daily activities of elderly patients. The exercises were supervised by the same investigator for each patient and followed the same order.

(1) Stand up from a chair. Patients were asked to stand up and sit down from a standard chair as many times as possible for two minutes.

(2) Walking. Patients walked as briskly as possible back and forth along a measured length (approximately 25 m) of corridor, turning around at the end of each length. The total number of lengths walked in six minutes, or the maximum number attained by the patient before asking to stop, was recorded.

(3) Stair climbing. Patients were timed how quickly they could ascend two flights of stairs (26 steps), using a stair rail if necessary.

The heart rate at peak exercise was determined immediately after exercise by an automated heart rate monitor. Patients were asked to grade how difficult they had perceived each.
exercise according to the Borg symptom score, scores being from 6 (very, very light) to 20 (very, very hard) with corresponding word prompts for the numbers in between.

**STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**
All results are expressed as means (SE). Means were compared by an analysis of variance. The differences between means were detected by Fisher’s least significant difference test. A P value less than 0.05 was regarded as significant. The study size was calculated from data derived from a previous investigation. With type I and II errors set at 0.1 and 0.05 respectively there was sufficient power to detect a four point change in pacemaker symptom score, a 20% change in total Borg score, and a 25% change in exercise capacity. The study was analysed on an intention to pace basis; we included patients who developed spontaneous return of anterograde conduction, but we also performed an analysis excluding them.

**Results**
Four patients spontaneously regained anterograde atrioventricular conduction between pacemaker implantation and the initial study visit. In these patients the pacemaker was inhibited by the resting sinus rate during VVI mode. In two of these patients the ventricles were paced during exercise in VVIR mode, resulting in the development of the pacemaker syndrome.

One patient developed retrograde conduction during the VVIR study that was associated with significant symptomatic deterioration. Three patients requested early crossover from VVIR pacing owing to intolerable symptoms. Overall, 11 patients preferred DDD mode to the other two modes. One patient each preferred VVI and VVIR mode and seven did not express a preference.

The mean period effect on total symptom and pacemaker syndrome symptom were 1.4 and 1.1 respectively (P > 0.05). There was no significant treatment and period interaction. The effects of pacing order—that is, DDD followed by VVIR or vice versa—on symptom scores, exercise performance, and Borg scores are shown in Table 2. Symptomatically, patients tolerated VVIR pacing better if they had not been previously exposed to DDD pacing. Exercise tolerance and Borg scores, however, were not influenced by the order of pacing.

**SYMPTOMS**
Mean total symptom scores during VVI, VVIR, and DDD pacing were 5.9 (1.1), 6.1 (1.0), and 3.5 (0.9) respectively (P < 0.01). The corresponding pacemaker syndrome symptom scores were 4.8 (0.7), 5.2 (0.8), and 2.9 (0.8) (P < 0.05). The scores for individual patients are shown in Figure 1. Both scores were significantly reduced during DDD mode compared with VVI and VVIR modes (P < 0.05). Symptom scores during VVI and VVIR modes were not significantly different. When the four patients with anterograde atrioventricular conduction were excluded the total symptom scores were 6.8 (1.3), 6.3 (1.1) and 3.9 (1.0) for VVI, VVIR, and DDD modes respectively (P < 0.01). The corresponding pacemaker syndrome symptom scores were 5.4 (0.8), 5.4 (0.9), and 3.3 (0.9) (P < 0.05).

**EXERCISE PERFORMANCE AND PERCEIVED EXERCISE DIFFICULTY**
For each test, exercise performance was better in the rate-response modes (DDD and VVIR) than with VVI pacing. In contrast to symptom scores, exercise performance during DDD and VVIR modes was similar. Maximum heart rates after each exercise were similar in the two rate-response modes. These results are detailed in Tables 3 and 4.

### Table 2  Effect of pacing order on symptom scores, exercise performance, and total Borg scores. Values are means (SE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptom score:</th>
<th>Pacing order (11 patients):</th>
<th>Pacing order (9 patients):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VVI</td>
<td>DDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.5 (2)</td>
<td>3.6 (1)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacemaker syndrome</td>
<td>4.7 (1)</td>
<td>2.9 (1)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise performance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of stand ups in 2 minutes</td>
<td>36 (4)**</td>
<td>44 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of lengths walked in 6 minutes</td>
<td>18 (2)</td>
<td>20 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to climb 26 steps(s)</td>
<td>15 (1)</td>
<td>14 (1)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Borg score</td>
<td>37 (1)</td>
<td>34 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significantly different from VVI and VVIR; **significantly different from VVIR and DDD; †significantly different from DDD (P < 0.05).

