



ACC/ESC Expert consensus document

American College of Cardiology/European Society of Cardiology Clinical Expert Consensus Document on Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy

A report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation Task Force on Clinical Expert Consensus Documents and the European Society of Cardiology Committee for Practice Guidelines ☆

Writing Committee Members, Barry J. Maron, (Co-Chair)^{a,b}, William J. McKenna, (Co-Chair)^{a,b*}, Gordon K. Danielson^a, Lukas J. Kappenberger^{a,b*}, Horst J. Kuhn^{b*}, Christine E. Seidman, Pravin M. Shah^a, William H. Spencer III^a, Paolo Spirito^{a,b*}, Folkert J. Ten Cate^{a,b*}, E. Douglas Wigle^a

ACCF Task Force on Clinical Expert Consensus Documents Members, Robert A. Vogel, (Chair), Jonathan Abrams, Eric R. Bates, Bruce R. Brodie†, Peter G. Danias†, Gabriel Gregoratos, Mark A. Hlatky, Judith S. Hochman, Sanjiv Kaul, Robert C. Lichtenberg, Jonathan R. Lindner, Robert A. O'Rourke‡, Gerald M. Pohost, Richard S. Schofield, Cynthia M. Tracy†, William L. Winters Jr†

ESC Committee for Practice Guidelines Members*, Werner W. Klein, (Chair), Silvia G. Priori, (Co-Chair), Angeles Alonso-Garcia, Carina Blomström-Lundqvist, Guy De Backer, Jaap Deckers, Markus Flather, Jaromir Hradec, Ali Oto, Alexander Parkhomenko, Sigmund Silber, Adam Torbicki

Table of contents

Preamble	1966
Introduction	1966
Organization of committee and evidence review.	1966
Purpose of this Expert Consensus Document	1966
General considerations and perspectives.....	1966
Nomenclature, definitions, and clinical diagnosis ..	1967
Obstruction to LV Outflow	1967
Genetics and molecular diagnosis	1968
General considerations for natural history, and clinical course.....	1970

Symptoms and pharmacological management strategies	1972
Beta-adrenergic blocking agents	1972
Verapamil	1973
Disopyramide	1973
Drugs in end-stage phase	1974
Asymptomatic patients	1974
Infective endocarditis prophylaxis	1974
Pregnancy.....	1974
Treatment options for drug-refractory patients.....	1974
Additional approaches to relieve outflow obstruction and symptoms	1976

* When citing this document, the American College of Cardiology Foundation and the European Society of Cardiology would appreciate the following citation format: Maron BJ, McKenna WJ, Danielson GK, Kappenberger LJ, Kuhn HJ, Seidman CE, Shah PM, Spencer WH, Spirito P, Ten Cate FJ, Wigle ED. ACC/ESC clinical expert consensus document on hypertrophic cardiomyopathy: a report of the American College of Cardiology Task Force on Clinical Expert Consensus Documents and the European Society of Cardiology Committee for Practice Guidelines (Committee to Develop an Expert Consensus Document on Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy). Eur Heart J 2003; doi:10.1016/S0195-668X(03)00479-2.

Copies: This document is available on the Web sites of the ACC at www.acc.org and ESC at www.escardio.org. Copies of this document are available by calling 800-253-4636 (US only) or writing the American College of Cardiology Foundation, Resource Center, 9111 Old Georgetown Road, Bethesda, MD 20814-1699 as well as by calling or writing ESC Guidelines–Reprints, Elsevier Publishers Ltd., 32 Jamestown Road, London, NW1 7BY, United Kingdom, Tel: +44.207.424.4422; Fax: +44.207.424.4433; Email: gr.davies@elsevier.com

^a American College of Cardiology

^b European Society of Cardiology

* Official representatives of the European Society of Cardiology

† Former members of Task Force

‡ Former Chair of Task Force

Dual-chamber pacing	1976
Percutaneous alcohol septal ablation	1977
Sudden Cardiac Death	1980
Risk stratification	1980
Prevention	1982
Athlete recommendations	1983
Atrial Fibrillation	1984
References	1984

Preamble

This document has been developed as a Clinical Expert Consensus Document (CECD), combining the resources of the American College of Cardiology Foundation (ACCF) and the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). It is intended to provide a perspective on the current state of management of patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Clinical Expert Consensus Documents are intended to inform practitioners, payers, and other interested parties of the opinion of the ACCF and the ESC concerning evolving areas of clinical practice and/or technologies that are widely available or new to the practice community. Topics chosen for coverage by expert consensus documents are so designed because the evidence base, the experience with technology, and/or the clinical practice are not considered sufficiently well developed to be evaluated by the formal American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association (ACC/AHA) Practice Guidelines process. Often the topic is the subject of considerable ongoing investigation. Thus, the reader should view the CECD as the best attempt of the ACC and the ESC to inform and guide clinical practice in areas where rigorous evidence may not yet be available or the evidence to date is not widely accepted. When feasible, CECDs include indications or contraindications. Some topics covered by CECDs will be addressed subsequently by the ACC/AHA Practice Guidelines Committee.

The Task Force on Clinical Expert Consensus Documents makes every effort to avoid any actual or potential conflicts of interest that might arise as a result of an outside relationship or personal interest of a member of the writing panel. Specifically, all members of the writing panel are asked to provide disclosure statements of all such relationships that might be perceived as real or potential conflicts of interest to inform the writing effort. These statements are reviewed by the parent task force, reported orally to all members of the writing panel at the first meeting, and updated as changes occur.

*Robert A. Vogel, MD, FACC,
Chair, ACCF Task Force on Clinical Expert
Consensus Documents
Werner W. Klein, MD, FACC, FESC
Chair, ESC Committee for Practice Guidelines*

Introduction

Organization of committee and evidence review

The Writing Committee consisted of acknowledged experts in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy (HCM) representing the American College of Cardiology Foundation

and the European Society of Cardiology. Both the academic and private practice sectors were represented. The document was reviewed by 2 official reviewers nominated by the ACCF, 3 official reviewers were nominated by the ESC, 12 members of the ACCF Clinical Electrophysiology Committee, and 4 additional content reviewers nominated by the Writing Committee. The document was approved for publication by the ACCF Board of Trustees in August 2003 and the Board of ESC in July 2003. This document will be considered current until the Task Force on Clinical Expert Consensus Documents revises or withdraws it from distribution. In addition to the references cited as part of this document, a comprehensive bibliography including relevant, supplementary references is available on the ACCF and ESC websites.

Purpose of this Expert Consensus Document

Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy is a complex and relatively common genetic cardiac disorder (about 1:500 in the general adult population)¹ that has been the subject of intense scrutiny and investigation for over 40 years.^{2–15} Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy affects men and women equally and occurs in many races and countries, although it appears to be under-diagnosed in women, minorities, and under-served populations.^{16–20}

Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy is a particularly common cause of sudden cardiac death (SCD) in young people (including trained athletes)^{21–29} and may cause death and disability in patients of all ages, although it is also frequently compatible with normal longevity.^{30–35} Because of its heterogeneous clinical course and expression,^{7,36–42} HCM frequently presents uncertainty and represents a management dilemma to cardiovascular specialists and other practitioners, particularly those infrequently engaged in the evaluation of patients with this disease.

Furthermore, with the recent introduction of novel treatment strategies targeting subgroups of patients with HCM,^{7,43–49} controversy is predictable, and difficult questions periodically arise. Consequently, it is now particularly timely to clarify and place into perspective those clinical issues relevant to the rapidly evolving management for HCM.

General considerations and perspectives

This clinical scientific statement represents the consensus of a panel of experts appointed by the ACC and ESC. The writing group is comprised of cardiovascular specialists and molecular biologists, each having extensive experience with HCM. The panel focused largely on the management of this complex disease and derived prudent, practical, and contemporary treatment strategies for the many subgroups of patients comprising the broad HCM disease spectrum. Because of the relatively low prevalence of HCM in general cardiologic practice,⁵⁰ its diverse presentation, and mechanisms of death and disability and skewed patterns of patient referral,^{7,11,13,36–38,42,51–59} the level of evidence governing management decisions for drugs or devices has often been derived from non-randomized and retrospective

investigations. Large-scale controlled and randomized study designs, such as those that have provided important answers regarding the management of coronary artery disease (CAD) and congestive heart failure,^{60–62} have generally not been available in HCM as a result of these factors. Therefore, treatment strategies have necessarily evolved based on available data that have frequently been observational in design, sometimes obtained in relatively small patient groups, or derived from the accumulated clinical experience of individual investigators, and reasonable inferences drawn from other cardiac diseases. Consequently, the construction of strict clinical algorithms designed to assess prognosis and dictate treatment decisions for all patients has been challenging and has not yet achieved general agreement. In some clinical situations, management decisions and strategies unavoidably must be individualized to the particular patient.

Understanding of the molecular basis, clinical course, and treatment of HCM has increased substantially in the last decade. In particular, there has been a growing awareness of the clinical and molecular heterogeneity characteristic of this disorder and the many patient subgroups that inevitably influence considerations for treatment. Some of these management strategies are novel and evolving, and this document cannot, in all instances, convey definitive assessments of their role in the treatment armamentarium. Also, for some uncommon subsets within the broad disease spectrum, there are little data currently available to definitively guide therapy. With these considerations in mind, the panel has aspired to create a document that is not only current and pertinent but also has the potential to remain relevant for many years.

Nomenclature, definitions, and clinical diagnosis

The clinical diagnosis of HCM is established most easily and reliably with two-dimensional echocardiography by demonstrating left ventricular hypertrophy (LVH) (typically asymmetric in distribution, and showing virtually any diffuse or segmental pattern of left ventricular (LV) wall thickening).³⁶ Left ventricular wall thickening is associated with a nondilated and hyperdynamic chamber (often with systolic cavity obliteration) in the absence of another cardiac or systemic disease (e.g., hypertension or aortic stenosis) capable of producing the magnitude of hypertrophy evident, and independent of whether or not LV outflow obstruction is present.^{1,5,7,36} Although the usual clinical diagnostic criteria for HCM is a maximal wall thickness greater than or equal to 15 mm, genotype-phenotype correlations have shown that virtually any wall thickness (including those within normal range) are compatible with the presence of a HCM mutant gene.^{6,17,19,63–65} Mildly increased LV wall thicknesses of 13 mm to 14 mm potentially due to HCM should be distinguished from certain extreme expressions of the physiologically-based athlete's heart.^{66–68} The advent of contemporary magnetic resonance imaging that provides high-resolution tomographic images of the

entire LV may represent an additional diagnostic modality⁶⁹ particularly in the presence of technically suboptimal echocardiographic studies or when segmental hypertrophy is confined to unusual locations within the LV wall.

Since the modern description by Teare in 1958,¹² HCM has been known by a confusing array of names that largely reflect its clinical heterogeneity, relatively uncommon occurrence in cardiologic practice, and the skewed experience of early investigators. This problem in nomenclature has been an obstacle to general recognition of the disease within the medical and non-medical community. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy (or HCM) is now widely accepted as the preferred term⁷ because it describes the overall disease spectrum without introducing misleading inferences that LV outflow tract obstruction is an invariable feature of the disease, such as is the case with hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy,⁷⁰ muscular subaortic stenosis,⁷¹ or idiopathic hypertrophic subaortic stenosis.⁷² Indeed, most patients with HCM do not demonstrate outflow obstruction under resting (basal) conditions, although many may develop dynamic subaortic gradients of varying magnitude with provocative maneuvers or agents.^{7,13,41,72–77} Of note, even though the absence of obstruction (at rest) is common, both in patients with and without symptoms, most treatment modalities have targeted those symptomatic HCM patients with outflow obstruction.^{41,43–49,78–108}

Obstruction to LV Outflow

It is of clinical importance to distinguish between the obstructive or nonobstructive forms of HCM, based on the presence or absence of a LV outflow gradient under resting and/or provokable conditions.^{5,7,11,13,41,109,110} Indeed, in most patients, management strategies have traditionally been tailored to the hemodynamic state. Outflow gradients are responsible for a loud apical systolic ejection murmur associated with a constellation of unique clinical signs,^{14,72,111} hypertrophy of the basal portion of ventricular septum and small outflow tract, and an enlarged and elongated mitral valve in many patients.^{39,112–114} Obstruction may either be subaortic^{13,71,72} or mid-cavity^{13,115} in location. Subaortic obstruction is caused by systolic anterior motion (SAM) of the mitral valve leaflets and mid-systolic contact with the ventricular septum.^{13,71,113,116–119} This mechanical impedance to outflow occurs in the presence of high velocity ejection in which a variable proportion of the forward blood flow may be ejected early in systole.^{120,121} Systolic anterior motion is probably attributable to a drag effect^{117,122} or possibly a Venturi phenomenon^{13,118} and is responsible not only for subaortic obstruction, but also the concomitant mitral regurgitation (usually mild-to-moderate in degree) due to incomplete leaflet apposition, which is typically directed posteriorly into the left atrium.^{111,123} When the mitral regurgitation jet is directed centrally or anteriorly into the left atrium, or if multiple jets are present, independent abnormalities intrinsic to the mitral valve should be suspected (e.g., myxomatous degeneration, mitral leaflet fibrosis, or

anomalous papillary muscle insertion).^{13,91,115,124} Occasionally (perhaps in 5% of cases), gradients and impeded outflow are caused predominately by muscular apposition in the mid-cavity region—usually in the absence of mitral-septal contact—involving anomalous direct insertion of anterolateral papillary muscle into the anterior mitral leaflet, or excessive mid-ventricular or papillary muscle hypertrophy and malalignment.^{13,91,115}

Although it has previously been subject to periodic controversy,^{72,120,125,126} there is now widespread recognition that the subaortic gradient (30 mm Hg or more) and associated elevations in intra-cavity LV pressure reflect true mechanical impedance to outflow and are of pathophysiologic and prognostic importance to patients with HCM.^{127,128} Indeed, outflow obstruction is a strong, independent predictor of disease progression to HCM-related death (relative risk vs. nonobstructed patients, 2.0), to severe symptoms of New York Heart Association (NYHA) class III or IV, and to death due specifically to heart failure and stroke (relative risk vs. nonobstructed patients, 4.4).¹²⁷ However, the likelihood of severe symptoms and death from outflow tract obstruction was not greater when the gradient was increased in magnitude above the threshold of 30 mm Hg.¹²⁷

Disease consequences related to chronic outflow gradients are likely to be mediated by the resultant increase in LV wall stress, myocardial ischemia and eventually cell death and replacement fibrosis.^{7,127,129} Therefore, the presence of LV outflow obstruction justifies intervention to reduce or abolish significant subaortic gradients in severely symptomatic patients who are refractory to maximum medical management.^{11,14,41,127}

Obstruction in HCM is characteristically dynamic (i.e., not fixed): the magnitude (or even presence) of an outflow gradient may be spontaneously labile and vary considerably with a number of physiologic alterations as diverse as a heavy meal or ingestion of a small amount of alcohol.^{72,73,109} Different gradient cut-offs have been proposed for segregating individual patients into hemodynamic subgroups, but rigorous partitioning into such hemodynamic categories according to gradient can be difficult because the unpredictable dynamic changes that may occur in individual patients.^{72,73}

Nevertheless, it is reasonable to divide the overall HCM disease spectrum into hemodynamic subgroups, based on the representative peak instantaneous gradient as assessed with continuous wave Doppler: 1) obstructive gradient under basal (resting) conditions equal to or greater than 30 mm Hg (2.7 m/s by Doppler), 2) latent (provocable) obstructive—gradient less than 30 mm Hg under basal conditions and equal to or greater than 30 mm Hg with provocation 3) nonobstructive—less than 30 mm Hg under both basal and (provocable) conditions. By current clinical convention, LV outflow gradients are routinely measured noninvasively with continuous wave Doppler echocardiography, generally obviating the need for serial cardiac catheterizations in this disease (except when atherosclerotic CAD or other associated anomalies such as intrinsic valvular disease are suspected).

It is important to underscore that a variety of interventions have been traditionally employed to elicit latent (inducible) gradients in the echocardiography, cardiac catheterization, and exercise laboratories (i.e., amyl nitrite inhalation, Valsalva maneuver, post-PVC response, isoproterenol or dobutamine infusion, standing posture, and physiologic exercise),^{3,72,73} however, rigorous standardization for these maneuvers has been lacking, and many have come to be regarded as non-physiologic. To define latent gradients during and/or immediately following exercise for the purpose of major management decisions, treadmill or bicycle exercise testing in association with Doppler echocardiography is probably the most physiologic and preferred provocative maneuver, given that HCM-related symptoms are typically elicited with exertion. Intravenous administration of dobutamine is undesirable,^{130,131} as discussed under the section on *alcohol septal ablation*.

Genetics and molecular diagnosis

Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy is inherited as a Mendelian autosomal dominant trait and is caused by mutations in any one of 10 genes, each encoding protein components of the cardiac sarcomere composed of thick or thin filaments with contractile, structural, or regulatory functions.^{6,9,17–19,64,65,132–139} It is possible to regard the diverse clinical spectrum as a single, unified disease entity and primary disorder of the sarcomere.^{18,63} Three of the HCM-causing mutant genes predominate in frequency—i.e., beta-myosin heavy chain (the first identified), myosin-binding protein C and cardiac troponin-T probably comprise more than one-half of the genotyped patients to date. Seven other genes each account for fewer cases: regulatory and essential myosin light chains, titin, alpha-tropomyosin, alpha-actin, cardiac troponin-I, and alpha-myosin heavy chain. This genetic diversity is compounded by intragenic heterogeneity, with about 200 mutations now identified (see <http://genetics.med.harvard.edu/~seidman/cg3>), most of which are missense, with a single amino acid residue substituted with another.⁶³ Indeed, molecular defects responsible for HCM are usually different in unrelated individuals, and many other mutations in previously identified genes (and even in additional genes, each probably accounting for a small proportion of familial HCM) undoubtedly remain to be identified.

