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ABSTRACT

Objective: Worldwide, more than 50 million ECGs are carried out annually. Studies show that the standard wrist–ankle placement method may produce poor quality ECGs. Factors including limb movement, tremor, anxiety, cold extremities cause artefacts (distortions of the baseline and ECG waveforms). A problem exists. Physicians face a challenge interpreting poor quality ECGs. Diagnostic delays occur. Patients are subjected to recalls; compassion initiated this study. Torso (modified) leads are favoured as they provide rapid acquisition of better quality ECGs, but cause erroneous electrocardiography. Investigators have not attempted to correct these errors. This study analyses the errors and aims to rectify them.

Methods: Our pilot and other studies indicated that torso electrodes placed close to the heart cause an increase in R wave amplitude >3 mm in inferior leads that results in disappearance of inferior infarcts; a decrease >3 mm in I and aVL may cause false lateral infarcts. We hypothesised that finding electrode placements that do not cause alterations in R wave amplitude should correct these problems. Several electrode placements were assessed to obtain ECGs identical with the standard, but with better quality. A total of 1112 patients received standard and new electrode placement recordings. ECG parameters were assessed. A blinded interpreter assisted.

Results: Electrodes positioned on the mid-arm and lower abdomen revealed ECGs identical with the standard without artefacts or loss of inferior or appearance of lateral infarcts.

Conclusions: This study proved that the new method is faultless and provides better quality ECGs, no recalls and without risk for misinterpretations. Not having to remove leg garments is convenient and allows more rapid acquisition of ECGs. The forearms are freed for, intravenous, radial access, and ECGs needed during procedures. The findings have implications worldwide for patients, clinicians and technicians, and generate the need to study the method in emergency settings.

INTRODUCTION

For more than 65 years, the standard 12-lead ECG has been obtained by placing electrodes on the ankles and wrists, along with chest leads, and it is well established that limb movement, subtle muscle tremor and interference from muscle potential results in artefacts that alter interpretation. Torso (modified) leads have shown to abolish such artefacts but produce erroneous ECG that disqualifies modified leads as a standard recording. A methodological question remains unresolved. Could modification of the electrode placements used in studies of
modified leads prevent the errors observed? Sound methodology to rectify the problems caused by torso leads required a thorough review and understanding of relevant study findings accompanied by a pilot study.

- Takuma et al in a study of 30 patients, placed electrodes on the shoulder tip and the anterior superior iliac spine to permit easier and more rapid ECG acquisition in emergency settings and obtain higher quality recordings. The electrode placements on the acromion process, and near the iliac crest caused abnormal changes in R wave amplitude. The investigators obtained better quality ECGs and emphasised the advantages of modified leads, but did not recommend them for routine use.2

- Jowett et al indicated that ‘The appeal of this easily applied lead system has resulted in extensive use in our hospital, both in emergency and non-emergency situations’. Their study of 100 patients resulted in the disappearance of five of six inferior infarcts that were previously observed on the standard ECG.3 The electrode sites were as performed by Takuma et al. The ECGs of 43% of patients showed movement artefact with wrist-ankle placement compared with no artefacts with torso recordings. R wave amplitude was altered.

Papouchado et al assessed the differences between the standard 12-lead ECG and the modified (Mason and Likar) exercise lead system in 29 patients. This showed that when the lower limb electrode was positioned in the nipple line at the level of the umbilicus, and moved vertically to the costal margin or higher, a marked increase in R wave amplitude occurred in inferior leads and a decrease in R wave amplitude was observed in lead1 and aVL occurred. Vertical but not horizontal abdominal electrode placements were assessed.6 Most important, abdominal, horizontal variations were assessed in the present study.

Wilson discussing the standard limb leads placed on the chest stated “the principles of the equilateral triangle should not be applied to any system of chest leads whatsoever”. Wilson emphasised that since all points on the arm have the same potential, it does not matter whether the electrode is placed on the wrist, the forearm or the upper arm; the arm acts mainly as an extension of the wire attached to it.5

METHODS

The acromion process is part of the scapular and thus, part of the trunk. It is not surprising therefore, that this torso electrode position used by Jowett et al caused the disappearance of five of six inferior infarcts and appearance of false lateral infarcts and showed significant variation of waveforms in the study by Takuma et al. The present study avoided this erroneous electrode placement. Findings from our pilot study, and data from investigators initiated the following thinking and deductions to design an appropriate method to resolve the problems attached to torso (modified) leads.

1. The problem that surrounds torso placements is an increase in R wave amplitude >2 mm in inferior leads that can result in disappearance of inferior myocardial infarction (MI), and a >2 mm decrease in leads 1 and aVL that may simulate a lateral infarct. Right axis change is caused by alterations in R wave amplitude.