**Figure 1** Individual total symptom and pacemaker syndrome symptom scores during VVI, DDD, and VVIR pacing. Thickened lines represent patients with intact anterograde atrioventricular conduction.
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Table 3 Exercise test performances and respective Borg scores during VVI, VVIR, and DDD pacing modes. Values are means (SE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Stand ups No</th>
<th>Borg score</th>
<th>Walking No of lengths</th>
<th>Borg score</th>
<th>Climbing 26 steps</th>
<th>Borg score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VVI</td>
<td>35 (3)*</td>
<td>13 (1)</td>
<td>18 (1)*</td>
<td>12 (1)</td>
<td>17 (1)</td>
<td>11 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVIR</td>
<td>41 (4)</td>
<td>15 (1)</td>
<td>19 (1)</td>
<td>11 (1)</td>
<td>16 (1)</td>
<td>12 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDD</td>
<td>48 (3)</td>
<td>12 (1)</td>
<td>20 (1)</td>
<td>11 (1)</td>
<td>15 (1)**</td>
<td>11 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significantly different from VVIR and DDD mode (P < 0.05).
**Significantly different from VVI (P < 0.01).

Total Borg scores (SE) during VVI, VVIR, and DDD modes were 35.7 (1-3), 33.5 (1-4), and 35.8 (1-1) respectively (P = 0.06). The Borg values for each exercise test are shown in table 3.

ECHOCARDIOGRAPHIC DATA
Echocardiographic data were available in 17 patients. Mean (SE) left ventricular systolic and diastolic dimensions were 34.9 (1-5) mm and 54.2 (1-2) mm respectively. The mean ejection fraction was 61.8% (2-5%). There was a significant correlation between resting ejection fraction (DDD mode) and total (r² = 0.38, P < 0.01) and pacemaker symptom (r² = 0.29, P < 0.05) scores during baseline VVI pacing (fig 2). However, the association was not strong enough to allow accurate prediction of VVI intolerance or preference. Mean left atrial size was 38 (1-1) mm (range 32–49 mm). There was no correlation between left atrial size and any symptom score or derivative.

Discussion
In our elderly population both total and pacemaker syndrome symptom scores were significantly lower during DDD mode compared with VVI and VVIR modes. There was no difference in symptomatic scores between VVI and VVIR pacing modes. In terms of exercise performance and the perceived level of exercise (Borg score), however, we observed no overall difference between the two rate-response modes. Both rate-response modes (DDD and VVIR) were significantly better than baseline VVI pacing.

Figure 2 Relation between resting ejection fraction (DDD mode) and total symptom score during VVI mode

Table 4 Mean (SE) heart rates (beats/minute) during VVI, VVIR, and DDD pacing modes for each exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercise</th>
<th>VVI</th>
<th>VVIR</th>
<th>DDD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stand ups</td>
<td>82 (5)*</td>
<td>106 (4)</td>
<td>107 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>80 (5)*</td>
<td>113 (5)</td>
<td>109 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing stairs</td>
<td>81 (4)*</td>
<td>112 (5)</td>
<td>111 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significantly different from VVIR and DDD, (P < 0.001).

SYMPTOM SCORES
Previous crossover studies within patients have compared symptomatic and exercise performance during DDD and VVIR pacing modes. Sulke et al reported symptomatic deterioration during VVIR compared with DDD pacing within a fairly young population (mean age 52 (4)).11 Menozzi et al likewise reported significant symptomatic deterioration during VVIR pacing in a group of older patients (mean age 72 (6)).10 In this study there was substantial variation in the individual responses to VVIR pacing; five (36%) patients reported severe symptoms and requested early crossover while a further six (43%) reported no difference between the two pacing modes.12 In contrast, we found that most of our patients (80%) reported deterioration in symptoms during VVIR compared with DDD pacing. One of the patients who reported improved symptoms during VVIR pacing had significant obstructive airways disease and was aware of an uncomfortable resting tachycardia (sinus rate 100 beats/minute) when atrial tracking (DDD mode). His symptomatic tachycardia, presumably related to his regular bronchodilator treatment, was abolished during VVIR pacing.