Phenotypic expression of HCM (i.e., LVH) is the product not only of the causal mutation, but also of modifier genes and environmental factors.^{140,141} The magnitude of effect that modifier genes have on morphologic expression has not yet been systematically explored, but it can be inferred from the phenotypic variability of affected individuals in the same family carrying identical disease-causing mutations. As a result of the complexity of the molecular biology of hypertrophy, a large number of genes may influence the expression of the phenotype. There is also increasing recognition of the role of genetics in the genesis of electrophysiological abnormalities associated with LVH. For example, an increased risk for atrial fibrillation (AF)

in HCM has been identified with a beta-myosin heavy chain Arg663 His mutation.¹³⁶

Missense mutations in the gene encoding the gamma-2-regulatory subunit of the AMP-activated protein kinase (PRKAG2), a regulator of cellular energy homeostasis, have been reported to cause familial LVH associated with ventricular pre-excitation.^{134,142} Absence of classical histopathology such as myocyte disarray, a distinct molecular cause for LVH (in part, reflecting glycogen accumulation in myocytes), and progressive conduction system disease and heart block distinguish PRKAG2 from sarcomere protein gene mutations typical of HCM.¹⁴² Indeed, this syndrome is probably most appropriately regarded as a metabolic storage disease distinct from true HCM. Therefore, it may not be optimal to base management and clinical risk assessment of patients with cardiac hypertrophy and WPW on the data derived from patients with HCM. Also, thickening of the LV wall resembling HCM occurs in children (and some adults) with other disease states—e.g., Noonan's syndrome, mitochondrial myopathies, Friedreich's ataxia, metabolic disorders, Anderson-Fabry disease (X-linked deficiency of the lysosomal enzyme alpha-galactosidase),^{143,144} LV non-compaction,¹⁴⁵ and cardiac amyloidosis.¹¹⁰

Molecular genetic studies over the past decade have underscored and provided important insights into the profound clinical and genetic heterogeneity of HCM, including the power to achieve preclinical diagnosis of individuals who are affected by a mutant gene but who show no evidence of the disease phenotype on a two-dimensional echocardiogram (or ECG).^{6,17,57,64,65,146,147} Indeed, HCM may be even more common in the general population than the cited prevalence of 1:500 (based on recognition of the established phenotype by echocardiography)¹ because of incomplete, time-dependent, variable expression of the disease phenotype and because many affected individuals have not been clinically recognized and are not represented in general cardiologic practice, where the disease is relatively uncommon.⁵⁰ In the clinical assessment of individual pedigrees, it is obligatory for the proband to be informed of the familial nature and autosomal dominant transmission of HCM.

Not all individuals harboring a genetic defect will express the clinical features of HCM (e.g., LVH on echocardiogram, abnormal ECG pattern or disease-related symptoms) at all times during life, and 12-lead ECG abnormalities or evidence of diastolic dysfunction assessed by Doppler tissue imaging may even precede the appearance of the phenotype on echocardiogram especially in the young.^{148–151} Indeed, clinical and molecular genetic studies have demonstrated that there is in fact no minimum LV wall thickness required to be consistent with the presence of an HCM-causing mutant gene.^{17,65,146–148,152} For example, it is common for children less than 13 years old to be affected "silent" mutation carriers *without* evidence of LVH on an echocardiogram. Most commonly, substantial LV remodeling with the spontaneous appearance of LVH occurs associated with accelerated body growth and maturation

during the adolescent years and with morphologic expression usually completed at the time physical maturity is achieved (about 17 to 18 years).^{150,152,153}

Furthermore, novel diagnostic criteria for HCM have recently emerged, based on genotype-phenotype studies showing that incomplete penetrance and disease expression with absence of (or minimal) LVH may occur in *adult* individuals (most commonly due to cardiac myosin-binding protein-C or troponin-T mutations).^{17,19,65,135,149,151} In both cross-sectional¹⁷ and serial echocardiographic studies,⁶⁵ mutations in myosin-binding protein C gene have demonstrated age-related penetrance and late-onset of the phenotype in which delayed and *de novo* appearance of LVH on echocardiogram occurs in mid-life and even later. Therefore, the traditional tenet that held that a normal echocardiogram (and ECG) obtained after full growth has been achieved defined a genetically unaffected relative has been revised. Such late-onset adult morphologic conversions dictate that it is no longer possible, based solely on a normal echocardiogram and ECG, to issue definitive reassurance to asymptomatic family members at maturity (or even in middle-age) that they are free of a disease-causing mutant HCM gene.

Clinical screening of first-degree relatives and other family members should be encouraged. Therefore, when a DNA-based diagnosis is not feasible, the recommended clinical strategies for screening family members employ history and physical examination, 12-lead ECG, and two-dimensional echocardiography at annual evaluations during adolescence (12 to 18 years of age). Due to the possibility of delayed adult-onset LVH, it is reasonable and prudent to recommend that adult relatives with normal echocardiograms at or beyond age 18 have subsequent clinical studies performed about every five years. Screening in relatives younger than age 12 is not usually pursued systematically unless the child has a high-risk family history or is involved in particularly intense competitive sports programs. Affected patients identified through family screening (or otherwise) are conventionally evaluated on approximately 12- to 18-month basis, as described under Risk Stratification and SCD heading.

Laboratory DNA-analysis for mutant genes is the most definitive method for establishing the diagnosis of HCM. At present, however, there are several obstacles to the translation of genetic research into practical clinical applications and routine clinical strategy. These include the substantial genetic heterogeneity, the low frequency with which each causal mutation occurs in the general HCM population, and the important methodologic difficulties associated with identifying a single disease-causing mutation among 10 different genes in view of the complex, time-consuming, and expensive laboratory techniques involved. Mutation analysis is presently confined to a few research-oriented laboratories. The current development of better methodologies for automated, direct DNA-sequencing and indirect approaches for sequence profiling now provides sensitive techniques that can accurately define the molecular cause for HCM in a single proband, without involving family members or complex linkage analysis in large




Fig. 1 Clinical presentation and treatment strategies for patient subgroups within the broad clinical spectrum of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy (HCM). See text for details. AF = atrial fibrillation; DDD = dual-chamber; ICD = implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; SD = sudden death; and Rx = treatment. Adapted with permission.¹¹ *No specific treatment or intervention indicated, except under exceptional circumstances.

pedigrees. However, the large number and size of the genes that may need to be examined in each proband continue to limit the efficiency of a gene-based diagnosis. However, once a mutation is defined in a proband, an accurate definition of genetic status in all family members is both efficient and inexpensive.

Although there is interest in the application of gene therapy to a variety of inheritable human conditions, at this time the clinical utilization of this technology in HCM is extremely problematic. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy is transmitted as an autosomal dominant trait, and affected persons possess one mutated and one normal allele. Because most mutations in this disease cause substitution of a single amino acid within the encoded protein, gene therapy would theoretically have the daunting task of selectively targeting and inactivating the mutated gene, the encoded protein, or both. Furthermore, selection of patients for gene therapy would be particularly complex given that some forms of the disease are compatible with normal longevity and absence of symptoms. Also, such therapeutic interventions would presumably be applicable only to a small patient subset consisting of very young affected members from high-risk families identified prior to the development of LVH. Spontaneous animal models of HCM,¹⁵⁴ or model organisms including mice and rabbits, may foster

the development of pharmacologic therapies that reduce disease manifestations, including hypertrophy and interstitial (matrix) fibrosis.^{155–158}

General considerations for natural history, and clinical course

Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy is a unique cardiovascular disease with the potential for clinical presentation during any phase of life from infancy to old age (day one to over 90 years). The clinical course is typically variable, and patients may remain stable over long periods of time with up to 25% of a HCM cohort achieving normal longevity (75 years of age or older).^{7,30,31,34,159} However, the course of many patients may be punctuated by adverse clinical events, largely related to sudden, unexpected death, embolic stroke, and the consequences of heart failure.^{5,7,29,30,38} Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy is also a rare cause of severe heart failure in infants and very young children, and presentation in this age group itself constitutes an unfavorable prognostic sign.^{53,58}

In general, adverse clinical course proceeds along one or more of several of the following pathways, which ultimately dictate treatment strategies (Figs 1 and 2):^{5,7,11,14,26} 1) high risk for premature sudden and unexpected death; 2) progressive symptoms largely of




Fig. 2 The principal pathways of disease progression in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy (HCM). Widths of the respective arrows approximate the frequency with which the pathway occurs in HCM populations. AF = atrial fibrillation.

exertional dyspnea, chest pain (either typical of angina or atypical in nature), and impaired consciousness, including syncope, near-syncope or presyncope (i.e., dizziness/lightheadedness), in the presence of preserved LV systolic function; 3) progression to advanced congestive heart failure (the "end-stage phase") with LV remodeling and systolic dysfunction;^{37,160} and 4) complications attributable to AF, including embolic stroke.^{38,161–163}

However, full appreciation of the clinical implications of HCM (and its treatment strategies) requires an awareness of the unique patterns of patient referral and selection biases that have had an important impact on our perceptions of this disease.^{5,7,11,59,164} Perhaps to a far greater extent than other cardiovascular diseases, much of the published clinical data assembled over four decades have emanated largely from a few selected tertiary centers in North America and Europe, disproportionately comprised of patients referred because of their high-risk status or severe symptoms requiring highly specialized care (such as surgery).^{59,164} On the other hand, clinically stable, asymptomatic, or elderly patients were often under-represented.

Over-dependence on frequently cited, ominous mortality rates of 3% to 6% per year for HCM-related premature death from tertiary centers may have led to an exaggeration of the overall risk and impact of this disease on patients and, thereby, contributed to a misguided perception that HCM is invariably an unfavorable disorder with inevitable, adverse consequences frequently requiring major therapeutic intervention.^{7,59,165} However, more recent reports from non-tertiary centers with fewer selected, regional, and community-based cohorts not subject to tertiary center referral bias are

probably more representative of the overall disease state, citing annual mortality rates in a much lower range of about 1%, with the survival of patients not dissimilar to that of the general adult U.S. population.^{7,30,31} Nevertheless, of note, there are subgroups of patients within the broad HCM spectrum with annual mortality rates far exceeding 1% and conform to the rates of up to 6% per year previously attributed to the overall disease.^{7,11,41,165,166}

Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy attributable to sarcomere protein mutations also occurs in the elderly¹³⁹ and should be distinguished from non-genetic hypertensive heart disease or age-related changes in persons of advanced age. The determinants of extended survival in some patients with HCM are largely unresolved. It is possible that benign genetic substrates may convey favorable prognosis and normal life expectancy. However, at present, genotype data are available for only a limited number of elderly patients, with mutations in the cardiac myosin-binding protein C gene being most common.¹³⁹ Older patients with HCM characteristically show relatively mild degrees of LVH and may not experience severe symptoms. Some even have large resting subaortic gradients that are often caused by the SAM-septal contact associated with normal-sized mitral leaflets greatly displaced anteriorly, seemingly by calcium accumulation posteriorly in the mitral annulus, within a particularly small LV outflow tract.¹⁶⁷ Definitive clinical diagnosis of HCM in older patients with LVH and systemic hypertension is often difficult to resolve, particularly when LV wall thickness is less than 20 mm and SAM is absent. In the absence of genotyping, marked LVH disproportionate to the level of blood pressure elevation,

unusual patterns of LVH unique to HCM,³⁶ or an obstruction to LV outflow at rest represents presumptive evidence for HCM.¹²⁷

Not uncommonly, HCM coexists with other cardiac conditions such as systemic hypertension and/or CAD. In such patients, the management of HCM should be considered independent of any co-morbidity, and each of the disease entities should be treated on its own merit. For example, specific concerns that may arise include avoidance of angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors to control hypertension in the presence of HCM-related resting or provokable LV outflow tract obstruction and failure to exclude the diagnosis of CAD in those HCM patients with angina pectoris.

In summary, it is probably most appropriate to regard HCM as a complex disease capable of producing important clinical consequences and premature death in some patients, while many other patients reach normal longevity and life expectancy with mild or no disability and without major therapeutic interventions. Many individuals affected by HCM may not require treatment for most or all of their natural lives, and they therefore deserve reassurance with regard to their prognosis.

Symptoms and pharmacological management strategies

A fundamental goal of treatment in HCM is the alleviation of symptoms related to heart failure (Fig. 1). Pharmacological therapy has traditionally been the initial therapeutic approach for relieving disabling symptoms of exertional dyspnea (with or without associated chest pain) and improving exercise capacity for more than 35 years, since the introduction of beta-blockers in the mid-1960s.^{3,10,14,168–179} Also, drugs are often the sole therapeutic option available to the many patients *without* obstruction to LV outflow, under resting or provokable conditions, who constitute a substantial proportion of the HCM population. Indeed, it is the convention to empirically initiate pharmacologic therapy when symptoms of exercise intolerance intervene, although there have been few randomized trials to compare the effect of drugs in HCM^{5,7,11,179} (Fig. 1).

Exertional dyspnea and disability (often associated chest pain), dizziness, presyncope and syncope usually occur in the presence of preserved systolic function and a nondilated LV.^{5,7,11,14,180} Symptoms appear to be caused in large measure by diastolic dysfunction with impaired filling due to abnormal relaxation and increased chamber stiffness, leading in turn to elevated left atrial and LV end-diastolic pressures (with reduced stroke volume and cardiac output),^{181–188} pulmonary congestion, and impaired exercise performance with reduced oxygen consumption at peak exercise.¹⁸⁹

The pathophysiology of such symptoms, due to this form of diastolic heart failure, may also be intertwined with other important pathophysiologic mechanisms such as myocardial ischemia,^{190–201} outflow obstruction associated with mitral regurgitation,^{13,127} and AF.¹⁶³ Indeed, many patients may experience symptoms largely from diastolic dysfunction or myocardial

ischemia in the absence of outflow obstruction (or severe hypertrophy). Other patients (i.e., those with LV outflow obstruction) are more disabled by elevated LV pressures and concomitant mitral regurgitation than by diastolic dysfunction, as is evidenced by the often dramatic symptomatic benefit derived from major therapeutic interventions that reduce or obliterate outflow gradient (most frequently myectomy or alcohol ablation).^{7,13–15,49,81,83–88,90–95,102–106,202}

Chest pain in the absence of atherosclerotic CAD may be typical of angina pectoris or atypical in character. Most chest discomfort is probably due by bursts of myocardial ischemia, evidenced by the findings of scars at autopsy,^{51,195,199,203} fixed or reversible myocardial perfusion defects and the suggestion of scarring by magnetic resonance imaging,¹²⁹ net lactate release during atrial pacing, and impaired coronary vasodilator capacity.^{190,192,193,198,201,204} Myocardial ischemia is probably a consequence of abnormal microvasculature, consisting of intramural coronary arterioles with thickened walls (from medial hypertrophy) and narrowed lumen,^{195–201} and/or a mismatch between the greatly increased LV mass and coronary flow. Because typical anginal chest pain may be part of the HCM symptom-complex, associated atherosclerotic CAD (which may complicate clinical course) is often overlooked in these patients. Therefore, coronary arteriography is indicated in patients with HCM and persistent angina who are over 40 years of age or who have risk factors for CAD, or when CAD is judged possible prior to any invasive treatment for HCM such as septal myectomy (or alcohol septal ablation).

Beta-adrenergic blocking agents

Beta-blockers are negative inotropic drugs that have traditionally been administered to HCM patients with or without obstruction, usually relying on the patient's own subjective and historical perception of benefit.^{11,14,168,169,172,179} However, judgments regarding treatment strategies in HCM with beta-blockers are often difficult, taking into account the frequent day-to-day variability in magnitude of symptoms. Treadmill or bicycle exercise—with or without measurement of peak oxygen consumption¹⁸⁹—have proved helpful in targeting patients for therapy or determining when changes in dosage or drugs are appropriate. If limiting symptoms progress, drug dosage may be increased within the accepted therapeutic range. Patient responses to drugs are highly variable in terms of magnitude and duration of benefit, and the selection of medications has not achieved widespread standardization and has been dependent, in part, on the experiences of individual practitioners, investigators, and centers.

Propranolol was the first drug used in the medical management of HCM, and long-acting preparations of propranolol or more cardioselective agents such as atenolol, metoprolol, or nadolol have been employed more recently. There are many reports of subjective symptomatic improvement and enhanced exercise capacity in a dose range of up to 480 mg per day for

propranolol (2 mg/kg in children), both in patients with and without outflow obstruction. Although some investigators have administered massive doses of propranolol (up to 1,000 mg per day), claiming symptomatic benefit and long-term survival without major side effects,¹⁷² this is not generally accepted practice. However, even moderate doses of beta-blockers may affect growth in young children or impair school performance, or trigger depression in children and adolescents, and should be closely monitored in such patients.

Substantial experience suggests that standard dosages of these drugs can mitigate disabling symptoms and limit the latent outflow gradient provoked during exercise when sympathetic tone is high and heart failure symptoms occur. However, there is little evidence that beta-blocking agents consistently reduce outflow obstruction under resting conditions. Consequently, beta-blockers are a preferred drug treatment strategy for symptomatic patients with outflow gradients present only with exertion.

The beneficial effects of beta-blockers on symptoms of exertional dyspnea and exercise intolerance appear to be attributable largely to a decrease in the heart rate with a consequent prolongation of diastole and relaxation and an increase in passive ventricular filling. These agents lessen LV contractility and myocardial oxygen demand and possibly reduce microvascular myocardial ischemia. Potential side effects include fatigue, impotence, sleep disturbances, and chronotropic incompetence.

Verapamil

In 1979, the calcium antagonist verapamil was introduced as another negative inotropic agent for the treatment of HCM,¹⁷⁰ and has been widely used empirically in both the nonobstructive and obstructive forms, with a reported benefit for many patients, including those with a component of chest pain.^{176,205,206} Verapamil in doses up to 480 mg per day (usually in a sustained release preparation) has favorable effects on symptoms, probably by virtue of improving ventricular relaxation and filling as well as relieving myocardial ischemia and decreasing LV contractility.^{181,182,206} However, aside from the mild side-effects of constipation and hair loss, verapamil may also occasionally harbor a potential for clinically important adverse consequences and has been reported to cause death in a few HCM patients with severe disabling symptoms (orthopnea and paroxysmal nocturnal dyspnea) and markedly-elevated pulmonary arterial pressure in combination with marked outflow obstruction.¹⁴ Adverse hemodynamic effects of verapamil are presumably the result of the vasodilating properties predominating over negative inotropic effects, resulting in augmented outflow obstruction, pulmonary edema, and cardiogenic shock. Because of these concerns, caution should be exercised in administering verapamil to patients with resting outflow obstruction and severe limiting symptoms. Some investigators discourage the use of calcium antagonists in the management of obstructive HCM and instead favors disopyramide (often

with a beta-blocker) for such patients with severe symptoms.^{14,173} Verapamil is not indicated in infants due to the risk for sudden death that has been reported with intravenous administration. Dosages of oral verapamil have not been established for infants and preadolescent children.