2. Finding electrode placements that do not cause alterations in R wave amplitude should correct the problems.

3. The electrodes for the limb leads must not all be placed on the torso, because this invalidates Einthoven’s7 theory of the equilateral triangle.6

4. Electrodes must not be positioned on the acromion.

5. The upper limb electrode must be placed on the arm at any point but must be below the shoulder joint. This study used the mid-arm; thus, the new electrode placement (NEP) cannot be described as torso leads. The new electrode placements must prevent the following errors observed with torso leads:

- An unfavourable change in R wave amplitude in the limb leads that causes:
  - The disappearance of inferior MI;
  - The appearance of QS in leads 1 and aVL, causing a false lateral infarct;
  - Right axis deviation.

Our pilot study placed electrodes on the mid-arm, various abdominal sites and infracavicular. Finally, the lower limb electrodes were moved to the lower abdomen 7.6 cm (3 inches) below a horizontal line running across the umbilicus. This position, well below the umbilicus, was maintained for all 1112 patients tested (group A, B, C).

Thought was given to performing ECGs simultaneously, but it was decided that comparing a standard ECG with an NEP ECG performed 1 min apart would not change the interpretation except for arrhythmias. Special software provided duplicate ECGs to be performed at nine laboratory locations, which allowed two electronic ECGs to reach the primary investigator for interpretation. The interpreter was not blinded for the electrodes. ECGs from 1112 patients were assessed. Patients were allocated to group A (786 patients) including 30 with inferior MI, group B (50 patients) and group C (276 patients) including 10 patients with inferior MI.

Group A: Enrollment of patients age 33–87 was started following ethics approval, 3 February 2014 in the city of Ottawa. A consent form was signed. Patients for NEP recordings had the ankle electrodes placed 7.6 cm below the umbilicus and 10 cm on either side of the umbilical midline. 651 patients attending Gamma Dynacare laboratories (GDML) for routine ECGs had a standard 12-lead ECG completed; and within 1 min, an NEP ECG was also carried out. A total of 135 patients seen in a cardiology referral centre had duplicate ECGs performed, and were supervised by the primary investigator (figure 1).
Duplicate ECGs were assessed for four main problems:

1. **Inferior MI**—Assessment was made for patients with inferior MIs proven clinically by history of chest pain, serial ECGs, cardiac enzyme elevation, and/or coronary angiograms. One patient was encountered with acute chest pain: the NEP ECG revealed an acute inferior MI; the patient was rushed to coronary intervention; a standard ECG was not completed. For each subject, a standard and NEP ECG was placed side by side on a computer screen and calipers determined if R wave amplitude was increased 2 mm or more in inferior leads. If an old inferior infarct ECG pattern was noted to disappear; or if the R wave amplitude increased 3 mm or more in inferior leads, then the ECG must be repeated under supervision. If the abnormal changes persisted, the study would be halted.

2. **Leads 1 and aVL**—Assessment was made for a decrease in R wave amplitude of 2 mm or more. A 3 mm or more change may result in a false lateral MI pattern and would halt the study.

3. **Right axis deviation**—The electronic ECGs from >50 consecutive patients in group A were assessed for a greater than 10° right axis change.

4. ** Artefacts**—recalls because of artefacts were assessed and poor quality noted.

**RESULTS**

Figures 2–5 show that the five major problems observed with torso leads are not observed with recordings carried out using the new placements.

**Group A**

1. **Artefacts**—figure 2A shows a standard ECG with artefacts that disappear on the NEP tracing figure 2B (see online supplementary file appendix 3, eFigure 23)

   Similar or less prominent artefacts on standard 12-lead ECGs were responsible for 19 (2.94%) recalls of 651 patients but no recalls were required for NEP ECGs. The majority of patient ECGs that revealed major artefacts exhibited clearing of most artefacts when NEP ECGs were completed. Poor quality ECGs were observed with STD ECGs in ~10% of all cases versus ~2% for NEP ECGs.

2. **Inferior infarcts**—duplicate ECGs from 30 group A patients with proven inferior MI revealed no differences and were reassessed by a blinded interpreter who agreed with our findings. Figure 3 shows the ECG of a patient with a proven old inferior infarct. Diagnostic wide Q

---

**Figure 1** The arm electrodes (A and B) are placed on the mid-arm, on the lateral aspect of the biceps, immediately below the V4 horizontal line. The abdominal electrodes (C and D) placed 7.6 cm (~3 inches) below the umbilical horizontal line, and 5 cm (~2 inches) on either side of the umbilical vertical line. The distance between these two electrodes to be 10 cm (~4 inches).
waves are seen in leads 11, 111, aVF: (a) standard ECG, (b) NEP ECG. The NEP ECG of a 57-year-old female patient, with acute chest pain and acute inferior MI, is shown in figure 4. No standard ECG was performed, in order to avoid delays to percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI).

3. Decrease in R wave amplitude in 1 and aVL—No significant decrease in R wave amplitude (equal to or >2 mm) was observed in any ECG from group A (786 patients), and no QS pattern was observed in leads 1 and aVL. Figure 5A shows a standard ECG tracing with low amplitude (<3 mm) R wave in lead 1 and aVL. Figure 5B gives the NEP ECG showing no appreciable changes. No QS pattern, in leads 1 and aVL, false lateral infarct pattern, was observed from the screening of all patient ECGs.