The subjective response to VVIR pacing was highly dependent on whether there had been previous exposure to dual chamber pacing. For example, in the 11 patients who had been randomly allocated to the DDD mode then VVIR mode we observed substantial symptomatic deterioration when these patients were re-exposed to single chamber pacing (VVIR). Seven of the 11 patients who preferred DDD mode came from this group, along with two of the three patients who requested early crossover from VVIR mode. In contrast, nine patients initially exposed to VVIR pacing reported symptomatic improvement compared with baseline VVI. These observations are similar to those of Sulke et al, who compared VVI, DDI, and DDD pacing modes in a group of apparently symptom free patients with long term VVI pacemakers.21 We also observed that exercise tolerance was not significantly influenced by the pacing order. Freed from the worry of syncope after having had a pacemaker implanted, most patients are much improved with simple VVI pacing. Although some patients will develop overt pacemaker syndrome, most will remain without complaint, unaware of the symptomatic benefits associated with physiological (dual chamber) pacing. It is only after exposure to dual chamber pacing that the high incidence of subclinical pacemaker syndrome in these patients becomes apparent.21
Oldroyd et al observed no difference in overall symptoms between DDD and VVIR pacing modes in 10 patients (mean age 56; range 25–74). Important age related cardiovascular changes may render elderly people less tolerant of non-physiological—that is, VVIR pacing. Left ventricular compliance decreases with advancing age,14 increasing the dependence of cardiac output on atrial filling during late diastole.15 Corrective cardiovascular reflexes, such as the baroreflexes, may be attenuated with advancing age, thereby increasing the risks of hypotension and of the pacemaker syndrome.16 In the studies by Sulke et al16 and Menozzi et al11 and in our study, the symptom questionnaire was specifically designed to detect symptoms suggestive of the pacemaker syndrome—for example, palpitations, pulsation, and dizziness—whereas the questionnaire (McMaster) used in Oldroyd’s study does not specifically ask about the pacemaker syndrome and may have underestimated these symptoms.

Anterograde atrioventricular conduction returned in four (20%) patients after implantation. Although comfortable at rest, two of these patients experienced palpitations and dyspnoea (the pacemaker syndrome) during exercise in VVIR mode but not in DDD mode. In these circumstances the pacemaker syndrome arises when the rate-response function drives the ventricular rate higher than the natural sinus rate.22,23 Despite symptoms of exercise induced pacemaker syndrome, the overall exercise tolerance of these patients was similar to that during DDD mode. Exclusion of these patients from the analysis did not significantly change the overall findings of the study.

EXERCISE PERFORMANCE
Our observations confirm previous reports of improved exercise capacity in the elderly during either DDD24–26 or VVIR pacing modes compared with fixed rate VVI pacing. However, most studies that have directly compared DDD and VVIR modes have reported no significant difference in exercise performance.9,10 The contribution of atrial filling to stroke volume increases with advancing age, particularly so during submaximal exercise,24 and we had hypothesised that both exercise performance and the perceived level of exercise (Borg scores) in our group of elderly patients would be improved during DDD pacing compared with VVIR pacing. Although we found a trend towards a benefit from DDD pacing, the difference was not significant.

Failure to detect an important difference is unlikely to be a type II error since the power of the sample size was sufficient to detect at least a 25% change in the performance of each test. Neither can these observations be explained by the exercise heart rates as these were well matched for each test. Alternatively, the findings may be partly explained by a selection bias which favoured enrolment of comparatively fit elderly subjects with more cardiovascular reserve who were able to compensate for the loss of atrial contraction during VVIR pacing. Patients in whom there was considered to be a relatively strong indication for dual chamber pacing—for example, a history of heart failure—were not recruited, as borne out by the normal echocardiographic left ventricular dimensions. Selection bias towards fitter elderly patients may also have resulted from the study design, which required three separate visits to the department and extended travelling distances.

RETROGRADE ATRIOVENTRICULAR CONDUCTION
The development of retrograde atrioventricular conduction in one of our patients (during VVIR mode pacing) was heralded by significant deterioration in symptoms. Similarly, in the study of Oldroyd et al the only patient to request early crossover from VVIR to DDD mode was the only patient with intact retrograde conduction.9 The nine other patients without retrograde conduction reported no deterioration in symptoms during VVIR pacing. The authors concluded “that it would be appropriate to consider VVIR activity sensing pacemakers... in patients with complete anterograde and retrograde heart block and preserved ventricular function.”15 Although the development of retrograde atrioventricular block is a risk factor for the development of the pacemaker syndrome,26 the absence of retrograde conduction at pacemaker implantation does not preclude its subsequent development.27,28 Furthermore, the presence of ventricular atrial conduction has limited utility as a predictor of the pacemaker syndrome in individual patients.11,20

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS
In active elderly patients with complete heart block both DDD and VVIR pacing are associated with improved exercise capacity compared with fixed rate VVI pacing. Although VVIR pacing may be adequate in some patients, the convenience and reduced cost of these systems may be offset by the high incidence of the pacemaker syndrome. On the basis of these observations we conclude that VVIR pacing in elderly subjects with complete heart block results in suboptimal symptomatic benefit and should not be used instead of DDD pacing.
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