Most clinicians favor using beta-blockers over verapamil for the initial medical treatment of exertional dyspnea, although it does not appear to be of crucial importance which drug is administered first. It has been common practice, however, to administer verapamil to those patients who do not experience a benefit from beta-blockers or who have a history of asthma. Improvement with verapamil may be due to the primary actions of the drug, and in some instances, partially attributable to withdrawal of beta-blockers and the abolition of side effects that evolved insidiously over time. At present, there is no evidence that combined medical therapy with administration of beta-blockers and verapamil is more advantageous than the use of either drug alone.

Disopyramide

The negative inotropic and Type I-A antiarrhythmic agent disopyramide was introduced into the treatment regimen for patients with obstructive HCM in 1982. There are reports of disopyramide producing symptomatic benefit (at 300 mg to 600 mg per day with a dose-response effect) in severely limited patients with resting obstruction, because of a decrease in SAM, outflow obstruction, and mitral regurgitant volume.^{168,171,173,174,177} Anticholinergic side effects such as dry mouth and eyes, constipation, indigestion, and difficulty in micturition may be reduced by long-acting preparations through which cardioactive benefits are more sustained. Because disopyramide may cause accelerated atrioventricular (A-V) nodal conduction and thus increase ventricular rate during AF, supplemental therapy with beta-blockers in low doses to achieve normal resting heart rate has been advised.

Although disopyramide incorporates antiarrhythmic properties, there is little evidence that proarrhythmic effects have intervened in HCM patients. Nevertheless, this issue remains of some concern in a disease associated with an arrhythmogenic LV substrate; prolongation of the QT interval should be monitored while administering the drug. Furthermore, disopyramide administration may be deleterious in nonobstructive HCM by decreasing cardiac output, causing most investigators to limit its use to patients with outflow obstruction who have not responded to beta-blockers or verapamil.

At present, the information regarding drugs such as sotalol and other calcium antagonists (such as diltiazem) is insufficient to recommend their use in HCM. Diuretic agents may be added to the cardioactive drug regimen prudently—preferably in the absence of marked outflow obstruction. Because many patients have diastolic dysfunction and require relatively high filling pressures to achieve adequate ventricular filling, it may be advisable to administer diuretics cautiously. Nifedipine, because of its particularly potent vasodilating properties, may be

deleterious, particularly for patients with outflow obstruction. Combined therapy with disopyramide and amiodarone (or disopyramide and sotalol), or quinidine and verapamil (or quinidine and procainamide), should also be avoided due to concern over proarrhythmia; also, administration of nitroglycerine, ACE inhibitors or digitalis are generally contraindicated or discouraged in the presence of resting or provokable outflow obstruction. In patients with severe heart failure refractory to other medications, caution is advised in administering amiodarone in a high dosage (greater than or equal to 400 mg per day). In patients with erectile dysfunction, PDE inhibitors should be used with the awareness that a mild afterload reducing effect may be deleterious in patients with resting or provokable obstruction.

Drugs in end-stage phase

A small but important subgroup of patients with non-obstructive HCM develops systolic ventricular dysfunction and severe heart failure, usually associated with LV remodeling demonstrable as wall thinning and chamber enlargement. This particular evolution of HCM occurs in only about 5% of patients and has been variously known as the "end-stage", "burnt-out", or "dilated" phase.^{7,37,160} Drug treatment strategies in such patients with systolic failure differ substantially from strategies for in HCM patients with typical LVH, nondilated chambers, and preserved systolic function (i.e., involving conversion to after load-reducing agents such as ACE inhibitors or angiotensin II-receptor blockers or diuretics, digitalis, beta-blockers or spironolactone) (Fig. 1). There is no evidence, however, that beta-blockers prevent or convey a benefit to congestive heart failure and ventricular systolic dysfunction of the "end-of-stage" (by contrast with the experience in dilated cardiomyopathy and CAD). Ultimately, patients with end-stage heart failure may become candidates for heart transplantation, and they represent the primary subgroup within the broad disease spectrum of HCM for when this treatment option is considered²⁰⁷ (Fig. 1).

Asymptomatic patients

Data from largely unselected cohorts and genotyping studies in families suggest that most HCM patients, including many who are not even aware of their disease, probably have no symptoms or only mild symptoms.^{5-7,17-19,30,50,55,59,64,65,164} While most of the asymptomatic patients do not require treatment, some represent therapeutic dilemmas because of their youthful age and the consideration for prophylactic therapy to prevent SCD or disease progression.^{21,27,127,208,209}

Prophylactic drug therapy in asymptomatic (or mildly symptomatic) patients to prevent or delay development of symptoms and improve prognosis has been the subject of debate for many years, but it remains on an entirely empiric basis without controlled data to either support or contradict its potential efficacy.¹¹ This issue is unresolved due to the relatively small patient populations previously available for study, as well as the

infrequency with which adverse end-points occur prematurely in this disease. Additionally, there is a growing awareness that an important proportion of HCM patients achieve normal life expectancy.^{30-32,34,55} In general, treatments to delay or prevent progression of the disease due to heart failure-related symptoms are most appropriately directed toward relieving LV outflow tract obstruction and controlling or abolishing AF through pharmacologic or intervention-based strategies. Indeed, treatments targeted at aborting the disease progression are now confined to those patients judged to be at high-risk for SCD (as discussed under Risk Stratification and SCD). The efficacy of empiric, prophylactic drug treatment with beta-blockers, verapamil or disopyramide for delaying the onset of symptoms and favorably altering the clinical course or outcome in asymptomatic young patients with particularly marked LV outflow tract gradients (about 75 mm Hg to 100 mm Hg or more) is unresolved.

Infective endocarditis prophylaxis

In HCM there is a small risk for bacterial endocarditis, which appears largely confined to those patients with LV outflow tract obstruction under resting conditions or with intrinsic mitral valve disease.²¹⁰ The site of the valvular vegetation is usually the thickened anterior mitral leaflet, although cases have been reported with lesions on the outflow tract endocardial contact plaque (at the point of mitral-septal contact) or on the aortic valve.^{210,211} Therefore, the AHA recommendation²¹² should be applied to HCM patients with evidence of outflow obstruction under resting or exercise conditions at the time of dental or selected surgical procedures that create a risk for blood-borne bacteremia.

Pregnancy

There is no evidence that patients with HCM are generally at increased risk during pregnancy and delivery. Absolute maternal mortality is very low (although possibly higher in patients with HCM than in the general population) and appears to be confined principally to women with high-risk clinical profiles.²¹³ Such patients should be afforded highly specialized preventive obstetrical care during pregnancy. Otherwise, most pregnant HCM patients undergo normal vaginal delivery without the necessity for cesarean section.

Treatment options for drug-refractory patients

In some patients, medical therapy ultimately proves insufficient to control symptoms, and the quality of life becomes unacceptable to the patient. At this point in the clinical course, after a trial administration of maximum drug treatment, the subsequent therapeutic strategies are dictated largely by whether LV outflow obstruction is present (Fig. 1).

Surgery. Patients in a small but important subgroup comprising only about 5% of all HCM patients in non-referral settings (but up to 30% in tertiary referral populations), are generally regarded as candidates for surgery. These patients have particularly marked outflow gradients (peak instantaneous usually greater than or equal to 50 mm Hg), as measured with continuous wave Doppler echocardiography either under resting/basal conditions and/or with provocation preferably utilizing physiologic exercise. In addition, these patients have severe limiting symptoms, usually of exertional dyspnea and chest pain that are regarded in adults as NYHA functional classes III and IV, refractory to maximum medical therapy.^{7,8,11,14,41,90,92,102,103} Over the past 40 years, based on the experience of a number of centers throughout the world, the ventricular septal myectomy operation (also known as the Morrow procedure)⁸ has become established as a proven approach for amelioration of outflow obstruction and the standard therapeutic option, and the gold standard, for both adults and children with obstructive HCM and severe drug-refractory symptoms.^{7,11,14,15,41,70,78,81,84,85,90–95,102–106,214} The myectomy operation should be confined to centers experienced in this procedure.

Myectomy is performed through an aortotomy and involves the resection of a carefully defined relatively small amount of muscle from the proximal septum (about 5 to 10 g), extending from near the base of the aortic valve to beyond the distal margins of mitral leaflets (about 3 to 4 cm), thereby enlarging the LV outflow tract²¹⁵ and, as a consequence in the vast majority of patients, abolishing any significant mechanical impedance to ejection and mitral valve SAM immediately normalizing LV systolic pressures, abolishing mitral regurgitation, and ultimately, reducing LV end-diastolic pressures. Such an abrupt relief of the gradient with surgery (in contrast to slower reduction with alcohol septal ablation in many cases) is particularly advantageous in patients with severe functional limitations.

Some surgeons have utilized a more extensive myectomy procedure for obstructive HCM, with the septal resection widened and extended far more distally than in the classic Morrow procedure (i.e., 7 to 8 cm from the aortic valve to below the level of papillary muscles).^{70,91} In addition, the anterolateral papillary muscle may be dissected partially free from its attachment with the lateral LV free wall to enhance papillary muscle mobility and reduce anterior tethering of the mitral apparatus.⁹¹ Alternatively, mitral valve replacement or repair has been employed in selected patients judged to have severe mitral regurgitation due to intrinsic abnormalities of the valve apparatus (such as myxomatous mitral valve).¹²⁴

Previously, some surgeons found it advantageous in selected patients to perform mitral valve replacement^{216,217} when the basal anterior septum in the area of resection is relatively thin (e.g., less than 18 mm) and muscular resection was judged to present an unacceptable risk of septal perforation or inadequate hemodynamic result.⁹³ However, currently, some surgical centers experienced with myectomy do not advocate

mitral valve replacement (in the absence of intrinsic mitral valve disease), even in the presence of a relatively thin ventricular septum; carefully performed surgical septal reduction is the preferred method.

Mitral valvuloplasty (plication) in combination with myectomy has been proposed for some patients with particularly deformed or elongated mitral leaflets.⁸⁴ Muscular mid-cavity obstruction due to an anomalous papillary muscle requires an extended distal myectomy⁹¹ or alternatively mitral valve replacement.¹¹⁵ Occasionally, patients, usually children, may demonstrate an obstruction to right ventricular outflow due to excessive muscular hypertrophy of trabeculae or crista supraventricularis muscle;²¹⁸ resection of the right ventricular outflow tract muscle, with or without an outflow tract patch, has abolished the gradient.

Published reports of over 2,000 patients from North American and European centers show remarkably consistent results with the ventricular septal myectomy operation. Isolated myectomy (without concomitant cardiac procedures such as valve replacement or coronary artery bypass grafting) is now performed with low operative mortality in patients of all ages, including children, at those centers having the most experience with this procedure (reported as 1% to 3%, and even less in the most recent cases).^{7,11,15,81,92–95,101–107} Surgical risk may be higher among very elderly patients (particularly those with severe disabling symptoms associated with pulmonary hypertension), patients with prior myectomy, or those undergoing additional cardiac surgical procedures. Complications such as complete heart block (requiring permanent pacemaker) and iatrogenic ventricular septal perforation have become uncommon (equal to or less than 1% to 2%), while partial or complete left bundle-branch block is an inevitable consequence of the muscular resection and is not associated with adverse sequelae.^{15,81,85,90–93,102–106} Intraoperative guidance with echocardiography (transesophageal or with the transducer applied directly to the right ventricular surface) is standard at centers performing surgery for HCM and is useful in assessing the site and extent of the proposed myectomy, structural features of the mitral valve, and the effect of muscular resection on SAM and mitral regurgitation.^{93,123,219}

Septal myectomy is associated with persistent, long-lasting improvement in disabling symptoms and exercise capacity (i.e., increase by one or more NYHA classes and demonstrable increase in peak oxygen consumption with exercise) and decreased frequency of syncope five or more years after surgery.^{7,11,13–15,81,90–95,102–106,220} Symptomatic benefit following myectomy appears to be largely the consequence of abolishing or substantially reducing the basal outflow gradient and mitral regurgitation, and restoring normal LV systolic and end-diastolic pressures (in more than 90% of patients), which may also favorably influence LV diastolic filling and myocardial ischemia.²⁰⁴ Because myectomy may result in a decrease in left atrial size,²²¹ the likelihood of AF occurring after surgery may be mitigated (and sinus rhythm restored with greater ease), especially in patients younger than 45 years.

Selected patients in whom severe refractory symptoms are indisputably linked to marked outflow gradients elicited by exercise (when resting obstruction is absent or mild) usually also benefit from myectomy. Reacquisition of SAM and a large resting LV outflow gradient is exceedingly uncommon after successful myectomy in either adults or children, and the need for reoperation to reduce recurrent outflow gradient is extremely uncommon at centers having the most experience with the septal myectomy operation.^{15,81,95,103,105}

By convention, surgery has not been recommended or performed in asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic patients with obstructive HCM for a number of reasons: 1) the effect of surgery per se on longevity is unresolved, although several surgical series have reported improved late survival after myectomy compared with the clinical course of nonoperated medically treated patients with severe symptoms; 2) operative mortality is now very low, but in some patients the risk of surgery may exceed the ultimate risks from the disease; 3) outflow obstruction is often compatible with normal longevity; 4) there is little or no evidence that surgical relief of outflow obstruction abolishes the risk for progression to the end-stage phase, which is an independent disease consequence.

Although definitive evidence is lacking, there is some suggestion in retrospective non-randomized studies that surgical relief of outflow obstruction in severely symptomatic patients may reduce long-term mortality and possibly SCD.^{10,95,105} It should be emphasized that surgery is not regarded as curative but is performed to achieve an improved quality of life and functional (exercise) capacity. One possible exception to this tenet may be young asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic patients with particularly marked outflow obstruction (e.g., 75 mm to 100 mm Hg or more at rest). There is a paucity of data in this subset, but it is not unreasonable to at least consider surgical intervention for young patients, even if they are not severely symptomatic, in the presence of particularly marked obstruction to LV outflow.

Additional approaches to relieve outflow obstruction and symptoms

Ventricular septal myectomy has generally been confined to selected major centers having substantial experience with this procedure. However, some patients may not have ready access to such specialized surgical care because of geographical factors; or they may not be favorable operative candidates, because of concomitant medical conditions—particularly advanced age, prior cardiac surgery, or insufficient personal motivation. Two techniques can be considered as potential alternatives to surgery for selected patients who otherwise meet the same clinical criteria as candidates for surgery.

Dual-chamber pacing

Several groups had investigated the effects of permanent dual-chamber pacing on severe outflow obstruction

and refractory symptoms within observational and uncontrolled study designs.^{80,100,222} Data in these studies were necessarily based on the subjective perception of symptom level by patients over relatively short periods of time. Such investigations reported dual-chamber pacing to be associated with a substantial decrease in outflow gradient, as well as amelioration of symptoms in most patients. These observations inferred that a reduction of gradient with pacing in turn consistently relieved symptoms. However, other catheterization laboratory studies showed that a decrease in the outflow gradient produced by temporary A-V sequential pacing could be associated with detrimental effects on ventricular filling and cardiac output.^{97,223}

Subsequently, dual-chamber pacing in HCM was subjected to scrutiny in three randomized, cross-over studies (double-blind in two) in which patients received 2 to 3 months each of pacing and also back-up AAI mode (no pacing) as a control, by activating and deactivating the pacemaker accordingly.^{43,47,98,99} Two randomized, cross-over, double-blind studies (one multi-center and one from the Mayo Clinic) reported the effects of pacing in HCM patients to be less favorable than the observational data had suggested.^{43,98} For example, the average decrease in outflow gradient with pacing, while statistically significant, was nevertheless much more modest (about 25% to 40%) than the in the uncontrolled studies and varied substantially among individual patients. In one study, the average subaortic gradient, even after nine months of pacing, remained in the preoperative range (e.g., average 48 mm Hg).

In these controlled studies, subjective symptomatic improvement assessed by quality-of-life score was reported with similar frequency by patients both after periods of pacing and after the same time period without pacing (AAI-backup).^{43,98} Objective measures of exercise capacity (e.g., treadmill exercise time and maximal oxygen consumption) did not differ significantly during pacing and without pacing. These observations demonstrate that subjectively reported symptomatic benefit during pacing frequently occurs without objective evidence of improved exercise capacity and can be regarded in part as a placebo effect.^{43,89,98} Furthermore, no correlation has been demonstrated for gradient reduction between short- and long-term pacing, suggesting that testing the gradient response to short-term pacing in the catheterization laboratory has limited practical clinical value in judging long-term efficacy.⁴³ However, the failure to achieve gradient reduction with temporary pacing suggests that permanent pacing is probably not indicated.