4. R wave amplitude changes in V leads: no changes were observed, and no differences in ECGs were noted in patients with right and left bundle branch block, left ventricular hypertrophy or anterior infarction.

5. Right axis deviation—fifty group A patients showed a non-significant axis change of zero to 7°

Group B—As demonstrated by the pilot study, with abdominal electrode placements as follows: 7.6 cm beneath the umbilicus and horizontally, close to the iliac crest, 20 cm or more from the umbilicus, caused a 1–2 mm change in R wave amplitude versus no change with electrodes 10 cm from the umbilicus. Electrode placements 10 cm from the umbilicus produced recordings that were virtually the same as the standard, and was used successfully in all 786 group A patients. It was felt necessary however, to assess electrodes placed 5 cm from the umbilicus (figure 1). Therefore, on completion of group A, 50 patients (group B) were tested with triplicate ECGs, using placements 10 cm and 5 cm from the umbilicus compared with standard recordings. For each sets of recordings, the technician was supervised by the investigator.

Results Group B: the abdominal placement 10 cm from the umbilicus showed ECGs virtually identical with the standard in all patients. The R wave amplitude was equal to the standard in 44 of 50 patients. In six patients minimal, 0.5–1 mm non-significant R wave changes were observed. Electrode placement 5 cm form the umbilicus
(figure 1) revealed identical wave forms and R wave amplitude as the standard in all 50. Although R wave amplitude changes at 10 cm from the umbilicus were considered not significant, and was used successfully in all group A patients, group C was started with abdominal placement 5 cm from the umbilicus (figure 1). Group B patients were, in essence, a second pilot study and were not counted in the statistical analysis.

**Group C**—276 patients attending GDML had duplicate ECGs performed with electrode placements as shown in figure 1.

**Results** The principal investigator, and a blinded interpreter compared NEP and standard ECGs and found no differences in wave forms, or parameters. Table 1 gives ECG parameters in 30 consecutive patients. No changes in R wave amplitude were noted, and no false lateral infarcts appeared. The ECGs of 10 patients with proven old inferior MIs revealed the same waveforms, with no disappearance of inferior infarcts (see online supplementary file appendix 3). P waves, ST segment and T waves were identical with that of the standard ECG. No ECG differences were noted in patients with left and right bundle branch block, atrial fibrillation or premature beats. Arrhythmia diagnosis was unchanged by the new method. No R wave amplitude changes occurred in leads 1 and aVL, inferior or chest leads. Forty-six patients had low amplitude R waves <5 mm in leads 1 and aVL, and 16 with the lowest R wave amplitudes <4 mm were chosen to test the new placement method for flaws. No occurrence of a QS pattern in leads 1 and aVL or false lateral infarct was noted in the 16 test patients ECGs (see test cases in the online supplementary file, appendix 2, eFigures 1 to 32 and appendix 3 eFigure 21, 22).

A blinded interpreter assessed:

- All 276 group C patients.

**Figure 3** (A) Standard lead ECG: deep wide Q waves in leads 11, 111, aVF: old inferior, and anterolateral myocardial infarction, artefacts in V3, V4 (see online supplementary file, appendix 1, eFigures 1–59, eAppendix 3, figures 1–20). (B) New electrode placement ECG, old inferolateral infarct; the tracing is similar to the standard recording, but with clearing of artefacts in V3 and V4. The R wave amplitude in all 12 leads is the same in the standard and NEP ECG.
Figure 4  New electrode placement ECG from a female, age 57 with acute chest pain, shows abnormal ST elevation in leads 11, 111, aVF, V5, V6: typical findings of acute inferior MI with lateral involvement, ST segment elevation MI. Reciprocal depression V1-V2, aVL is not diagnostic but helps confirm the diagnosis of acute MI.

Figure 5  (A) Standard 12-lead ECG: low R wave amplitude in lead 1, aVL; a test case chosen to flaw the new electrode placement (see online supplementary file, appendix 2, eFigures 1 to 32 and appendix 3 eFigure 21, 22). (B) New electrode placement ECG; similar to that of the standard ECG. The R wave amplitude in all 12 leads is virtually the same. The very small R wave in aVL did not change to a QS pattern (see online supplementary file eAppendix 2, eFigures 1 to 32).
All ECGs that are in the online supplementary files.

- 10 duplicate ECGs with inferior MIs (see online supplementary file appendix 3).

- The QRS axis in 50 consecutive group C patients (see online supplementary file table S2).

- 16 duplicate ECGs, test cases showing very low R waves in leads 1 and aVL for QS pattern or false lateral MI (see online supplementary file eAppendix 2, eFigures 1 to 32).

- 30 ECGs showing old inferior MIs (see online supplementary file eAppendix 1).