As part of its design, the randomized, cross-over, single-blind European multi-center HCM pacing trial, PIC (Pacing in Cardiomyopathy),^{47,48,89,107} excluded from chronic pacing those patients without significant gradient reduction during temporary pacing. With data very similar to the other two randomized studies, (but also with a large proportion of patients who elected to continue pacing based on their own subjective assessment of treatment), the PIC investigators concluded that pacemaker therapy was an option for most severely symptomatic patients with obstructive HCM refractory to drug

Table 1 Comparison of Septal Myectomy and Percutaneous Alcohol Septal Ablation*

Parameter	Myectomy	Ablation
Operative mortality	1% to 2%	1% to 2%
Gradient reduction (at rest)	to less than 10 mm Hg	to less than 25 mm Hg
Symptoms (subjective)	decreased	decreased
Symptoms (objective)	decreased	decreased
Effective with anatomic variability in septum	usually	uncertain
Pacemaker (high grade A-V block)	1% to 2%	5% to 10%
Estimated patient selection	×	15 to 20×
Sudden death risk (long-term)	very low	uncertain
Available follow-up	more than 40 years	about 6 years
Intramyocardial scar	absent	present

*Data represents best estimates based on the assimilation of published data, and with emphasis placed on the most recent clinical experience.

treatment. Nevertheless, taken together the available data do not support dual-chamber pacing as a primary treatment for most severely symptomatic patients with obstructive HCM. In a nonrandomized study comparing pacing and the myectomy operation, hemodynamic and symptomatic outcome proved to be superior with surgery.⁹⁹

Although it is not a primary treatment for the disease, there is nevertheless evidence to support utilizing a trial of dual-chamber pacing in selected patient subgroups that may benefit in terms of gradient relief and improvement in symptoms and exercise tolerance. For example, there may be both subjective and objective symptomatic benefit with pacing in some patients of advanced age (over 65 years),⁴³ for whom alternatives to surgery are often desirable. Otherwise, there are few predictive data upon which to specifically target those patients who are most likely to potentially benefit from pacing therapy; for example, there is little relationship between the magnitude of gradient reduction with chronic pacing and the symptomatic benefit ultimately achieved. Pacing-induced LV remodeling with thinning of the wall was claimed in one uncontrolled study⁸⁰ but could not be confirmed in a randomized investigation.⁴³ Furthermore, there is no evidence that pacing reduces the risk of SCD in HCM,^{43,80} alters or aborts underlying progression of the disease state, or conveys favorable hemodynamic or symptomatic benefit for patients with the nonobstructive form.²²⁴

Of potential advantage, pacing therapy permits more aggressive drug treatment by obviating the concern for drug-induced bradycardia.⁸² Some patients receiving an implantable cardioverter defibrillator (ICD) for high-risk status, in which obstruction to LV outflow is also present, may benefit from use of the dual-chamber pacing component of the ICD to effect a reduction in outflow gradient. The ACC/AHA/NASPE 2002 guidelines have designated pacing for severely symptomatic and medically refractory HCM patients with LV outflow obstruction as a class IIB indication.²²⁵

However, it should be underscored that maintenance of pacing therapy (directed toward alleviating

obstruction and symptoms) may be substantially more complex in HCM than in other cardiac conditions; therefore, for optimal results this procedure should be performed in centers highly experienced in both pacemaker therapy and HCM. Producing and maintaining a reduction in gradient (and presumably in symptoms) requires that pre-excitation of the right ventricular apex and distal septum be established and that complete ventricular capture—both at rest and during exercise—without compromising ventricular filling and cardiac output. Hence, ascertaining the optimal A-V interval for dual-chamber pacing is a crucial element of pacing management in HCM. Programming of the pacemaker A-V interval to ensure complete ventricular capture may require slowing of intrinsic A-V nodal conduction with a beta-blocker or verapamil, or possibly ablation of the A-V node in selected cases (thereby rendering the patient pacemaker dependent), has been suggested. It is also understood that no other treatment modality in HCM (including surgery and alcohol septal ablation) has undergone such rigorous randomized testing in order to validate its efficacy. At present, there are no data concerning the role of biventricular pacing in HCM patients with severe heart disease.

Percutaneous alcohol septal ablation

A second option to surgery is the more recently developed alcohol septal ablation technique (Table 1).^{44–46,49,79,83,86–88,101,226–234} First reported in 1995, this catheter interventional treatment involves the introduction of absolute alcohol into a target septal perforator branch of the left anterior descending coronary artery for the purpose of producing a myocardial infarction within the proximal ventricular septum. Septal ablation mimics the hemodynamic consequences of myectomy by reducing the basal septal thickness and excursion (producing akinetic or hypokinetic septal motion), enlarging the LV outflow tract and, thereby, lessening the SAM of the mitral valve and mitral regurgitation.^{44–46,49,88,227}

This technique utilizes conventional methods and technology currently available for atherosclerotic CAD. After standard coronary arteriograms are performed, a coronary balloon is placed into a proximal major septal perforator artery with the aid of flexible coronary guide wires. A temporary pacing catheter is positioned in the right ventricular apex in the event that high-grade A-V block occurs. After the balloon is inflated, an arteriogram is performed through the lumen to verify that the balloon is located in the desired anatomic position and to ensure that leakage of alcohol into the left anterior descending coronary artery or coronary venous system does not occur.

Myocardial contrast echocardiography guidance (with injection of echo contrast or radio-opaque medium) is important in selecting the appropriate septal perforator branch. This technique is useful for determining the precise area of septum targeted for alcohol and infarction and whether the selected septal perforator also perfuses other distant and unwanted areas of left or right ventricular myocardium or papillary muscles.^{79,230} Some groups prefer a pressure-angiographic and fluoroscopy guided technique.^{226,227,233} The targeted septal perforator and area for infarction are identified by an immediate fall in outflow gradient following balloon occlusion and/or contrast injection.

The amount of ethanol to be injected is estimated by the angiographic visualization of septal anatomy and whether contrast wash-out is slow or rapid.^{46,79,86,226,233} Usually, about 1 to 3 cc (average 1.5 to 2 cc) of desiccated ethanol (of at least 95% concentration) is slowly infused into the septal perforator and septum via the balloon catheter, inducing a myocardial infarction demonstrable by 400 to 2,500 units of creatinine phosphokinase release, equivalent to an area of necrosis estimated to be 3% to 10% of the LV mass (20% of the septum). However, centers performing a large number of alcohol septal ablation procedures today are using smaller amounts of ethanol, leading to less creatinine phosphokinase release and smaller septal infarcts, and also reducing the incidence of complete heart block.^{44,233}

Successful alcohol septal ablation may trigger a rapid reduction in resting outflow gradient evident in the catheterization laboratory. More frequently, a progressive decrease in the gradient occurs after 6 to 12 months, usually achieving levels in a range equivalent to that with myectomy, and resulting from remodeling of the septum without significant impairment in global LV ejection.^{46,49,229-234} This has been reported for patients with large resting gradients at baseline as well as those with outflow obstruction present only under provokable conditions.²³⁴ Often a biphasic response of the gradient is observed with alcohol septal ablation in which an acute response with striking reduction (probably due to stunning of the myocardium) is followed by a rise to about 50% of its pre-procedure level the next day, but within several months may reach greatly reduced levels. Results of myectomy and alcohol ablation compared at two institutions showed similar gradient reductions with the two techniques.⁹⁶ Another comparative analysis from a single

institution showed both surgery and ablation to substantially reduce resting and provokable gradients, but to a significantly greater degree with surgery.¹⁰¹

A number of other favorable structural and functional effects following ablation have been reported,²³¹ representing the expected consequences of reduced outflow gradient, normalization of LV pressures, and reduced systolic overload. Echocardiographic analyses from two groups have reported ablation to be associated with widespread regression of LVH beyond the alcohol target area,^{229,233} but the extent to which remodeling occurs with time secondary to this procedure is unpredictable and not fully understood. Also, there is concern that extensive wall thinning could lead to arrhythmogenic susceptibility or even the end-stage phase.

A large proportion of ablation patients from several centers have been reported to demonstrate subjective improvement in limiting symptoms and in quality of life in observational studies over relatively short-term follow-up periods of 2 to 5 years. As with surgery, the decrease in symptoms associated with ablation is often dramatic.^{44,46,49,88,101,108,232,234} In addition, improved exercise performance has been shown objectively in terms of total treadmill exercise time and peak oxygen consumption in some studies.^{46,96,101,232} However, alcohol septal ablation has yet to be subjected to the scrutiny of randomized or controlled studies or long-term follow-up. A recent study found that both septal myectomy and ablation led to improved exercise testing parameters, but surgery was superior in this regard.²³²

The mortality and morbidity associated with alcohol ablation in experienced centers have proved to be relatively low, although they are similar in surgical myectomy. Procedure-related mortality has been reported to be from 1% to 4% but is probably reduced in the more recent cases. Reports of permanent pacemaker implantation for induced high-grade A-V block have ranged from 5% to as high as 30%,^{46,88,101,228} but this complication appears to be decreasing substantially with the use of smaller amounts of alcohol. In contrast to septal myectomy, which usually produces left bundle branch block, alcohol ablation commonly results in right bundle branch block.^{45,46} It is also possible for coronary artery dissection to occur, as well as backward extravasation of alcohol, producing occlusion or abrupt coronary no-flow⁸⁷ and a large anteroseptal myocardial infarction.

Proper selection of patients for alcohol septal ablation remains a crucial issue.²²⁸ Similar to patients recommended for septal myectomy,^{5,7,8,11,13,41} all candidates for alcohol septal ablation should have severe heart failure symptoms (NYHA classes III or IV) refractory to all medications utilized in HCM as well as a subaortic gradient of 50 mm Hg or more measured with Doppler echocardiography either under basal conditions and/or with physiologic provocative maneuvers during exercise.²²⁸ Caution should be exercised so that in patients selected for alcohol septal ablation, outflow gradients are documented to be due to SAM and proximal mitral valve-septal contact,¹¹⁹ exclusive of congenital abnormalities of the mitral apparatus such as anomalous papillary

muscle insertion into mitral valve, which produces more distal muscular obstruction in the mid-cavity.^{91,115}

Nevertheless, the number of alcohol ablations performed world-wide now approaches an estimated 3,000 over only about a six-year period, exceeding the number of surgical myectomies performed over the 40 years since this operation was introduced.²²⁸ In some instances, the frequency with which myectomy surgery has been performed for obstructive HCM has now been reduced by more than 90%^{103,228} due to the recent accelerated enthusiasm for ablation.

Disproportionality in the frequency with which alcohol septal ablation is performed relative to myectomy (ablations are estimated to be at least 15 to 20 times more common than surgery at present) has raised concerns that there may have an insidious and unjustifiable lowering of the symptom and gradient-level threshold in the selection of patients for ablation, with less symptomatic NYHA class II, less obstructed, and younger patients now undergoing the procedure.²²⁸ This circumstance has evolved in part because of the relative ease with which ablation can be performed (compared to surgery), with substantially less discomfort during a much shorter post-operative hospitalization and recovery period in the absence of a sternotomy. However, this fact does not justify less strict criteria for alcohol septal ablation.

Another factor that has affected patient selection for alcohol septal ablation is the practice of determining eligibility based solely on a subaortic gradient provoked by non-physiologic interventions such as dobutamine infusion (rather than exercise, for example).^{88,230} Dobutamine is an inotropic and catecholamine-inducing drug that is a powerful stimulant of subaortic gradients in normal hearts or in cardiac diseases other than HCM^{130,131,235} of questionable physiologic and clinical significance,²³⁵ and occasionally results in adverse consequences to patients with obstruction; dependence on dobutamine to induce gradients can expose some patients to septal ablation in the absence of true impedance to LV outflow. Therefore, dobutamine is generally not recommended for the purpose of provoking outflow gradients in severely symptomatic HCM patients who are regarded as possible candidates for major interventions.

A predominate concern raised with respect to alcohol septal ablation is the potential long-term risk for arrhythmia-related cardiac events (including SCD) directly attributable to the procedure. Unlike myectomy, alcohol septal ablation potentially creates a permanent arrhythmogenic substrate in the form of a healed intramyocardial septal scar that could increase the risk of lethal re-entrant arrhythmias.²²⁶ This is particularly relevant because many patients with HCM already possess an unstable electrophysiologic substrate as part of their underlying disease.^{2,208,236,237} However, since HCM patients are at increased risk for SCD over particularly long periods, possibly through much of their lifetimes, it will require many years (and probably decades) to determine the likelihood that risk for arrhythmia-related events and SCD is increased as a consequence of the healed intramyocardial scar produced by alcohol septal ablation. Indeed, this is particularly relevant for young

patients in whom even a modest annual increase in the risk of SCD would have the likelihood of shortening life considerably. Reports of the non-inducibility of re-entrant ventricular tachyarrhythmia in small numbers of patients in the short term after septal ablation⁴⁶ do not appear sufficient at this juncture to exclude the possibility of late-onset ventricular tachyarrhythmias and SCD over the long risk period characteristic of HCM.^{26,208}

Therefore, at present, the impact of alcohol ablation on the incidence of SCD is unresolved. Until more is known regarding the natural history of patients undergoing alcohol septal ablation and there is less uncertainty regarding the consequences of the intramyocardial scar, particularly careful selection of patients seems advisable and prudent (by largely confining the procedure to older adults), particularly when the option for surgical myectomy is feasible. There would not appear to be a primary role for alcohol ablation in children, and such procedures are not advised.

Due to morphologic heterogeneity, not all HCM patients with obstruction are ideal candidates for septal ablation. This therapy relies on the fixed anatomic distribution and size of the septal perforator coronary arteries. Therefore, the ablation technique cannot make adjustments for variability in the distribution and size of these arterial vessels in relation to the distribution of septal hypertrophy, or for other complexities of LV outflow tract morphology such as greatly elongated mitral leaflets and anomalous papillary muscle. The direct operative approach provides greater flexibility for relieving obstruction and also allows surgical treatment for associated cardiac abnormalities such as primary valvular disease (e.g., myxomatous mitral valve prolapse or aortic stenosis),¹²⁴ atherosclerotic CAD, or segmental myocardial bridging of the left anterior descending coronary artery,²³⁸ as well as anomalies of the mitral valve and apparatus. Also, relief of obstruction with surgery is immediate (but is often delayed with alcohol septal ablation), which may be crucial in some patients with particularly severe symptoms of heart failure.

The "learning curve" for expertise with the alcohol septal ablation technique is steep (due, in part, to the relatively small number of eligible HCM patients), particularly regarding selection of the optimal septal perforator branch; therefore, ablation should not be regarded as a routine technique to be employed by any expert interventional cardiologist. It is advisable that alcohol ablation (as well as myectomy) be largely confined to centers having substantial and specific experience with HCM and the procedure in order to assure proper patient selection, the lowest possible rates of morbidity and mortality, and the greatest likelihood of achieving benefits.

While alcohol ablation represents an option available to HCM patients and a selective alternative to surgery, it is not at this time regarded as the standard and primary therapeutic strategy for all severely symptomatic patients refractory to maximal medical management with marked obstruction to LV outflow (Table 1). Septal myectomy remains the gold standard for this HCM patient subset.^{7,11,14,41,232}

Table 2 Risk Factors for Sudden Death in HCM*

Major	Possible in Individual Patients
Cardiac arrest (ventricular fibrillation)	Atrial fibrillation
Spontaneous sustained ventricular tachycardia	Myocardial ischemia
Family history of premature sudden death	LV outflow obstruction
Unexplained syncope	High-risk mutation
LV thickness greater than or equal to 30 mm	Intense (competitive) physical exertion
Abnormal exercise blood pressure	
Nonsustained ventricular tachycardia (Holter)	

Symbols:
Abbreviations: LV = left ventricular.
*see text for details.

Sudden Cardiac Death

Risk stratification

Since the modern description of HCM by Teare in 1958,¹² sudden and unexpected death (unassociated with severe heart failure) has been recognized as the most devastating and often unpredictable complication and the most frequent mode of premature demise from this disorder. Sudden cardiac death may occur as the initial disease presentation, most frequently in asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic young people.^{7,10,21–29,42,56,208,209,237–248} The high-risk HCM patients constitute only a minority of the overall disease population,^{5,7,11,21,22,27,249} and historically, a major investigative focus has been the isolation of the small but important subset of patients at high-risk among the overall HCM spectrum. Since SCD can be the initial manifestation of HCM,^{23,25–27,239} it often occurs without reliable warning signs or symptoms, and often in the early morning hours after awakening.²⁴ Although SCD is most frequent in adolescents and young adults less than 30 to 35 years old, such risk also extends through mid-life and beyond;²⁶ the basis for this particular predilection of SCD for the young is unresolved. Therefore, achieving any particular age does not itself confer an immunity to sudden HCM-related catastrophe. Sudden cardiac death occurs most commonly during mild exertion or sedentary activities (or during sleep), but it is not infrequently triggered by vigorous physical exertion.^{23,25} Indeed, HCM is the most common cause of cardiovascular-related SCD in young people, including competitive athletes (most commonly in basketball and football).²⁵

The available data (largely from recorded arrhythmic events that triggered appropriate defibrillator interventions) suggest that complex ventricular tachyarrhythmias emanating from an electrically unstable myocardial substrate are the most common mechanism by which SCD occurs in HCM.^{2,208,209,236,237} Indeed, ventricular arrhythmias are an important clinical feature in adults with HCM. On routine ambulatory (Holter) 24-h ECG monitoring, 90% of adults demonstrate ventricular arrhythmias, which are often frequent or complex, including premature ventricular depolarizations (greater than or equal to 200 in 20% of patients), ventricular

couplets (in greater than 40%) or nonsustained bursts of ventricular tachycardia (in 20% to 30%).²⁵⁰ Alternatively, it is possible that in some patients supraventricular tachyarrhythmias could trigger ventricular tachyarrhythmias or that bradyarrhythmias occur and require back-up pacing.

It has been suggested that life-threatening tachyarrhythmias could be provoked in HCM by a number of variables either secondary to environmental factors (e.g., intense physical exertion)^{23,25} or, alternatively, intrinsic to the disease process. The latter may involve a vicious cycle of increasing myocardial ischemia^{190,192–198,238,251} and diastolic (or systolic) dysfunction,^{37,181–188} possibly impacted by outflow obstruction,^{13,127} systemic arterial hypotension,^{29,252,253} or supraventricular tachyarrhythmias^{163,244,254} that lead to decreased stroke volume and coronary perfusion.

Although the available data on the stratification of SCD risk are substantial and a large measure of understanding has been achieved, it is important to underscore that precise identification of all individual high-risk patients by clinical risk markers is not completely resolved. This issue remains a challenge due largely to the heterogeneity of HCM disease presentation and expression, its relatively low prevalence in cardiologic practice, and the complexity of potential pathophysiologic mechanisms.^{1,7,36,41,50,59} Nevertheless, it is possible to identify most high-risk patients by non-invasive clinical markers,^{21,22,255} and only a small minority of those HCM patients who die suddenly (about 3%) are without any of the currently acknowledged risk markers.²¹ The highest risk for SCD has been associated with the following (Table 2): 1) prior cardiac arrest or spontaneously occurring and sustained VT;²³⁹ 2) family history of a premature HCM-related SCD particularly if sudden, in a close relative, or if multiple in occurrence;^{5,7,21} 3) identification of a high-risk mutant gene;^{6,19,63,132,245–247} 4) unexplained syncope, particularly in young patients or when exertional or recurrent;^{7,11} 5) nonsustained VT (of 3 beats or more and of at least 120 beats/min) evident on ambulatory (Holter) ECG recordings;^{240,242,256–258} 6) abnormal blood pressure response during upright exercise which is attenuated or hypotensive, indicative of hemodynamic instability, and of greater predictive value in patients less than 50 years old or if hypotensive;^{29,252,253,259} and 7) extreme LVH

with maximum wall thickness of 30 mm or more, particularly in adolescents and young adults.^{21,27,28}

HCM patients (particularly those less than 60 years old) should undergo comprehensive clinical assessments on an annual basis for risk stratification and evolution of symptoms, including careful personal and family history, noninvasive testing with two-dimensional echocardiography (primarily for assessment of magnitude of LVH and outflow obstruction), 24- or 48-h ambulatory (Holter) ECG recording for VT, and blood pressure response during maximal upright exercise (treadmill or bicycle). Subsequent risk analysis should be performed periodically and when there is a perceived change in clinical status.