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Parameters/ECG type</th>
<th>NEP</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>NEP</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>NEP</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>NEP</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>NEP</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PR interval (ms)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QRS duration</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axis</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R wave amplitude lead 1(mm)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTc</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

Intraclass correlation (ICC) estimates were calculated in order to quantify the agreement between the NEP ECG and the standards.
and the standard (STD) ECG with respect to R wave amplitude in Lead 1 and the different ECG parameters measured in n=30 patients. The NEP and STD method have a high level of agreement in measurement of the R wave amplitude in Lead 1, ICC correlation 0.984. Table 1 shows R wave amplitudes in Lead 1, and ECG parameters for the NEP and standard ECGs in 30 patients. See table 2 for ICC estimates and Spearman correlations. Spearman and Pearson correlations as well as the ICC were also calculated in order to quantify the agreement in the axis deviation measured in 50 consecutive patients (See table 2A, table 1 in the supplement gives actual measurements of axis deviation).

When comparing diagnosis with STD and NEP, sensitivities and specificities were also calculated along with exact binomial 95% CIs (table 3). The NEP and standard ECG recordings from 40 patients with inferior infarction and 149 patients with normal ECGs show similar sensitivities and specificities (table 3).

DISCUSSION
This large study proved conclusively that the NEP method is sound and suitable for routine ECG. Five small studies compared standard limb lead placements and torso placed electrodes. Diamond et al studied only 11 patients using all torso leads. Variations in QRS amplitude were observed but reported as not significant. The investigators concluded that the torso lead system appears to produce an ECG recording interchangeable with the standard limb placement. Time has shown that this conclusion is incorrect. Importantly, there were no patients with inferior infarction in the study. The standard ECG in one patient ‘with a marked tremor was interpretable only with great difficulty; the torso system gave a far superior ECG.’

A 1989 study by Sevilla et al assessed 44 patients, using exercise torso-lead placements to acquire 12-lead ECGs. The wrist electrodes were placed under the clavicle in the mid-clavicular lines. The ankle electrodes were positioned in the anterior axillary lines above the costal margins. Loss of ECG inferior pattern occurred in 11 of 16; a false lateral infarct was seen in 19% of patients and a significant change in frontal axis was noted.

Pahlm et al reported on torso placements in 30 patients. Simultaneous recordings revealed significant frontal plane axis shift and diminished Q-wave durations in lead aVF compared with those of the standard.

The 1995 emergency room study of 30 patients with only one inferior infarct by Takuma et al showed minor QRS amplitude changes, and was not recommended for routine use. However, the quality of recordings were definitely improved. The wrist electrodes were placed on the shoulder tip, the acromion process.

The 2005, ECG study of 100 patients by Jowett et al with torso electrode similar to the Takuma placement resulted in loss of five of six inferior infarcts, one false lateral infarct, and important amplitude changes that created eight possible myocardial infarcts to appear. A marked change in axis was observed.

Importantly, these investigators did not attempt to correct the problems caused by torso leads. The present study analysed the problems and rectified them.

The 2007 AHA/ACC guidelines on ECG Part 1: recommends studies to look at modified leads. Previous studies and our pilot study indicate that modified leads (all torso) cause serious errors.

The present study shows that a lower torso and upper arm placement is reliable. No inferior infarcts were lost and no false lateral infarcts were produced by the NEP. If the abdominal electrode placement is as shown in figure 1, the NEP does not cause a change in R wave amplitude. Thus, disappearance of inferior MI and causation of a lateral infarct cannot occur. Each ECG should be labelled ‘new electrode placement’ to distinguish the system from modified leads that provide erroneous ECG recordings. However, a 5 cm lateral displacement of the abdominal electrodes should not alter interpretation as shown for all 786 group A patients including 30 patients with inferior infarcts in whom the abdominal electrode placement was ∼5 cm lateral to that used for group C (see figure 1).

Limitations and further studies
This study was not performed in emergency rooms, but the NEP ECG captured the ST-elevation, reciprocal depression and Q waves of acute inferior MI remarkably well (figure 4). Owing to the rapidity of application, and better quality ECGs, the NEP should prove useful for diagnosis in patients with probable acute coronary syndrome and in emergency settings. The NEP needs to be studied in this population of patients.

CONCLUSION
This large study showed that the new method produces ECGs that are identical to the standard and provides

| Table 2 | Intraclass correlation (ICC) and Spearman correlation in 30 patients showing R wave amplitude and ECG parameters and axis deviation in 50 patients |
|---|---|---|---|
| ICC | Pearson | Spearman |
| PR interval (n=30 patients) | 0.965 | 0.967 |
| QRS duration | 0.977 | 0.953 |
| QRS axis | 0.996 | 0.996 |
| R wave | 0.984 | 0.982 |
| Amplitude lead 1 | 0.943 | 0.899 |
| QTc | 0.992 | 0.990 |
| Axis deviation (n=50 consecutive patients) | 0.992 | 0.993 |
better quality ECGs, with no recalls and without risk for misinterpretations.

- The NEP revealed waveforms that are identical with that of the standard 12-lead ECG, resulting in the same interpretation;
- The new method does not cause disappearance of MI pattern or change R wave amplitude or QRS axis;
- The NEP was shown suitable and as reliable as the standard for observation of P waves and arrhythmia diagnosis;
- The NEP can replace standard electrode placements at the wrist and ankles for routine 12-lead electrocardiography.

The NEP is an alternative method to the wrist–ankle placements and has several advantages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Sensitivity (95% CI)</th>
<th>Specificity (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old inferior MI (n=1112)</td>
<td>1.0 (0.997 to 1.0)</td>
<td>1.0 (0.912 to 1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal ECG (group C) (n=276)</td>
<td>1.0 (0.971 to 1.0)</td>
<td>1.0 (0.976 to 1.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>FN</th>
<th>Sensitivity (95% CI)</th>
<th>Specificity (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old inferior MI (n=1112)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0 (0.997 to 1.0)</td>
<td>1.0 (0.912 to 1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal ECG (group C) (n=276)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0 (0.971 to 1.0)</td>
<td>1.0 (0.976 to 1.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FN, False negative; FP, False positive; TN, True negative; TP, True positive.
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A New Electrode Placement Method for 12-lead Electrocardiography.

The supplement gives standard (STD) and new electrode placement (NEP) ECGs that were verified by a blinded interpreter. They focus on the four errors known to occur with torso (modified) leads.

Marked changes in R wave amplitude causing:

- disappearance of inferior infarcts;
- appearance of QS in leads 1, aVL – probable false lateral infarcts;
- right axis deviation.

eAppendix 1. 30 ECGs from patients in group A, all with proven inferior MI. The abdominal electrode was placed 3 inches below the umbilical level and 8 inches apart: Standard and new electrode placement ECGs show identical wave forms, and similar interpretations.

eAppendix 2. 16 ECGs from patients in group A: these ECGs were chosen from 786 group A patient’s ECGs because of the presence of very low R waves in leads 1 and aVL; that may reveal a QS on the NEP ECG simulating a false lateral MI; test cases to fault the new electrode placement method.

eAppendix 3. 13 ECGs from patients in group C: 10 with inferior MI, 1 with low R waves lead 1, AVL; 1 patient with severe right ventricular hypertrophy and marked right axis deviation; 1 patient with standard ECG showing artifacts that clear on NEP ECG, a better quality ECG.

All group C patients 1 to 264 and all ECGs provided in appendix 1 to 3 have been validated by a blinded interpreter unknown to the author.

**Table 1.** QRS Axis deviation in 50 consecutive patients

eAppendix 1. 30 subjects with proven inferior MI: test cases from group A; abdominal placement 8 inches apart: Standard and new electrode placement ECGs are virtually identical. All ECGs verified by blinded- interpreter.

eFigure 1. Patient 01 old Inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 2. Patient 01 old Inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 3. Patient 02 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 4. Patient 02 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 5. Patient 03 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 6. Patient 03 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 7. Patient 04 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 8. Patient 04 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 9. Patient 05 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 10. Patient 05 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 11. Patient 06 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 12. Patient 06 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 13a. Patient 07 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 13b. Patient 07 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 14. Patient 08 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 15. Patient 08 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 16. Patient 09 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 17. Patient 09 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 18. Patient 10 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 19. Patient 10 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 20. Patient 11 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 21. Patient 11 old Inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 22. Patient 12 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 23. Patient 12 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 24. Patient 13 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 25. Patient 13 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 26. Patient 14 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 27. Patient 14 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 28. Patient 15 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 29. Patient 15 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 30. Patient 16 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 31. Patient 16 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 32. Patient 17 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 33. Patient 17 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 34. Patient 18 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 35. Patient 18 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 36. Patient 19 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 37. Patient 19 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 38. Patient 20 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 39. Patient 20 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 40. Patient 21 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 41. Patient 21 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 42. Patient 22 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 43. Patient 22 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 44. Patient 23 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 45. Patient 23 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 46. Patient 24 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 47. Patient 24 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 48. Patient 25 inferior MI NEP ECG similar to STD
eFigure 49. Patient 25 proven inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 50. Patient 26 inferior MI NEP ECG similar to STD
eFigure 51. Patient 26 proven inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 52. Patient 27 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 53. Patient 27 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 54. Patient 28 proven inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 55. Patient 28 inferior MI NEP ECG similar to STD
eFigure 56. Patient 29 old inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 57. Patient 29 old inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 58. Patient 30 old inferior MI STD ECG artifacts
eFigure 59. Patient 30 old inferior MI NEP ECG artifacts cleared