Recent attention has focused on the magnitude of LVH (as assessed by conventional two-dimensional echocardiography) as an indicator of risk.²⁷ Two independent groups have reported a direct association between magnitude of LV wall thickness and risk of SCD in large HCM populations.^{21,22,27} In one study,²⁷ extreme LVH (maximum thickness of 30 mm or more), present in approximately 10% of HCM patients, conveyed substantial long-term risk. Sudden cardiac death was most common in asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic adolescents or young adults and was estimated at 20% over 10 years and 40% over 20 years (i.e., annual mortality about 2%). There is supporting circumstantial evidence from retrospective cross-sectional analyses that extreme hypertrophy represents a risk factor for premature SCD because it is observed less commonly in older than in younger patients;^{21,22,260} this finding could reflect either preferential SCD at a young age, structural remodeling with wall thinning, or both. This relationship of extreme hypertrophy to age is accentuated with wall thicknesses of 35 mm or more, which appear in less than 1% of patients older than 50 years.²⁶⁰ Another group, however, has maintained that extreme hypertrophy is a predictor of SCD, only when associated with other risk factors such as unexplained syncope, family history of premature SCDs, nonsustained VT on Holter, or an abnormal blood pressure response during exercise.²² At present, although it is not unequivocally resolved as to whether extreme hypertrophy as a sole risk factor is sufficient to justify a recommendation for prevention of SCD with an ICD, serious consideration for such an intervention should be given to young patients.

The concept that risk of SCD is related to the magnitude of hypertrophy does not, however, infer that the risk is necessarily low when LV wall thickness is less than 30 mm, because other risk markers may be present in a given patient; indeed, the majority of patients who die suddenly do, in fact, have wall thicknesses of less than 30 mm.^{21,22,27,28} Furthermore, a small number of high-risk pedigrees with troponin T and I mutations have been reported in whom SCD was associated with particularly mild forms of LVH, including a few individuals with normal LV wall thickness and mass.^{19,248,261} However, such events appear to be uncommon within the overall HCM patient spectrum. Although prognosis is generally not tightly linked to the pattern and distribution of LVH, the preponderance of evidence suggests that segmental wall thickening at the low end of the morphologic spectrum

(i.e., less than 20 mm thickness, regardless of its precise location), generally confers a favorable prognosis in the absence of other major risk factors.^{11,27,28} Such localized hypertrophy includes the nonobstructive form of HCM confined to the most distal portion of LV ("apical HCM").^{33,40,52}

Disorganized cardiac muscle cell arrangement,^{4,51,236} myocardial replacement scarring as a repair process following cell death (possibly resulting from ischemia due to abnormal microvasculature consisting of intramural small vessel disease or muscle mass-to-coronary flow mismatch)^{129,195,199,200,203} and the expanded interstitial (matrix) collagen compartment²⁶² probably serve as the primary arrhythmogenic substrate predisposing some susceptible patients to re-entrant, life-threatening ventricular tachyarrhythmias. That extreme degrees of LVH can be linked to sudden events is perhaps not unexpected, considering the potential impact of such wall thickening on myocardial architecture, oxygen demand, coronary vascular resistance, and capillary density, all of which thereby create an electrophysiologically unstable substrate. The degree of hypertrophy does not appear to be directly associated with the severity of diastolic dysfunction and limiting symptoms.^{188,263} Paradoxically, most patients with massive degrees of LVH do not experience marked symptomatic disability,^{22,27,263} LV outflow obstruction, or left atrial enlargement.

It is a clinical perception that the premonitory symptom most associated with the likelihood of SCD in HCM is impaired consciousness (i.e., syncope or near-syncope).^{128,165} However, the sensitivity and specificity of syncope as a predictor of SCD is low, possibly because most such events in this disease are probably not in fact secondary to arrhythmias or related to outflow obstruction. Indeed, there are many potential causes of syncope, some of which are unrelated to the basic disease state and are often neurocardiogenic (i.e., vagal, neurally-mediated syndromes) in origin.^{5,7,11,264} Even when an underlying cause for impaired consciousness cannot be identified, this symptom-complex can be compelling in some HCM patients,¹²⁸ particularly when it is exertional or recurrent, when it occurs in the young, or in the context of a single recent syncopal episode judged to be disease-related. Therefore, syncope may represent the basis of a defibrillator implant to ensure preservation of life should a life-threatening arrhythmia intervene.²⁰⁸

Available data suggest that LV outflow obstruction (gradient 30 mm Hg or more) can only be regarded as a minor risk factor for SCD in HCM.^{29,30,127} The impact of gradient on SCD risk is not sufficiently strong (positive predictive value of only 7%) for obstruction to merit a role as the sole (or predominant) deciding clinical parameter and the primary basis for decisions to intervene prophylactically with an ICD.¹²⁷

Identification of HCM in young children is exceedingly uncommon and often creates a specific clinical dilemma because such an initial diagnosis occurring so early in life (frequently fortuitously) raises uncertainty regarding future risk over particularly long time periods. One report suggests that short tunneled (bridged) intramyocardial segments of left anterior descending coronary

artery independently convey increased risk for cardiac arrest, probably mediated by myocardial ischemia.²³⁸ However, potential biases in patient selection, the frequency of coronary arterial bridging in surviving adults and those who have died of noncardiac causes, and the need for routine invasive coronary arteriography in order to identify this abnormality prospectively seem to mitigate the potential power of coronary bridging as a risk factor for SCD.

It has been proposed, based on genotype-phenotype correlations, that the genetic defects responsible for HCM could represent the primary determinant and stratifying marker of prognosis and for SCD and heart failure risk, with specific mutations conveying either favorable or adverse prognosis (i.e., high- and low-risk mutations).^{6,19,132,138,247,265,266} For example, it has been suggested that some cardiac beta-myosin heavy chain mutations (such as Arg403Gln and Arg719Gln) and some troponin-T mutations are associated with higher incidence of premature death, decreased life expectancy, and early onset disease manifestations, while other HCM genes such as cardiac myosin-binding protein C (particularly InsG791) or alpha-tropomyosin (Asp175Asn) convey a more favorable prognosis.⁶³ However, routine clinical testing for specific mutations believed to be high (or low) risk has been shown to have low yield.^{265,266} Therefore, it is premature to draw definitive conclusions regarding gene-specific clinical outcomes based solely on the presence of a particular mutation, by virtue of extrapolation from available epidemiologic-genetic data which are formulated from relatively small numbers of genotyped families largely skewed toward high-risk status.⁶ Consequently, it is becoming increasingly evident that the presence or absence of a particular mutation does not by itself represent sufficient data to convey clear prognostic implications and that HCM mutations may not possess distinctive clinical signatures.

The particular prognosis attached to adult carriers with a mutant HCM gene but without LVH and clinical expression of HCM,^{54,245} or those individuals who develop hypertrophy *de novo* in adulthood,^{6,17,64,65,146} is uncertain; however, at this early juncture, this subgroup would not appear to be associated with an adverse prognosis (Fig. 1). An exception to this tenet may be the small number of SCDs in young people with little or no LVH reported in a very few families with troponin-T mutations.^{19,245,247,248}

There is no convincing evidence that invasive markers such as those defined with laboratory electrophysiologic testing (i.e., programmed ventricular stimulation)^{264,267} have an important routine role in identifying those HCM patients who have an unstable electrical substrate and are at high-risk for SCD due to life threatening arrhythmias. Similar to the experience in CAD and dilated cardiomyopathy, polymorphic VT and VF (which are the most commonly provoked arrhythmias) are generally regarded as nonspecific electrophysiologic testing responses to multiple ventricular extra-stimuli,^{5,11} and these specialized laboratory studies are highly dependant on the level of aggression of the protocol.²⁶⁷ For example, stimulation with three ventricular premature depolarizations

rarely triggers monomorphic VT in HCM (in contrast to CAD), but frequently induces polymorphic VT or VF, even in some patients at low risk for SCD.

It is now the predominant view that the risk stratification strategies involving laboratory induction of such ventricular arrhythmias are neither desirable in HCM patients on a routine basis nor, *per se*, justify aggressive intervention.^{5,7,11} Electrophysiologic studies with or without programmed ventricular stimulation may, however, have some value in selected patients such as those with otherwise unexplained syncope.

Most of the clinical markers of SCD risk in HCM are limited by relatively low positive predictive values due in part to relatively low-event rates.^{11,21,27,28,30,242} However, the high negative predictive values (at least 90%) of these markers suggest that the *absence* of risk factors and certain other clinical features can be used to develop a profile of patients having a low likelihood of SCD or other adverse events.¹¹ Adult patients can probably be considered *low risk* if they demonstrate: 1) no or only mild symptoms of chest pain or exertional dyspnea (NYHA functional classes I and II); 2) absence of family history of premature death from HCM; 3) absence of syncope judged to be HCM-related; 4) absence of nonsustained ventricular tachycardia during ambulatory (Holter) ECG; 5) outflow tract gradient at rest of less than 30 mm Hg; 6) normal or relatively mild increase in left atrial size (less than 45 mm); 7) normal blood-pressure response to upright exercise; and 8) mild LVH (wall thickness less than 20 mm).

Patients with an apparently favorable prognosis in the absence of risk factors constitute an important proportion of the overall HCM population. Most such patients probably will not require aggressive major medical treatment and generally deserve a large measure of reassurance regarding their prognoses. Little or no restriction is necessary with regard to recreational activities and employment, although exclusion from intense competitive sports is advised.

Prevention

Efforts at the prevention of SCD have historically targeted only the minority of patients with HCM in whom SCD risk was unacceptably high. Historically, treatment strategies to prophylactically reduce the risk for SCD or delay progression of congestive symptoms have been predicated on the administration of drugs such as beta adrenergic-blockers, verapamil, and type I-A antiarrhythmic agents (i.e., quinidine, procainamide) to those patients perceived to be at high risk. However, there is no evidence that this practice of prophylactically administering such drugs empirically to asymptomatic HCM patients to mitigate the risk for SCD is efficacious, and this strategy now seems out-dated with the current availability of measures that more effectively prevent SCD, such as the ICD. In addition, low dose (less than 300 mg) amiodarone has been associated with improved survival in HCM,^{243,257} but this agent requires careful monitoring and may not be tolerated due to its potential toxicity over the long risk periods incurred by young patients.

When risk level for SCD is judged by contemporary criteria to be unacceptably high and deserving of intervention, the ICD is the most effective and reliable treatment option available, harboring the potential for absolute protection and altering the natural history of this disease in some patients^{208,209,237,268} (Fig. 1). In one multicenter retrospective study, ICDs appropriately sensed and automatically aborted potentially lethal ventricular tachyarrhythmias by restoring sinus rhythm in almost 25% of a high-risk cohort, followed for a relatively brief period of 3 years.²⁰⁸ Appropriate device interventions occurred at a rate of 11% per year for secondary prevention (the implant following cardiac arrest or spontaneous and sustained ventricular tachycardia) and at 5% per year for primary prevention (implant based solely on noninvasive risk factors), usually in patients with no or only mild prior symptoms. There was only a 4 to 1 excess of ICDs implanted to lives saved. Patients receiving appropriate defibrillation shocks were generally young (mean age 40 years). ICDs often remained dormant for prolonged periods before discharging (up to 9 years), emphasizing the unpredictable timing of SCD events in this disease, the potentially long risk period, and the requirement for extended follow-up duration to assess survival in HCM studies.^{26,208} Therefore, while the decision to implant a defibrillator for primary prevention cannot reasonably be deferred beyond the time when high-risk status is first judged to be present, it may precede considerably the time at which the device ultimately discharges. There is an ongoing multicenter international study of HCM patients with ICDs²⁰⁸ for the purpose of obtaining data on interventional devices in a much larger population over longer periods of time.

The ICD is strongly warranted for secondary prevention of SCD in those patients with prior cardiac arrest or sustained and spontaneously occurring VT.^{7,208} The presence of multiple clinical risk factors conveys increasing risk for SCD of sufficient magnitude to justify aggressive prophylactic treatment with an ICD for primary prevention of SCD.^{208,268} Strong consideration should be afforded for a prophylactic ICD in the presence of one risk factor regarded as major in that patient (e.g., a family history of SCD in close relatives).^{7,27,268}

Because the positive predictive value of any single risk factor is low, such management decisions must often be based on individual judgment for the particular patient, by taking into account the overall clinical profile including age, the strength of the risk factor identified, the level of risk acceptable to the patient and family, and the potential complications largely related to the lead systems and to inappropriate device discharges. It is also worth noting that physician and patient attitudes toward ICDs (and the access to such devices within the respective health care system) can vary considerably among countries and cultures and thereby have an important impact on clinical decision-making and the threshold for implant in HCM.²⁶⁹ The ACC/AHA/NASPE 2002 guidelines have designated the ICD for primary prevention of SCD as a class IIb indication and for secondary prevention (after cardiac arrest) as a class I indication.²²⁵

There is, at present, an understandable reluctance on the part of pediatric cardiologists to implant such devices chronically in children (particularly for primary prevention) considering the necessary, ongoing commitment required for maintenance and the likelihood that lead or other (ICD-related) complications will occur over very long time periods. However, while adolescence may represent a psychologically difficult age to be encumbered by an ICD, it should also be emphasized that this is coincidentally the period of life consistently showing the greatest predilection for SCD in HCM.^{7,21–23,25–28,208} One alternative but empiric strategy proposed for some very young high-risk children is the administration of amiodarone as a bridge to later ICD placement after sufficient growth and maturation has occurred. Some investigators also regard the end-stage phase of HCM as a risk factor for SCD, justifying implantation of a cardioverter-defibrillator during the waiting period prior to the availability of a heart for transplant.

Athlete recommendations

In accord with the recommendations of the Expert Consensus panel of the 26th Bethesda Conference,²⁴¹ young patients with HCM should be restricted from intense competitive sports to reduce the risk for SCD that may be associated with such extreme lifestyle. A linkage has been established between SCD and intense exertion in trained athletes with underlying cardiovascular disease (including HCM) and SCD.^{25,270}

There is indirect and circumstantial evidence that the removal of young athletes from the competitive arena reduces risk for SCD.^{241,271} Not all trained athletes with HCM die suddenly during their competitive phase of life, only some HCM-related SCDs are associated with intense physical activity,^{25,26} and precision in the stratification of risk for athletes with HCM is particularly difficult given the extreme environmental conditions to which they are often exposed (associated with alterations in blood volume hydration and with electrolytes). Nevertheless, the consensus of the general medical community prudently supports avoiding exposure to most competitive sports for young athletes with HCM to reduce SCD risk, and therefore withdrawal from the athletic arena can be regarded as a treatment modality in this disease.^{241,271} However, stringent lifestyle or employment modifications for other HCM patients (who are not participants in organized athletics) do not seem justified or practical, although intense physical activity involving burst exertion (e.g., sprinting) or systematic isometric exercise (e.g., heavy lifting) should be discouraged. Although data are scarce, there is presently no evidence to suggest that genetically affected but phenotypically normal family members are generally at increased risk for SCD. Therefore, there is little basis for subjecting such individuals to the same activity restrictions as many other HCM patients, or excluding them from competitive athletics in the absence of cardiac symptoms, family history of SCD, or a mutant gene regarded as malignant. However, periodic (probably annual) noninvasive clinical evaluation

directed toward risk assessment is warranted in this subset of patients.

Atrial Fibrillation

Atrial fibrillation is the most common sustained arrhythmia in HCM and usually justifies aggressive therapeutic strategies^{30,38,161–163,249} (Fig. 1). Paroxysmal episodes or chronic AF ultimately occur in 20% to 25% of HCM patients,^{30,163,249} linked to left atrial enlargement and an increasing incidence with age.¹⁶³ Furthermore, it is possible that subclinical AF (i.e., identified only by Holter recording) may be even more common. Clinical cohort studies show that AF is reasonably well tolerated by about one-third of patients and is not an independent determinant of sudden unexpected death;¹⁶³ however, it is possible that in certain susceptible patients, AF may trigger life-threatening ventricular arrhythmias.^{244,254} Nevertheless, AF is independently associated with heart failure-related death, occurrence of fatal and nonfatal stroke, as well as long-term disease progression with heart failure symptoms;^{38,161,163} transient episodes occur in about 30% of patients immediately following septal myectomy, often in patients with a prior history of AF.²⁰² Risk for complications of AF is enhanced when the arrhythmia becomes chronic, onset is before 50 years of age, and outflow obstruction is present.¹⁶³

Paroxysmal episodes of AF may also be responsible for acute clinical deterioration, with syncope or heart failure resulting from the reduced diastolic filling and cardiac output—as a consequence of increased ventricular rate and with the loss of atrial contraction (and its contribution to ventricular filling) in a hypertrophied LV with pre-existing impaired relaxation and compliance.^{161–163} Atrial fibrillation in HCM should be managed generally in accordance with the ACC/AHA guidelines.²⁷² In particular, electrical or pharmacologic cardioversion are indicated in those patients presenting within 48 h of onset, assuming that the presence of atrial thrombi can be excluded with a reasonable degree of certainty. Although comparative data regarding the efficacy of antiarrhythmic drugs are not available for HCM patients, amiodarone is generally regarded as the most effective antiarrhythmic agent for preventing recurrences of AF, based largely on extrapolation from its use in other heart diseases.²⁷³

A generally aggressive strategy for maintaining sinus rhythm is warranted in HCM because of the association of AF with progressive heart failure and mortality, as well as stroke.³⁸ In chronic AF, beta-blockers, verapamil (and digoxin) have proved effective in controlling heart rate, although A-V node ablation and permanent ventricular pacing may occasionally be necessary in selected patients. Anticoagulant therapy (with warfarin) is indicated in patients with either paroxysmal or chronic AF.^{7,11,38,163} Because even one or two episodes of paroxysmal AF have been associated with increased risk for systemic thromboembolization in HCM, the threshold for initiation of anticoagulant therapy should be low and can include patients after the initial AF paroxysm.^{7,38,163} Since warfarin has proved superior to aspirin in other cardiac conditions associated with AF, it is the recom-

mended anticoagulant agent in HCM patients judged to be at risk for thromboembolism. While anticoagulation reduces the risk of thromboembolic events in patients with AF and HCM, it is also recognized that anticoagulation does not completely abolish the risk of stroke.^{38,163} Such clinical decisions should be tailored to the individual patient after considering the risk for hemorrhagic complications, lifestyle modifications, and expectations for compliance.

The most appropriate management for patients with asymptomatic nonsustained supraventricular tachycardia (detected only on ambulatory [Holter] ECG or exercise-testing), and associated with left atrial enlargement is presently unresolved. Also, at present, there is little experience specifically in HCM patients with emerging and novel alternative treatment strategies for AF such as pulmonary vein radio-frequency ablation, the surgical MAZE procedure, or implantable atrial defibrillators to warrant definitive recommendations at this time.

References

1. Maron BJ, Gardin JM, Flack JM, Gidding SS, Kurosaki TT, Bild DE. Prevalence of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in a general population of young adults. Echocardiographic analysis of 4111 subjects in the CARDIA Study. Coronary Artery Risk Development in (Young) Adults. *Circulation* 1995;**92**:785–9.
2. Ferrans VJ, Morrow AG, Roberts WC. Myocardial ultrastructure in idiopathic hypertrophic subaortic stenosis. A study of operatively excised left ventricular outflow tract muscle in 14 patients. *Circulation* 1972;**45**:769–92.
3. Frank S, Braunwald E. Idiopathic hypertrophic subaortic stenosis. Clinical analysis of 126 patients with emphasis on the natural history. *Circulation* 1968;**37**:759–88.
4. Maron BJ, Roberts WC. Quantitative analysis of cardiac muscle cell disorganization in the ventricular septum of patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1979;**59**:689–706.
5. Maron BJ. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Lancet* 1997;**350**:127–33.
6. Maron BJ, Moller JH, Seidman CE et al. Impact of laboratory molecular diagnosis on contemporary diagnostic criteria for genetically transmitted cardiovascular diseases. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, long-QT syndrome, and Marfan syndrome. [A statement for health-care professionals from the Councils on Clinical Cardiology, Cardiovascular Disease in the Young, and Basic Science, American Heart Association]. *Circulation* 1998;**98**:1460–71.
7. Maron BJ. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. A systematic review. *JAMA* 2002;**287**:1308–20.
8. Morrow AG, Reitz BA, Epstein SE et al. Operative treatment in hypertrophic subaortic stenosis. Techniques, and the results of pre and postoperative assessments in 83 patients. *Circulation* 1975;**52**:88–102.
9. Schwartz K, Carrier L, Guicheney P, Komajda M. Molecular basis of familial cardiomyopathies. *Circulation* 1995;**91**:532–40.
10. Shah PM, Adelman AG, Wigle ED et al. The natural (and unnatural) history of hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *Circ Res* 1974;**35**(Suppl II):179–95.
11. Spirito P, Seidman CE, McKenna WJ, Maron BJ. The management of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *N Engl J Med* 1997;**336**:775–85.
12. Teare D. Asymmetrical hypertrophy of the heart in young adults. *Br Heart J* 1958;**20**:1–18.
13. Wigle ED, Sasson Z, Henderson MA et al. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. The importance of the site and the extent of hypertrophy. A review. *Prog Cardiovasc Dis* 1985;**28**:1–83.
14. Wigle ED, Rakowski H, Kimball BP, Williams WG. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Clinical spectrum and treatment. *Circulation* 1995;**92**:1680–92.
15. Williams WG, Wigle ED, Rakowski H, Smallhorn J, LeBlanc J, Trusler GA. Results of surgery for hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1987;**76**:V104–8.

16. Maron BJ, Carney KP, Lever HM et al. Relationship of race to sudden cardiac death in competitive athletes with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2003;**41**:974–80.
17. Niihara H, Bachinski LL, Sangwatanaroj S et al. Mutations in the gene for cardiac myosin-binding protein C and late-onset familial hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *N Engl J Med* 1998;**338**:1248–57.
18. Thierfelder L, Watkins H, MacRae C et al. Alpha-tropomyosin and cardiac troponin T mutations cause familial hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. A disease of the sarcomere. *Cell* 1994;**77**:701–12.
19. Watkins H, McKenna WJ, Thierfelder L et al. Mutations in the genes for cardiac troponin T and alpha-tropomyosin in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *N Engl J Med* 1995;**332**:1058–64.
20. Kyriakidis M, Triposkiadis F, Anastasakis A et al. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in Greece. Clinical course and outcome. *Chest* 1998;**114**:1091–6.
21. Elliott PM, Poloniecki J, Dickie S et al. Sudden death in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Identification of high risk patients. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2000;**36**:2212–8.
22. Elliott PM, Gimeno B Jr., Mahon NG, Poloniecki JD, McKenna WJ. Relation between severity of left-ventricular hypertrophy and prognosis in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Lancet* 2001;**357**:420–4.
23. Maron BJ, Roberts WC, Epstein SE. Sudden death in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. A profile of 78 patients. *Circulation* 1982;**65**:1388–94.
24. Maron BJ, Kogan J, Proschan MA, Hecht GM, Roberts WC. Circadian variability in the occurrence of sudden cardiac death in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1994;**23**:1405–9.
25. Maron BJ, Shirani J, Poliac LC, Mathenge R, Roberts WC, Mueller FO. Sudden death in young competitive athletes. Clinical, demographic, and pathological profiles. *JAMA* 1996;**276**:199–204.
26. Maron BJ, Olivotto I, Spirito P et al. Epidemiology of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy-related death. Revisited in a large non-referral-based patient population. *Circulation* 2000;**102**:858–64.
27. Spirito P, Bellone P, Harris KM, Bernabo P, Bruzzi P, Maron BJ. Magnitude of left ventricular hypertrophy and risk of sudden death in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *N Engl J Med* 2000;**342**:1778–85.
28. Spirito P, Maron BJ. Relation between extent of left ventricular hypertrophy and occurrence of sudden cardiac death in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1990;**15**:1521–6.
29. Maki S, Ikeda H, Muro A et al. Predictors of sudden cardiac death in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 1998;**82**:774–8.
30. Maron BJ, Casey SA, Poliac LC, Gohman TE, Almquist AK, Aeppli DM. Clinical course of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in a regional United States cohort. *JAMA* 1999;**281**:650–5.
31. Maron BJ, Casey SA, Hauser RG, Aeppli DM. Clinical course of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy with survival to advanced age. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2003. In Press.
32. Cannan CR, Reeder GS, Bailey KR, Melton LJ III, Gersh BJ. Natural history of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. A population-based study, 1976 through 1990. *Circulation* 1995;**92**:2488–95.
33. Eriksson MJ, Sonnenberg B, Woo A et al. Long-term outcome in patients with apical hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2002;**39**:638–45.
34. Fay WP, Taliencio CP, Ilstrup DM, Tajik AJ, Gersh BJ. Natural history of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in the elderly. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1990;**16**:821–6.
35. Lever HM, Karam RF, Currie PJ, Healy BP. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in the elderly. Distinctions from the young based on cardiac shape. *Circulation* 1989;**79**:580–9.
36. Klues HG, Schiffers A, Maron BJ. Phenotypic spectrum and patterns of left ventricular hypertrophy in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Morphologic observations and significance as assessed by two-dimensional echocardiography in 600 patients. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1995;**26**:1699–708.
37. Maron BJ, Spirito P. Implications of left ventricular remodeling in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 1998;**81**:1339–44.
38. Maron BJ, Olivotto I, Bellone P et al. Clinical profile of stroke in 900 patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2002;**39**:301–7.
39. Klues HG, Maron BJ, Dollar AL, Roberts WC. Diversity of structural mitral valve alterations in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1992;**85**:1651–60.
40. Yamaguchi H, Ishimura T, Nishiyama S et al. Hypertrophic non-obstructive cardiomyopathy with giant negative T waves (apical hypertrophy). Ventriculographic and echocardiographic features in 30 patients. *Am J Cardiol* 1979;**44**:401–12.
41. Maron BJ, Bonow RO, Cannon RO III, Leon MB, Epstein SE. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Interrelations of clinical manifestations, pathophysiology, and therapy. *N Engl J Med* 1987;**316**:844–52.
42. Hecht GM, Klues HG, Roberts WC, Maron BJ. Coexistence of sudden cardiac death and end-stage heart failure in familial hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1993;**22**:489–97.
43. Maron BJ, Nishimura RA, McKenna WJ, Rakowski H, Josephson ME, Kievial RS. Assessment of permanent dual-chamber pacing as a treatment for drug-refractory symptomatic patients with obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. A randomized, double-blind, crossover study (M-PATHY). *Circulation* 1999;**99**:2927–33.
44. Faber L, Meissner A, Ziemssen P, Seggewiss H. Percutaneous transluminal septal myocardial ablation for hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. Long term follow up of the first series of 25 patients. *Heart* 2000;**83**:326–31.
45. Flores-Ramirez R, Lakkis NM, Middleton KJ, Killip D, Spencer WH III, Nagueh SF. Echocardiographic insights into the mechanisms of relief of left ventricular outflow tract obstruction after nonsurgical septal reduction therapy in patients with hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2001;**37**:208–14.
46. Gietzen FH, Leuner CJ, Raute-Kreinsen U et al. Acute and long-term results after transcatheter ablation of septal hypertrophy (TASH). Catheter interventional treatment for hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *Eur Heart J* 1999;**20**:1342–54.
47. Kappenberger L, Linde C, Daubert C et al. Pacing in hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. A randomized crossover study. PIC Study Group. *Eur Heart J* 1997;**18**:1249–56.
48. Kappenberger LJ, Linde C, Jeanrenaud X et al. Clinical progress after randomized on/off pacemaker treatment for hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. Pacing in Cardiomyopathy (PIC) Study Group. *Europace* 1999;**1**:77–84.
49. Knight C, Kurbaan AS, Seggewiss H et al. Nonsurgical septal reduction for hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. Outcome in the first series of patients. *Circulation* 1997;**95**:2075–81.
50. Maron BJ, Peterson EE, Maron MS, Peterson JE. Prevalence of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in an outpatient population referred for echocardiographic study. *Am J Cardiol* 1994;**73**:577–80.
51. Davies MJ, McKenna WJ. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy—pathology and pathogenesis. *Histopathology* 1995;**26**:493–500.
52. Louie EK, Maron BJ. Apical hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Clinical and two-dimensional echocardiographic assessment. *Ann Intern Med* 1987;**106**:663–70.
53. Maron BJ, Tajik AJ, Ruttenberg HD et al. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in infants. Clinical features and natural history. *Circulation* 1982;**65**:7–17.
54. Maron BJ, Kragel AH, Roberts WC. Sudden death in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy with normal left ventricular mass. *Br Heart J* 1990;**63**:308–10.
55. Maron BJ, Mathenge R, Casey SA, Poliac LC, Longe TF. Clinical profile of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy identified de novo in rural communities. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1999;**33**:1590–5.
56. Nicod P, Polikar R, Peterson KL. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and sudden death. *N Engl J Med* 1988;**318**:1255–7.
57. Rosenzweig A, Watkins H, Hwang DS et al. Preclinical diagnosis of familial hypertrophic cardiomyopathy by genetic analysis of blood lymphocytes. *N Engl J Med* 1991;**325**:1753–60.
58. Skinner JR, Manzoor A, Hayes AM, Joffe HS, Martin RP. A regional study of presentation and outcome of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in infants. *Heart* 1997;**77**:229–33.
59. Maron BJ, Spirito P. Impact of patient selection biases on the perception of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and its natural history. *Am J Cardiol* 1993;**72**:970–2.
60. Buxton AE, Lee KL, Fisher JD, Josephson ME, Prystowsky EN, Hafley G. A randomized study of the prevention of sudden death in patients with coronary artery disease. Multicenter Unsustained Tachycardia Trial Investigators. *N Engl J Med* 1999;**341**:1882–90.
61. Moss AJ, Zareba W, Hall WJ et al. Prophylactic implantation of a defibrillator in patients with myocardial infarction and reduced ejection fraction. *N Engl J Med* 2002;**346**:877–83.

62. Packer M, Coats AJ, Fowler MB et al. Effect of carvedilol on survival in severe chronic heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2001; **344**:1651–8.
63. Seidman JG, Seidman CE. The genetic basis for cardiomyopathy. From mutation identification to mechanistic paradigms. *Cell* 2001; **104**:557–67.
64. Charron P, Dubourg O, Desnos M et al. Clinical features and prognostic implications of familial hypertrophic cardiomyopathy related to the cardiac myosin-binding protein C gene. *Circulation* 1998; **97**:2230–6.
65. Maron BJ, Niimura H, Casey SA et al. Development of left ventricular hypertrophy in adults in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy caused by cardiac myosin-binding protein C gene mutations. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2001; **38**:315–21.
66. Maron BJ, Pelliccia A, Spirito P. Cardiac disease in young trained athletes. Insights into methods for distinguishing athlete's heart from structural heart disease, with particular emphasis on hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1995; **91**:1596–601.
67. Pelliccia A, Maron BJ, Spataro A, Proschan MA, Spirito P. The upper limit of physiologic cardiac hypertrophy in highly trained elite athletes. *N Engl J Med* 1991; **324**:295–301.
68. Palka P, Lange A, Fleming AD et al. Differences in myocardial velocity gradient measured throughout the cardiac cycle in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, athletes and patients with left ventricular hypertrophy due to hypertension. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1997; **30**:760–8.
69. Moon JC, McKenna WJ, McCrohan JA, Elliott PM, Smith GC, Pennell DJ. Toward clinical risk assessment in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy with gadolinium cardiovascular magnetic resonance. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2003; **41**:1561–7.
70. Schoendube FA, Klues HG, Reith S, Flachskampf FA, Hanrath P, Messmer BJ. Long-term clinical and echocardiographic follow-up after surgical correction of hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy with extended myectomy and reconstruction of the subvalvular mitral apparatus. *Circulation* 1995; **92**:1122–7.
71. Pollick C, Rakowski H, Wigle ED. Muscular subaortic stenosis. The quantitative relationship between systolic anterior motion and the pressure gradient. *Circulation* 1984; **69**:43–9.
72. Braunwald E, Lambrew C, Rockoff D et al. Idiopathic hypertrophic subaortic stenosis. I. a description of the disease based upon an analysis of 64 patients. *Circulation* 1964; **30**(Suppl IV):3–217.
73. Kizilbash AM, Heintz SK, Grayburn PA. Spontaneous variability of left ventricular outflow tract gradient in hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1998; **97**:461–6.
74. Panza JA, Maris TJ, Maron BJ. Development and determinants of dynamic obstruction to left ventricular outflow in young patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1992; **85**:1398–405.
75. Klues HG, Leuner C, Kuhn H. Left ventricular outflow tract obstruction in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Increase in gradient after exercise. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1992; **19**:527–33.
76. Panza JA, Petrone RK, Fananapazir L, Maron BJ. Utility of continuous wave Doppler echocardiography in the noninvasive assessment of left ventricular outflow tract pressure gradient in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1992; **19**:91–9.
77. Ross J Jr., Braunwald E, Gault JH, Mason DT, Morrow AG. The mechanism of the intraventricular pressure gradient in idiopathic hypertrophic subaortic stenosis. *Circulation* 1966; **34**:558–78.
78. Cohn LH, Trehan H, Collins JJ Jr. Long-term follow-up of patients undergoing myotomy/myectomy for obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 1992; **70**:657–60.
79. Faber L, Seggewiss H, Gleichmann U. Percutaneous transluminal septal myocardial ablation in hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. Results with respect to intraprocedural myocardial contrast echocardiography. *Circulation* 1998; **98**:2415–21.
80. Fananapazir L, Epstein ND, Curiel RV, Panza JA, Tripodi D, McAreavey D. Long-term results of dual-chamber (DDD) pacing in obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Evidence for progressive symptomatic and hemodynamic improvement and reduction of left ventricular hypertrophy. *Circulation* 1994; **90**:2731–42.
81. Heric B, Lytle BW, Miller DP, Rosenkranz ER, Lever HM, Cosgrove DM. Surgical management of hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. Early and late results. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 1995; **110**:195–206.
82. Jeanrenaud X, Schlapfer J, Fromer M, Aebischer N, Kappenberger L. Dual chamber pacing in hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. Beneficial effect of atrioventricular junction ablation for optimal left ventricular capture and filling. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol* 1997; **20**:293–300.
83. Kim JJ, Lee CW, Park SW et al. Improvement in exercise capacity and exercise blood pressure response after transcatheter alcohol ablation therapy of septal hypertrophy in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 1999; **83**:1220–3.
84. McIntosh CL, Maron BJ, Cannon RO III, Klues HG. Initial results of combined anterior mitral leaflet plication and ventricular septal myotomy-myectomy for relief of left ventricular outflow tract obstruction in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1992; **86**(Suppl):1160–7.
85. Krajcer Z, Leachman RD, Cooley DA, Coronado R. Septal myotomy-myectomy versus mitral valve replacement in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Ten-year follow-up in 185 patients. *Circulation* 1989; **80**:157–64.
86. Kuhn H, Gietzen FH, Schafers M et al. Changes in the left ventricular outflow tract after transcatheter ablation of septal hypertrophy (TASH) for hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy as assessed by transoesophageal echocardiography and by measuring myocardial glucose utilization and perfusion. *Eur Heart J* 1999; **20**:1808–17.
87. Kuhn H, Gietzen F, Leuner C. "The abrupt no-flow". A no-reflow like phenomenon in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Eur Heart J* 2002; **23**:91–3.
88. Lakkis NM, Nagueh SF, Dunn JK, Killip D, Spencer WH III. Nonsurgical septal reduction therapy for hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. One-year follow-up. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2000; **36**:852–5.
89. Linde C, Gadler F, Kappenberger L, Ryden L. Placebo effect of pacemaker implantation in obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. PIC Study Group. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol* 1999; **83**:903–7.
90. Maron BJ, Merrill WH, Freier PA, Kent KM, Epstein SE, Morrow AG. Long-term clinical course and symptomatic status of patients after operation for hypertrophic subaortic stenosis. *Circulation* 1978; **57**:1205–13.
91. Maron BJ, Nishimura RA, Danielson GK. Pitfalls in clinical recognition and a novel operative approach for hypertrophic cardiomyopathy with severe outflow obstruction due to anomalous papillary muscle. *Circulation* 1998; **98**:2505–8.
92. McCully RB, Nishimura RA, Tajik AJ, Schaff HV, Danielson GK. Extent of clinical improvement after surgical treatment of hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1996; **94**:467–71.
93. McIntosh CL, Maron BJ. Current operative treatment of obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1988; **78**:487–95.
94. Merrill WH, Friesinger GC, Graham TP Jr. et al. Long-lasting improvement after septal myectomy for hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2000; **69**:1732–5.
95. Mohr R, Schaff HV, Danielson GK, Puga FJ, Pluth JR, Tajik AJ. The outcome of surgical treatment of hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. Experience over 15 years. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 1989; **97**:666–74.
96. Nagueh SF, Ommen SR, Lakkis NM et al. Comparison of ethanol septal reduction therapy with surgical myectomy for the treatment of hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2001; **38**:1701–6.
97. Nishimura RA, Hayes DL, Ilstrup DM, Holmes DR Jr., Tajik AJ. Effect of dual-chamber pacing on systolic and diastolic function in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Acute Doppler echocardiographic and catheterization hemodynamic study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1996; **27**:421–30.
98. Nishimura RA, Trusty JM, Hayes DL et al. Dual-chamber pacing for hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. A randomized, double-blind, crossover trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1997; **29**:435–41.
99. Ommen SR, Nishimura RA, Squires RW, Schaff HV, Danielson GK, Tajik AJ. Comparison of dual-chamber pacing versus septal myectomy for the treatment of patients with hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. A comparison of objective hemodynamic and exercise end points. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1999; **34**:191–6.
100. Posma JL, Blanksma PK, Van Der Wall EE, Vaalburg W, Crijns HJ, Lie KI. Effects of permanent dual chamber pacing on myocardial