eAppendix 2. 16 test cases from group a: low R wave amplitude in leads 1 and aVL in standard 12 – lead ECG; NEP ECG shows no decrease in R amplitude or conversion to QS pattern.
eFigure 1. Patient 01 lead 1 aVL STD ECG R waves similar to NEP
eFigure 2. Patient 01 lead 1 aVL NEP ECG R wave amplitude is similar to STD ECG
eFigure 3. Patient 02 lead 1 aVL STD ECG similar R wave amplitude to NEP
eFigure 4. Patient 02 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG, R wave amplitude in leads 1, aVL and other leads is similar to the STD ECG
eFigure 5. Patient 03 lead 1 aVL STD ECG very low R wave amplitude leads 1 aVL
eFigure 6. Patient 03 lead 1aVL NEP ECG no change in R wave amplitude compared with STD
eFigure 7. Patient 04 lead 1 aVL STD ECG
eFigure 8. Patient 04 lead 1 aVL NEP ECG
eFigure 9. Patient 05 lead 1 VL STD ECG
eFigure 10. Patient 05 lead 1 aVL NEP ECG R wave amplitude in all leads are similar to STD
eFigure 11. Patient 06 lead 1 aVL STD ECG
eFigure 12. Patient 06 lead 1 aVL NEP ECG R wave amplitude in all 12 leads similar to STD
eFigure 13. Patient 07 lead 1 aVL NEP ECG all R waves similar to STD ECG
eFigure 14. Patient 07 lead 1 aVL STD ECG
eFigure 15. Patient 08 lead 1 aVL STD ECG
eFigure 16. Patient 08 lead 1 aVL NEP ECG similar to STD
eFigure 17. Patient 09 lead 1 aVL STD ECG
eFigure 18. Patient 09 lead 1 aVL NEP ECG similar
eFigure 19. Patient 10 lead 1 aVL STD ECG
eFigure 20. Patient 10 lead 1 aVL NEP ECG similar R waves
eFigure 21. Patient 11 LEAD 1 AVL STD ECG
eFigure 22. Patient 11 lead 1 aVL NEP ECG all R waves amplitude similar to STD
eFigure 23. Patient 12 lead 1 aVL STD ECG
eFigure 24. Patient 12 lead 1 aVL NEP ECG
eFigure 25. Patient 13 lead 1 aVL STD ECG
eFigure 26. Patient 13 lead 1 aVL NEP ECG R wave amplitude in inferior and other leads similar to STD
eFigure 27. Patient 14 lead 1 aVL STD ECG
eFigure 28. Patient 14 lead 1 aVL NEP ECG similar
eFigure 29. Patient 15 lead 1 aVL STD ECG
eFigure 30. Patient 15 Patient 15 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG virtually identical R wave amplitude all leads.
eFigure 31. Patient 16 R lead 1 aVL STD ECG
eFigure 32. Patient 16 R wave amplitude NEP ECG no increase in R wave amplitude in 11 111 aVF and no decrease in lead 1 Avl.

eAppendix 3. 10 proven old Inferior MI, and 3 test cases of interest from group C: standard and new electrode placement ECGs.
eFigure 1. 2014/05/30 Standard ECG, deep, wide inferior Q waves; old inferior infarct, QRS axis 19.
eFigure 2. NEP ECG shows virtually the same findings, deep, wide Q waves: old inferior MI; QRS axis25.
eFigure 3. 2014/ 05/09; standard ECG old inferior MI, QRS axis 74. VPBs.
eFigure 4. new electrode placement ECG, similar Q waves in inferior leads, axis 69.
eFigure 5. standard ECG, 2014/05/23; Q waves 11,111, aVF: old inferior infarct, VPBs.
eFigure 6. NEP ECG reveals virtually the same, Q waves 11, 111, aVF, old inferior MI, VPBs.
eFigure 7. 2014/05/16 Standard 12 – lead ECG, Q waves 11, 111, aVF, old inferior MI
eFigure 8. New electrode placement ECG, similar wave form and inferior Q waves

This supplementary material has been provided by the author to give readers additional information about the work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>NEP</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>NEP</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>-82</td>
<td>-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. QRS Axis deviation in 50 consecutive patients
eAppendix 1
eFigure 1: Patient 01; deep wide inferior Q waves; old Inferior MI STD ECG

eFigure 2: Patient 01 ~ 20 year old Inferior MI; the NEP ECG is identical.
eFigure 3: Patient 02 old inferior MI STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5–55] Hz –60Hz

eFigure 4: Patient 02 old inferior MI; the NEP ECG is similar.
eFigure 5: Patient 03 old inferior MI STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz ~60Hz

eFigure 6: Patient 03 old inferior MI; the NEP ECG is similar to the standard above.
Figure 7: Patient 04 old inferior and anterior MI STD ECG

Figure 8: Patient 04 old inferior MI NEP ECG is identical to standard ECG above.
eFigure 9: Patient 05 old inferior MI STD ECG

eFigure 10: Patient 05 old inferior MI NEP ECG is similar.
eFigure 11: Patient 06 old inferior MI, VPBs, STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-25] Hz -60Hz

eFigure 12: Patient 06 old inferior MI; the NEP ECG is identical.
eFigure 13a: Patient 07 old inferior MI STD ECG.