- perfusion in symptomatic hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Heart* 1996;**76**:358–62.
101. Qin JX, Shiota T, Lever HM et al. Outcome of patients with hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy after percutaneous transluminal septal myocardial ablation and septal myectomy surgery. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2001;**38**:1994–2000.
 102. Robbins RC, Stinson EB. Long-term results of left ventricular myotomy and myectomy for obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 1996;**111**:586–94.
 103. Schulte HD, Borisov K, Gams E, Gramsch-Zabel H, Losse B, Schwartzkopff B. Management of symptomatic hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy—long-term results after surgical therapy. *Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 1999;**47**:213–8.
 104. Ten Berg JM, Suttrop MJ, Knaepen PJ, Ernst SM, Vermeulen FE, Jaarsma W. Hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. Initial results and long-term follow-up after Morrow septal myectomy. *Circulation* 1994;**90**:1781–5.
 105. Theodoro DA, Danielson GK, Feldt RH, Anderson BJ. Hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy in pediatric patients. Results of surgical treatment. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 1996;**112**:1589–97.
 106. Yu EH, Omran AS, Wigle ED, Williams WG, Siu SC, Rakowski H. Mitral regurgitation in hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. Relationship to obstruction and relief with myectomy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2000;**36**:2219–25.
 107. Gadler F, Linde C, Daubert C et al. Significant improvement of quality of life following atrioventricular synchronous pacing in patients with hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. Data from 1 year of follow-up. PIC study group. *Pacing In Cardiomyopathy. Eur Heart J* 1999;**20**:1044–50.
 108. Ruzyllo W, Chojnowska L, Demkow M et al. Left ventricular outflow tract gradient decrease with non-surgical myocardial reduction improves exercise capacity in patients with hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *Eur Heart J* 2000;**21**:770–7.
 109. Paz R, Jortner R, Tunick PA et al. The effect of the ingestion of ethanol on obstruction of the left ventricular outflow tract in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *N Engl J Med* 1996;**335**:938–41.
 110. Kuhn H, Mercier J, Kohler E, Frenzel H, Hort W, Loogen F. Differential diagnosis of hypertrophic cardiomyopathies. Typical (sub-aortic) hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy, atypical (mid-ventricular) hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy and hypertrophic non-obstructive cardiomyopathy. *Eur Heart J* 1983;**4**(Suppl F:93-104.):93–104.
 111. Wigle ED. Cardiomyopathy. The diagnosis of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Heart* 2001;**86**:709–14.
 112. Klues HG, Roberts WC, Maron BJ. Morphological determinants of echocardiographic patterns of mitral valve systolic anterior motion in obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1993;**87**:1570–9.
 113. Spirito P, Maron BJ. Patterns of systolic anterior motion of the mitral valve in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Assessment by two-dimensional echocardiography. *Am J Cardiol* 1984;**54**:1039–46.
 114. Qin JX, Shiota T, Lever HM et al. Impact of left ventricular outflow tract area on systolic outflow velocity in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. A real-time three-dimensional echocardiographic study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2002;**39**:308–14.
 115. Klues HG, Roberts WC, Maron BJ. Anomalous insertion of papillary muscle directly into anterior mitral leaflet in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Significance in producing left ventricular outflow obstruction. *Circulation* 1991;**84**:1188–97.
 116. Maron BJ, Harding AM, Spirito P, Roberts WC, Waller BF. Systolic anterior motion of the posterior mitral leaflet. A previously unrecognized cause of dynamic subaortic obstruction in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1983;**68**:282–93.
 117. Sherrid MV, Gunsburg DZ, Moldenhauer S, Pearle G. Systolic anterior motion begins at low left ventricular outflow tract velocity in obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2000;**36**:1344–54.
 118. Cape EG, Simons D, Jimoh A, Weyman AE, Yoganathan AP, Levine RA. Chordal geometry determines the shape and extent of systolic anterior mitral motion. In vitro studies. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1989;**13**:1438–48.
 119. Shah PM, Taylor RD, Wong M. Abnormal mitral valve coaptation in hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. Proposed role in systolic anterior motion of mitral valve. *Am J Cardiol* 1981;**48**:258–62.
 120. Maron BJ, Spirito P, Green KJ, Wesley YE, Bonow RO, Arce J. Noninvasive assessment of left ventricular diastolic function by pulsed Doppler echocardiography in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1987;**10**:733–42.
 121. Wilson WS, Criley JM, Ross RS. Dynamics of left ventricular emptying in hypertrophic subaortic stenosis. A cineangiographic and hemodynamic study. *Am Heart J* 1967;**73**:4–16.
 122. Sherrid MV, Chu CK, Delia E, Mogtader A, Dwyer EM Jr. An echocardiographic study of the fluid mechanics of obstruction in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1993;**22**:816–25.
 123. Grigg LE, Wigle ED, Williams WG, Daniel LB, Rakowski H. Transesophageal Doppler echocardiography in obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Clarification of pathophysiology and importance in intraoperative decision making. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1992;**20**:42–52.
 124. Petrone RK, Klues HG, Panza JA, Peterson EE, Maron BJ. Coexistence of mitral valve prolapse in a consecutive group of 528 patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy assessed with echocardiography. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1992;**20**:55–61.
 125. Criley JM. Unobstructed thinking (and terminology) is called for in the understanding and management of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1997;**29**:741–3.
 126. Murgio JP, Alter BR, Dorethy JF, Altobelli SA, McGranahan GM Jr. Dynamics of left ventricular ejection in obstructive and nonobstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Clin Invest* 1980;**66**:1369–82.
 127. Maron MS, Olivetto I, Betocchi S et al. Effect of left ventricular outflow tract obstruction on clinical outcome in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *N Engl J Med* 2003;**348**:295–303.
 128. Kofflard MJ, Ten Cate FJ, van der Lee C, van Domburg RT. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in a large community-based population. Clinical outcome and identification of risk factors for sudden cardiac death and clinical deterioration. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2003;**41**:987–93.
 129. Choudhury L, Mahrholdt H, Wagner A et al. Myocardial scarring in asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2002;**40**:2156–64.
 130. Pellikka PA, Oh JK, Bailey KR, Nichols BA, Monahan KH, Tajik AJ. Dynamic intraventricular obstruction during dobutamine stress echocardiography. A new observation. *Circulation* 1992;**86**:1429–32.
 131. Okeie K, Shimizu M, Yoshio H et al. Left ventricular systolic dysfunction during exercise and dobutamine stress in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2000;**36**:856–63.
 132. Anan R, Greve G, Thierfelder L et al. Prognostic implications of novel beta cardiac myosin heavy chain gene mutations that cause familial hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Clin Invest* 1994;**93**:280–5.
 133. Coviello DA, Maron BJ, Spirito P et al. Clinical features of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy caused by mutation of a “hot spot” in the alpha-tropomyosin gene. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1997;**29**:635–40.
 134. Blair E, Redwood C, Ashrafian H et al. Mutations in the gamma(2) subunit of AMP-activated protein kinase cause familial hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Evidence for the central role of energy compromise in disease pathogenesis. *Hum Mol Genet* 2001;**10**:1215–20.
 135. Erdmann J, Raible J, Maki-Abadi J et al. Spectrum of clinical phenotypes and gene variants in cardiac myosin-binding protein C mutation carriers with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2001;**38**:322–30.
 136. Gruver EJ, Fatkin D, Dodds GA et al. Familial hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and atrial fibrillation caused by Arg663His beta-cardiac myosin heavy chain mutation. *Am J Cardiol* 1999;**83**:13H–8H.
 137. Kimura A, Harada H, Park JE et al. Mutations in the cardiac troponin I gene associated with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Nat Genet* 1997;**16**:379–82.
 138. Marian AJ, Roberts R. Recent advances in the molecular genetics of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1995;**92**:1336–47.
 139. Niimura H, Patton KK, McKenna WJ et al. Sarcomere protein gene mutations in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy of the elderly. *Circulation* 2002;**105**:446–51.
 140. Osterop AP, Kofflard MJ, Sandkuijl LA et al. AT1 receptor A/C1166 polymorphism contributes to cardiac hypertrophy in subjects with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Hypertension* 1998;**32**:825–30.
 141. Lechin M, Quinones MA, Omran A et al. Angiotensin-I converting enzyme genotypes and left ventricular hypertrophy in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1995;**92**:1808–12.

142. Arad M, Benson DW, Perez-Atayde AR et al. Constitutively active AMP kinase mutations cause glycogen storage disease mimicking hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Clin Invest* 2002; **109**:357–62.
143. Sachdev B, Takenaka T, Teraguchi H et al. Prevalence of Anderson-Fabry disease in male patients with late onset hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 2002; **105**:1407–11.
144. Beer G, Reinecke P, Gabbert HE, Hort W, Kuhn H. Fabry disease in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy (HCM). *Z Kardiol* 2002; **91**:992–1002.
145. Jenni R, Oechslin E, Schneider J, Jost CA, Kaufmann PA. Echocardiographic and pathoanatomical characteristics of isolated left ventricular non-compaction. A step towards classification as a distinct cardiomyopathy. *Heart* 2001; **86**:666–71.
146. Charron P, Dubourg O, Desnos M et al. Diagnostic value of electrocardiography and echocardiography for familial hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in a genotyped adult population. *Circulation* 1997; **96**:214–9.
147. Charron P, Dubourg O, Desnos M et al. Diagnostic value of electrocardiography and echocardiography for familial hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in genotyped children. *Eur Heart J* 1998; **19**:1377–82.
148. Panza JA, Maron BJ. Relation of electrocardiographic abnormalities to evolving left ventricular hypertrophy in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy during childhood. *Am J Cardiol* 1989; **63**:1258–65.
149. Ho CY, Sweitzer NK, McDonough B et al. Assessment of diastolic function with Doppler tissue imaging to predict genotype in preclinical hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 2002; **105**:2997.
150. Hagege AA, Dubourg O, Desnos M et al. Familial hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Cardiac ultrasonic abnormalities in genetically affected subjects without echocardiographic evidence of left ventricular hypertrophy. *Eur Heart J* 1998; **19**:490–9.
151. Nagueh SF, Bachinski LL, Meyer D et al. Tissue Doppler imaging consistently detects myocardial abnormalities in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and provides a novel means for an early diagnosis before and independently of hypertrophy. *Circulation* 2001; **104**:128–30.
152. Maron BJ, Spirito P, Wesley Y, Arce J. Development and progression of left ventricular hypertrophy in children with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *N Engl J Med* 1986; **315**:610–4.
153. Spirito P, Maron BJ. Absence of progression of left ventricular hypertrophy in adult patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1987; **9**:1013–7.
154. Fox PR, Liu SK, Maron BJ. Echocardiographic assessment of spontaneously occurring feline hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. An animal model of human disease. *Circulation* 1995; **92**:2645–51.
155. Geisterfer-Lowrance AA, Christe M, Conner DA et al. A mouse model of familial hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Science* 1996; **272**:731–4.
156. Lim DS, Lutucuta S, Bachireddy P et al. Angiotensin II blockade reverses myocardial fibrosis in a transgenic mouse model of human hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 2001; **103**:789–91.
157. Marian AJ, Wu Y, Lim DS et al. A transgenic rabbit model for human hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Clin Invest* 1999; **104**:1683–92.
158. Semsarian C, Ahmad I, Giewat M et al. The L-type calcium channel inhibitor diltiazem prevents cardiomyopathy in a mouse model. *J Clin Invest* 2002; **109**:1013–20.
159. Takagi E, Yamakado T, Nakano T. Prognosis of completely asymptomatic adult patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1999; **33**:206–11.
160. Spirito P, Maron BJ, Bonow RO, Epstein SE. Occurrence and significance of progressive left ventricular wall thinning and relative cavity dilatation in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 1987; **60**:123–9.
161. Robinson K, Frenneaux MP, Stockins B, Karatasakis G, Poloniecki JD, McKenna WJ. Atrial fibrillation in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. A longitudinal study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1990; **15**:1279–85.
162. Spirito P, Lakatos E, Maron BJ. Degree of left ventricular hypertrophy in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and chronic atrial fibrillation. *Am J Cardiol* 1992; **69**:1217–22.
163. Olivetto I, Cecchi F, Casey SA, Dolara A, Traverse JH, Maron BJ. Impact of atrial fibrillation on the clinical course of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 2001; **104**:2517–24.
164. Spirito P, Chiarella F, Carratino L, Berisso MZ, Bellotti P, Vecchio C. Clinical course and prognosis of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in an outpatient population. *N Engl J Med* 1989; **320**:749–55.
165. McKenna WJ, Deanfield J, Faruqui A, England D, Oakley C, Goodwin J. Prognosis in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Role of age and clinical, electrocardiographic and hemodynamic features. *Am J Cardiol* 1981; **47**:532–8.
166. Krikler DM, Davies MJ, Rowland E, Goodwin JF, Evans RC, Shaw DB. Sudden death in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Associated accessory atrioventricular pathways. *Br Heart J* 1980; **43**:245–51.
167. Lewis JF, Maron BJ. Elderly patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. A subset with distinctive left ventricular morphology and progressive clinical course late in life. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1989; **13**:36–45.
168. Sherrid MV, Pearle G, Gunsburg DZ. Mechanism of benefit of negative inotropes in obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1998; **97**:41–7.
169. Cohen LS, Braunwald E. Amelioration of angina pectoris in idiopathic hypertrophic subaortic stenosis with beta-adrenergic blockade. *Circulation* 1967; **35**:847–51.
170. Kaltenbach M, Hopf R, Kober G, Bussmann WD, Keller M, Petersen Y. Treatment of hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy with verapamil. *Br Heart J* 1979; **42**:35–42.
171. Matsubara H, Nakatani S, Nagata S et al. Salutary effect of disopyramide on left ventricular diastolic function in hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1995; **26**:768–75.
172. Ostman-Smith I, Wettrell G, Riesenfeld T. A cohort study of childhood hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Improved survival following high-dose beta-adrenoceptor antagonist treatment. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1999; **34**:1813–22.
173. Pollick C. Muscular subaortic stenosis. Hemodynamic and clinical improvement after disopyramide. *N Engl J Med* 1982; **307**:997–9.
174. Pollick C, Kimball B, Henderson M, Wigle ED. Disopyramide in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. I. Hemodynamic assessment after intravenous administration. *Am J Cardiol* 1988; **62**:1248–51.
175. Rosing DR, Kent KM, Maron BJ, Epstein SE. Verapamil therapy. A new approach to the pharmacologic treatment of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. ii. effects on exercise capacity and symptomatic status. *Circulation* 1979; **60**:1208–13.
176. Rosing DR, Condit JR, Maron BJ et al. Verapamil therapy. A new approach to the pharmacologic treatment of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy: iii. effects of long-term administration. *Am J Cardiol* 1981; **48**:545–53.
177. Sherrid M, Delia E, Dwyer E. Oral disopyramide therapy for obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 1988; **62**:1085–8.
178. Spicer RL, Rocchini AP, Crowley DC, Rosenthal A. Chronic verapamil therapy in pediatric and young adult patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 1984; **53**:1614–9.
179. Gilligan DM, Chan WL, Joshi J et al. A double-blind, placebo-controlled crossover trial of nadolol and verapamil in mild and moderately symptomatic hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1993; **21**:1672–9.
180. Frenneaux MP, Porter A, Caforio AL, Odawara H, Counihan PJ, McKenna WJ. Determinants of exercise capacity in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1989; **13**:1521–6.
181. Bonow RO, Frederick TM, Bacharach SL et al. Atrial systole and left ventricular filling in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Effect of verapamil. *Am J Cardiol* 1983; **51**:1386–91.
182. Bonow RO, Dilsizian V, Rosing DR, Maron BJ, Bacharach SL, Green MV. Verapamil-induced improvement in left ventricular diastolic filling and increased exercise tolerance in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Short- and long-term effects. *Circulation* 1985; **72**:853–64.
183. Briguori C, Betocchi S, Romano M et al. Exercise capacity in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy depends on left ventricular diastolic function. *Am J Cardiol* 1999; **84**:309–15.
184. Lele SS, Thomson HL, Seo H, Belenkie I, McKenna WJ, Frenneaux MP. Exercise capacity in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Role of stroke volume limitation, heart rate, and diastolic filling characteristics. *Circulation* 1995; **92**:2886–94.
185. Lewis JF, Spirito P, Pelliccia A, Maron BJ. Usefulness of Doppler echocardiographic assessment of diastolic filling in distinguishing "athlete's heart" from hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Br Heart J* 1992; **68**:296–300.
186. Betocchi S, Hess OM, Losi MA, Nonogi H, Kraysenbuehl HP. Regional left ventricular mechanics in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1993; **88**:2206–14.