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV (0.5-55) Hz ~60Hz

eFigure 13b: Patient 07 old inferior MI NEP ECG, similar.
eFigure 14: Patient 08 old inferior MI STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV 0.5-35 Hz ~60Hz

eFigure 15: Patient 08 old inferior MI NEP ECG is similar.

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV 0.5-35 Hz ~60Hz
eFigure 16: Patient 09, inferior Q waves; old inferior MI STD ECG

eFigure 17: Patient 09 old inferior MI, VPBs. NEP ECG is virtually identical.
eFigure 18: Patient 10 old inferior MI STD ECG

eFigure 19: Patient 10 old inferior MI NEP ECG is similar
eFigure 20: Patient 11; deep inferior Q waves: old inferior MI STD ECG

eFigure 21: Patient 11; similar Q waves and wave forms: old Inferior MI NEP ECG
eFigure 22: Patient 12 old inferior MI STD ECG, note artifacts, V4 – V 6. aVF.

eFigure 23: Patient 12 old inferior MI NEP ECG shows clearing of artifacts. Better quality ECG.
eFigure 24: Patient 13 old inferior MI STD ECG

eFigure 25: Patient 13 old inferior MI; the NEP ECG is virtually identical.
eFigure 26: Patient 14; deep wide Q waves, aVF: old inferior MI STD ECG

eFigure 27: Patient 14 old inferior MI; NEP ECG is not exempt from minor artifacts.
eFigure 28: Patient 15 old inferior MI STD ECG

eFigure 29: Patient 15 old inferior MI; NEP ECG
eFigure 30: Patient 16 old inferior MI STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz ~60Hz

eFigure 31: Patient 16 old inferior MI; the NEP ECG is virtually identical.

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz ~60Hz
eFigure 32: Patient 17 old inferior MI NEP ECG

eFigure 33: Patient 17 old inferior MI; the STD ECG is similar.
eFigure 34: Patient 18 old inferior MI; STD ECG

eFigure 35: Patient 18 old inferior MI; NEP ECG
eFigure 36: Patient 19 old inferior MI: STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5–55] Hz ~60Hz

eFigure 37: Patient 19 old inferior MI: the NEP ECG is virtually identical.
eFigure 38: Patient 20 old inferior MI; STD ECG

eFigure 39: Patient 20 old inferior MI: the NEP ECG is similar.
eFigure 40: Patient 21 old inferior MI STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-55] Hz ~60Hz

eFigure 41: Patient 21 old inferior MI: the NEP ECG is similar.
eFigure 42: Patient 22 old inferior MI STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5–35] Hz –60Hz

eFigure 43: Patient 22 old inferior MI the NEP ECG is similar.

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5–35] Hz –60Hz
eFigure 44: Patient 23 old inferior MI STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz ~60Hz

eFigure 45: Patient 23 old inferior MI; the NEP ECG is virtually identical.

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz ~60Hz
eFigure 46: Patient 24 old inferior MI STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-55] Hz ~60Hz

eFigure 47: Patient 24 old inferior MI; the NEP ECG is similar

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-55] Hz ~60Hz
eFigure 48: Patient 25 inferior MI NEP ECG similar to STD

eFigure 49: Patient 25 proven inferior MI STD ECG
eFigure 50: Patient 26 inferior MI NEP ECG similar to STD

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz ~60Hz

eFigure 51: Patient 26 proven inferior MI STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz ~60Hz
eFigure 52: Patient 27 old inferior MI STD ECG, note artifacts.

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz -60Hz

eFigure 53: Patient 27 old inferior MI NEP ECG, clearing of artifacts.
eFigure 54: Patient 28 proven inferior MI STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz ~60Hz

eFigure 55: Patient 28 inferior MI NEP ECG similar to STD

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz ~60Hz
eFigure 56: Patient 29 old inferior MI STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz -60Hz

eFigure 57: Patient 29 old inferior MI; the NEP ECG is virtually identical
Figure 58: Patient 30 old inferior MI STD ECG; artifacts

Figure 59: Patient 30 old inferior MI NEP ECG artifacts V2, V6 on standard ECG above cleared
eAppendix 2
eFigure 1: Patient 01 low R wave amplitude, LEAD 1 AVL; STD ECG

eFigure 2: Patient 01 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG R wave amplitude is similar to STD ECG
eFigure 3: Patient 02; Low R wave amplitude, lead 1 AVL; STD ECG.

eFigure 4: Patient 02 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG, R wave amplitude in leads 1, aVL and other leads is similar to the STD ECG.
eFigure 5: Patient 03 STD ECG: very low R wave amplitude leads 1 avl

eFigure 6: Patient 03 Lead 1 AVL NEP ECG no change in very low R Wave amplitude compared with STD; no conversion to QS pattern.
Figure 7: Patient 04 LEAD 1 AVL STD ECG

Figure 8: Patient 04 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG similar
eFigure 9: Patient 05 LEAD 1 AVL STD ECG

eFigure 10: Patient 05 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG R wave amplitude in all leads are similar to STD
eFigure 11: Patient 06 LEAD 1 AVL STD ECG; very low amplitude R waves 1 and aVL

eFigure 12: Patient 06 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG R wave amplitude in all 12 leads similar to STD
eFigure 13: Patient 07 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG all R waves similar to STD ECG

eFigure 14: Patient 07 LEAD 1 AVL STD ECG
eFigure 15: Patient 08 LEAD 1 AVL STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz 60Hz

eFigure 16: Patient 08 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG, R waves similar to STD

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz 60Hz
eFigure 17: Patient 09 LEAD 1 AVL STD ECG

eFigure 18: Patient 09 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG similar
eFigure 19: Patient 10 LEAD 1 AVL STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5–35] Hz – 60Hz

eFigure 20: Patient 10 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG similar R waves

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5–35] Hz – 60Hz
eFigure 21: Patient 11 LEAD 1 AVL STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5–25] Hz ~60Hz

eFigure 22: Patient 11 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG all R waves amplitude similar to STD

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5–25] Hz ~60Hz
eFigure 23: Patient 12 LEAD 1 AVL STD ECG

eFigure 24: Patient 12 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG virtually identical.
eFigure 25: Patient 13 LEAD 1 AVL STD ECG

eFigure 26: Patient 13 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG R wave amplitude in inferior and other leads similar to STD
**eFigure 27**: Patient 14 LEAD 1 AVL STD ECG; very low R waves.

**eFigure 28**: Patient 14 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG similar; no QS emerged.
eFigure 29: Patient 15 LEAD 1 AVL STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-100] Hz -60Hz

eFigure 30: Patient 15 LEAD 1 AVL NEP ECG virtually identical R wave amplitude all leads.
eFigure 31: Patient 16 R lead 1 aVL STD ECG

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-25] Hz 60Hz

eFigure 32: Patient 16 R WAVE AMP NEP ECG NO INCREASE IN R WAVE AMPLITUDE IN 11 111 AVF AND NO DECREASE IN LEAD 1 AVL
eAppendix 3
eFigure 1. 2014/05/30 Standard ECG, deep, wide inferior Q waves; old inferior infarct, QRS axis 19.

eFigure 2. NEP ECG shows virtually the same findings, deep, wide inferior Q waves: old inferior MI; QRS axis 25.
eFigure 3. 2014/05/09; standard ECG old inferior MI, QRS axis 74. VPBs.

eFigure 4. new electrode placement ECG, similar Q waves in inferior leads, axis 69.
Figure 5. standard ECG, 2014/05/23; Q waves 11,111, aVF: old inferior infarct, VPBs.

Figure 6. NEP ECG reveals virtually the same, Q waves 11, 111, aVF, old inferior MI, VPBs.
eFigure 7. 2014/05/16 Standard 12-lead ECG, Q waves 11, 111, aVF, old inferior MI.

eFigure 8. New electrode placement ECG, similar wave form and inferior Q waves.
eFigure 9. 14/05/23 Standard ECG; old inferior MI, QRS axis _40. RBBB

eFigure 10. NEP ECG similar wave form, inferior Q waves, axis _35, RBBB. Virtually the same ST –T wave changes.
eFigure 11. 14/05/27; standard ECG; Q waves 11, 111 aVF; old inferior MI, axis -30

eFigure 12. NEP ECG similar inferior Q waves, axis -30; R wave amplitude in lead 1 aVL unchanged
eFigure 13. standard ECG, old inferior MI, axis -57 virtually the same wave form as NEP ECG shown below

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz -60Hz

eFigure 14. New electrode placement ECG; similar inferior Q waves; old inferior MI, axis -55

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz -60Hz
eFigure 15. standard ECG, old inferior MI; axis -47, note artifacts

25 mm/sec 10 mm/mV [0.5-35] Hz -60Hz

eFigure 16. NEP ECG, old inferior MI similar to standard recording above, but artifacts are minimized and best appreciated if the tracing is enlarged; axis -42
eFigure 17. Standard ECG, inferior Q waves: clinically proven old inferior MI

eFigure 18. NEP ECG, old inferior MI, virtually similar wave forms, inferior Q waves
eFigure 19. standard ECG; inferior Q waves; proven old inferior MI.

eFigure 20. NEP ECG, similar inferior Q waves; old inferior MI.
eFigure 21. Standard 12-lead ECG; low amplitude R waves in leads 1 and aVL that can result in a QS pattern as observed with torso (modified) leads.

eFigure 22. New electrode placement ECG showing no change in R wave amplitude in leads 1, aVL or inferior leads. Virtually the same wave forms.
eFigure 23. July 2014. A standard method ECG shows artifacts; poor quality ECG. This problem we found to be more common in winter months; perhaps the wrist and ankle areas are colder than the torso and upper arm areas that allow better electrode sensing.
eFigure 24. NEP ECG done within 1 minute of STD shows clearing of artifacts