187. Spirito P, Maron BJ, Bonow RO, Epstein SE. Severe functional limitation in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and only mild localized left ventricular hypertrophy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1986; **8**:537–44.
188. Spirito P, Maron BJ. Relation between extent of left ventricular hypertrophy and diastolic filling abnormalities in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1990; **15**:808–13.
189. Sharma S, Elliott P, Whyte G et al. Utility of cardiopulmonary exercise in the assessment of clinical determinants of functional capacity in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 2000; **86**:162–8.
190. Cannon RO III, Schenke WH, Maron BJ et al. Differences in coronary flow and myocardial metabolism at rest and during pacing between patients with obstructive and patients with non-obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1987; **10**:53–62.
191. Cecchi F, Olivetto I, Gistri R, Lorenzoni R, Chiriatti G, Camici PG. Coronary microvascular dysfunction and prognosis in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *N Engl J Med* 2003. In Press.
192. Grover-McKay M, Schwaiger M, Krivokapich J, Perloff JK, Phelps ME, Schelbert HR. Regional myocardial blood flow and metabolism at rest in mildly symptomatic patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1989; **13**:317–24.
193. Krams R, Kofflard MJ, Duncker DJ et al. Decreased coronary flow reserve in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy is related to remodeling of the coronary microcirculation. *Circulation* 1998; **97**:230–3.
194. Maron BJ, Epstein SE, Roberts WC. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and transmural myocardial infarction without significant atherosclerosis of the extramural coronary arteries. *Am J Cardiol* 1979; **43**:1086–102.
195. Maron BJ, Wolfson JK, Epstein SE, Roberts WC. Intramural ("small vessel") coronary artery disease in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1986; **8**:545–57.
196. Nienaber CA, Gambhir SS, Mody FV et al. Regional myocardial blood flow and glucose utilization in symptomatic patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1993; **87**:1580–90.
197. O'Gara PT, Bonow RO, Maron BJ et al. Myocardial perfusion abnormalities in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Assessment with thallium-201 emission computed tomography. *Circulation* 1987; **76**:1214–23.
198. Takata J, Counihan PJ, Gane JN et al. Regional thallium-201 wash-out and myocardial hypertrophy in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and its relation to exertional chest pain. *Am J Cardiol* 1993; **72**:211–7.
199. Tanaka M, Fujiwara H, Onodera T, Wu DJ, Hamashima Y, Kawai C. Quantitative analysis of myocardial fibrosis in normals, hypertensive hearts, and hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Br Heart J* 1986; **55**: 575–81.
200. Tanaka M, Fujiwara H, Onodera T et al. Quantitative analysis of narrowings of intramyocardial small arteries in normal hearts, hypertensive hearts, and hearts with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1987; **75**:1130–9.
201. Schwartzkopff B, Mundhenke M, Strauer BE. Alterations of the architecture of subendocardial arterioles in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and impaired coronary vasodilator reserve. A possible cause for myocardial ischemia. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1998; **31**:1089–96.
202. Ommen SR, Thomson HL, Nishimura RA, Tajik AJ, Schaff HV, Danielson GK. Clinical predictors and consequences of atrial fibrillation after surgical myectomy for obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 2002; **89**:242–4.
203. Basso C, Thiene G, Corrado D, Buja G, Melacini P, Nava A. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and sudden death in the young. Pathologic evidence of myocardial ischemia. *Hum Pathol* 2000; **31**:988–98.
204. Cannon RO III, McIntosh CL, Schenke WH, Maron BJ, Bonow RO, Epstein SE. Effect of surgical reduction of left ventricular outflow obstruction on hemodynamics, coronary flow, and myocardial metabolism in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1989; **79**:766–75.
205. Gistri R, Cecchi F, Choudhury L et al. Effect of verapamil on absolute myocardial blood flow in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 1994; **74**:363–8.
206. Udelson JE, Bonow RO, O'Gara PT et al. Verapamil prevents silent myocardial perfusion abnormalities during exercise in asymptomatic patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1989; **79**:1052–60.
207. Shirani J, Maron BJ, Cannon RO III, Shahin S, Roberts WC. Clinicopathologic features of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy managed by cardiac transplantation. *Am J Cardiol* 1993; **72**:434–40.
208. Maron BJ, Shen W-K, Link MS et al. Efficacy of implantable cardioverter-defibrillators for the prevention of sudden death in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *N Engl J Med* 2000; **342**:365–73.
209. Elliott PM, Sharma S, Varnava A, Poloniecki J, Rowland E, McKenna WJ. Survival after cardiac arrest or sustained ventricular tachycardia in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1999; **33**:1596–601.
210. Spirito P, Rapezzi C, Bellone P et al. Infective endocarditis in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Prevalence, incidence, and indications for antibiotic prophylaxis. *Circulation* 1999; **99**:2132–7.
211. Roberts WC, Kishel JC, McIntosh CL, Cannon RO III, Maron BJ. Severe mitral or aortic valve regurgitation, or both, requiring valve replacement for infective endocarditis complicating hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1992; **19**:365–71.
212. Dajani AS, Taubert KA, Wilson W et al. Prevention of bacterial endocarditis. Recommendations by the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 1997; **96**:358–66.
213. Autore C, Conte MR, Piccininno M et al. Risk associated with pregnancy in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2002; **40**:1864–9.
214. Agnew TM, Barratt-Boyes BG, Brandt PW, Roche AH, Lowe JB, O'Brien KP. Surgical resection in idiopathic hypertrophic subaortic stenosis with a combined approach through aorta and left ventricle. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 1977; **74**:307–16.
215. Spirito P, Maron BJ, Rosing DR. Morphologic determinants of hemodynamic state after ventricular septal myotomy-myectomy in patients with obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. M mode and two-dimensional echocardiographic assessment. *Circulation* 1984; **70**:984–95.
216. McIntosh CL, Greenberg GJ, Maron BJ, Leon MB, Cannon RO III, Clark RE. Clinical and hemodynamic results after mitral valve replacement in patients with obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Ann Thorac Surg* 1989; **47**:236–46.
217. Cooley DA, Wukasch DC, Leachman RD. Mitral valve replacement for idiopathic hypertrophic subaortic stenosis. Results in 27 patients. *J Cardiovasc Surg (Torino)* 1976; **17**:380–7.
218. Maron BJ, McIntosh CL, Klues HG, Cannon RO III, Roberts WC. Morphologic basis for obstruction to right ventricular outflow in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 1993; **71**:1089–94.
219. Marwick TH, Stewart WJ, Lever HM et al. Benefits of intraoperative echocardiography in the surgical management of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1992; **20**:1066–72.
220. Redwood DR, Goldstein RE, Hirshfeld J et al. Exercise performance after septal myotomy and myectomy in patients with obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 1979; **44**:215–20.
221. Henry WL, Morganroth J, Pearlman AS et al. Relation between echocardiographically determined left atrial size and atrial fibrillation. *Circulation* 1976; **53**:273–9.
222. Rishi F, Hulse JE, Auld DO et al. Effects of dual-chamber pacing for pediatric patients with hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1997; **29**:734–40.
223. Betocchi S, Losi MA, Piscione F et al. Effects of dual-chamber pacing in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy on left ventricular outflow tract obstruction and on diastolic function. *Am J Cardiol* 1996; **77**:498–502.
224. Cannon RO III, Tripodi D, Dilsizian V, Panza JA, Fananapazir L. Results of permanent dual-chamber pacing in symptomatic non-obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 1994; **73**:571–6.
225. Gregoratos G, Abrams J, Epstein AE et al. ACC/AHA/NASPE 2002 guideline update for implantation of cardiac pacemakers and antiarrhythmic devices. Summary article: a report of the American college of cardiology/american heart association task force on practice guidelines (acc/aha/naspe committee to update the 1998 pacemaker guidelines). *Circulation* 2002; **106**:2145–61.

226. Kuhn H, Gietzen FH, Leuner C et al. Transcoronary ablation of septal hypertrophy (TASH). A new treatment option for hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *Z Kardiol* 2000;**89**(Suppl 4):IV41–54.
227. Kuhn H, Gietzen F, Leuner C, Gerenkamp T. Induction of subaortic septal ischaemia to reduce obstruction in hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. Studies to develop a new catheter-based concept of treatment. *Eur Heart J* 1997;**18**:846–51.
228. Maron BJ. Role of alcohol septal ablation in treatment of obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Lancet* 2000;**355**:425–6.
229. Mazur W, Nagueh SF, Lakkis NM et al. Regression of left ventricular hypertrophy after nonsurgical septal reduction therapy for hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 2001;**103**:1492–6.
230. Nagueh SF, Lakkis NM, He ZX et al. Role of myocardial contrast echocardiography during nonsurgical septal reduction therapy for hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1998;**32**:225–9.
231. Nagueh SF, Lakkis NM, Middleton KJ et al. Changes in left ventricular filling and left atrial function six months after nonsurgical septal reduction therapy for hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1999;**34**:1123–8.
232. Firoozi S, Elliott PM, Sharma S et al. Septal myotomy-myectomy and transcoronary septal alcohol ablation in hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. A comparison of clinical, hemodynamic and exercise outcomes. *Eur Heart J* 2002;**20**:1617–24.
233. Boekstegers P, Steinbigler P, Molnar A et al. Pressure-guided non-surgical myocardial reduction induced by small septal infarctions in hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2001;**38**:846–53.
234. Gietzen FH, Leuner CJ, Obergassel L, Strunk-Muller C, Kuhn H. Role of transcoronary ablation of septal hypertrophy in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, NYHA functional class III or IV and outflow obstruction only under provokable conditions. *Circulation* 2002;**106**:454–9.
235. Luria D, Klutstein MW, Rosenmann D, Shaheen J, Sergey S, Tzivoni D. Prevalence and significance of left ventricular outflow gradient during dobutamine echocardiography. *Eur Heart J* 1999;**20**:386–92.
236. Varnava AM, Elliott PM, Mahon N, Davies MJ, McKenna WJ. Relation between myocyte disarray and outcome in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 2001;**88**:275–9.
237. Silka MJ, Kron J, Dunnigan A, Dick M. Sudden cardiac death and the use of implantable cardioverter- defibrillators in pediatric patients. The Pediatric Electrophysiology Society. *Circulation* 1993;**87**:800–7.
238. Yetman AT, McCrindle BW, MacDonald C, Freedom RM, Gow R. Myocardial bridging in children with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy—a risk factor for sudden death. *N Engl J Med* 1998;**339**:1201–9.
239. Cecchi F, Maron BJ, Epstein SE. Long-term outcome of patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy successfully resuscitated after cardiac arrest. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1989;**13**:1283–8.
240. Maron BJ, Savage DD, Wolfson JK, Epstein SE. Prognostic significance of 24 hour ambulatory electrocardiographic monitoring in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. A prospective study. *Am J Cardiol* 1981;**48**:252–7.
241. Maron BJ, Isner JM, McKenna WJ. 26th Bethesda conference. Recommendations for determining eligibility for competition in athletes with cardiovascular abnormalities. task force 3: hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, myocarditis and other myopericardial diseases and mitral valve prolapse. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1994;**24**:880–5.
242. McKenna WJ, England D, Doi YL, Deanfield JE, Oakley C, Goodwin JF. Arrhythmia in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. I. Influence on prognosis. *Br Heart J* 1981;**46**:168–72.
243. McKenna WJ, Oakley CM, Krikler DM, Goodwin JF. Improved survival with amiodarone in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and ventricular tachycardia. *Br Heart J* 1985;**53**:412–6.
244. Stafford WJ, Trohman RG, Bilsker M, Zaman L, Castellanos A, Myerburg RJ. Cardiac arrest in an adolescent with atrial fibrillation and hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1986;**7**:701–4.
245. Varnava AM, Elliott PM, Baboonian C, Davison F, Davies MJ, McKenna WJ. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Histopathological features of sudden death in cardiac troponin t disease. *Circulation* 2001;**104**:1380–4.
246. Watkins H, Rosenzweig A, Hwang DS et al. Characteristics and prognostic implications of myosin missense mutations in familial hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *N Engl J Med* 1992;**326**:1108–14.
247. Watkins H. Sudden death in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *N Engl J Med* 2000;**342**:422–4.
248. Moolman JC, Corfield VA, Posen B et al. Sudden death due to troponin T mutations. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1997;**29**:549–55.
249. Cecchi F, Olivetto I, Monterege A, Santoro G, Dolara A, Maron BJ. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in Tuscany. Clinical course and outcome in an unselected regional population. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1995;**26**:1529–36.
250. Adabag AS, Casey SA, Maron BJ. Sudden death in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Patterns and prognostic significance of tachyarrhythmias on ambulatory holter ecg. *Circulation* 2002;**106**:11710.
251. Dilsizian V, Bonow RO, Epstein SE, Fananapazir L. Myocardial ischemia detected by thallium scintigraphy is frequently related to cardiac arrest and syncope in young patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1993;**22**:796–804.
252. Olivetto I, Maron BJ, Monterege A, Mazzuoli F, Dolara A, Cecchi F. Prognostic value of systemic blood pressure response during exercise in a community-based patient population with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1999;**33**:2044–51.
253. Sadoul N, Prasad K, Elliott PM, Bannerjee S, Frenneaux MP, McKenna WJ. Prospective prognostic assessment of blood pressure response during exercise in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 1997;**96**:2987–91.
254. Boriani G, Rapezzi C, Biffi M, Branzi A, Spirito P. Atrial fibrillation precipitating sustained ventricular tachycardia in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol* 2002;**13**:954.
255. Priori SG, Aliot E, Blomström-Lundqvist C et al. Task force on sudden cardiac death of the European Society of Cardiology. *Eur Heart J* 2001;**22**:1374–450.
256. Monserrat L, Elliott PM, Sharma S, Virdee M, Penas-Lado M, McKenna WJ. Non-Sustained ventricular tachycardia in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy: a marker of sudden death risk in young patients. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2003. In Press.
257. Cecchi F, Olivetto I, Monterege A, Squillatini G, Dolara A, Maron BJ. Prognostic value of non-sustained ventricular tachycardia and the potential role of amiodarone treatment in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Assessment in an unselected non-referral based patient population. *Heart* 1998;**79**:331–6.
258. Spirito P, Rapezzi C, Autore C et al. Prognosis of asymptomatic patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and nonsustained ventricular tachycardia. *Circulation* 1994;**90**:2743–7.
259. Ciampi Q, Betocchi S, Lombardi R et al. Hemodynamic determinants of exercise-induced abnormal blood pressure response in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2002;**40**:278–84.
260. Maron BJ, Piccininno M, Casey SA, Bernabo P, Spirito P. Relation of extreme left ventricular hypertrophy to age in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 2003;**91**:626–8.
261. Mogensen J, Kubo T, Duque M et al. Idiopathic restrictive cardiomyopathy is part of the clinical expression of cardiac troponin I mutations. *J Clin Invest* 2003;**111**:209–16.
262. Shirani J, Pick R, Roberts WC, Maron BJ. Morphology and significance of the left ventricular collagen network in young patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and sudden cardiac death. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2000;**35**:36–44.
263. Maron MS, Gohman TE, Casey SA, Maron BJ. Significance and Relationship Between Magnitude of Left Ventricular Hypertrophy and Congestive Heart Failure Symptoms in Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2002;**39**(Suppl A):173A (abstr).
264. Kuck KH, Kunze KP, Schluter M, Nienaber CA, Costard A. Programmed electrical stimulation in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Results in patients with and without cardiac arrest or syncope. *Eur Heart J* 1988;**9**:177–85.
265. Ackerman MJ, VanDriest SL, Ommen SR et al. Prevalence and age-dependence of malignant mutations in the beta-myosin heavy chain and troponin T genes in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. A comprehensive outpatient perspective. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2002;**39**:2042–8.
266. Van Driest SL, Ackerman MJ, Ommen SR et al. Prevalence and severity of “benign” mutations in the beta-myosin heavy chain, cardiac troponin T, and alpha-tropomyosin genes in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 2002;**106**:3085–90.

267. Fananapazir L, Chang AC, Epstein SE, McAreavey D. Prognostic determinants in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Prospective evaluation of a therapeutic strategy based on clinical, Holter, hemodynamic, and electrophysiological findings. *Circulation* 1992;**86**: 730–40.
268. Maron BJ, Estes NAM, III, Maron MS, Almquist AK, Link MS, Udelson JE. Primary prevention of sudden death as a novel treatment strategy in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation* 2003;**107**: 2872–5.
269. Camm AJ, Nisam S. The utilization of the implantable defibrillator—a European enigma. *Eur Heart J* 2000;**21**:1998–2004.
270. Corrado D, Basso C, Rizzoli G, Schiavon M, Thiene G. Does sports activity enhance the risk of sudden death in adolescents and young adults? *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2003. In Press.
271. Corrado D, Basso C, Schiavon M, Thiene G. Screening for hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in young athletes. *N Engl J Med* 1998; **339**:364–9.
272. Fuster V, Ryden LE, Asinger RW et al. ACC/AHA/ESC guidelines for the management of patients with atrial fibrillation. A report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines and the European Society of Cardiology Committee for Practice Guidelines and Policy Conferences (Committee to develop guidelines for the management of patients with atrial fibrillation) developed in collaboration with the North American Society of Pacing and Electrophysiology. *Eur Heart J* 2001; **22**:1852–923.
273. McKenna WJ, Harris L, Rowland E et al. Amiodarone for long-term management of patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Am J Cardiol* 1984;**54**:802–10.