

it ever occurs. Second, no mapping of the ventricles was performed to provide any data which could be used to analyze this possibility. Third, it is really not relevant to the points of the report regarding transient entrainment and interruption of a tachycardia with rapid pacing.

ALBERT L. WALDO, MD, FACC  
RICHARD W. HENTHORN, MD  
VANCE J. PLUMB, MD, FACC  
WILLIAM A. H. MACLEAN, MD, FACC  
*University of Alabama Medical Center  
University Station  
Birmingham, Alabama 35294*

## Transient Entrainment and Interruption of Ventricular Tachycardia With Rapid Atrial Pacing—II

We read with great interest the report by Waldo et al. and the accompanying editorial about entrainment of ventricular tachycardia (1,2). Several additional points about this phenomenon merit emphasis because of their importance to the mechanisms of ventricular tachycardia. We agree with Brugada and Wellens (2) that entrainment per se does not imply reentry. However, if focal impulse formation were hypothesized to be the mechanism responsible for an entrainable ventricular tachycardia with fusion, a sector of unidirectional block out of the focus would have to be present for the entraining wave to access the site of abnormal impulse formation and accelerate the next beat. Reentry with an excitable gap, as indicated by Waldo and his colleagues, is a simpler and better explanation for ventricular tachycardia in the patient they describe.

More can be said about the reentry mechanism in their case. The point or points at which the wave of excitation from the reentrant circuit engages the rest of the myocardium must be separate from the path over which the entraining wave front gains access to the circuit, so that access is not blocked by the wave front that just emerged from the circuit. Furthermore, a large area of physiologic or anatomic block between the muscle depolarized by the entraining stimulus and that depolarized by the wave front emerging from the site of reentry is required for fusion to be manifest during entrainment. If this were not the case, a contribution to the activation sequence by the entrained impulse would be inapparent.

The simplest explanation for the findings of Waldo et al. is reentry around a large anatomic or physiologic barrier, or macroreentry. This mechanism would provide both for facile engagement of the reentry circuit by an entraining impulse and for fusion. We believe that ventricular tachycardia subject to entrainment with fusion constitutes strong evidence of macroreentry (3). Other explanations for ventricular tachycardia of this nature are contrived and complicated. Finally, the occurrence of entrainment of ven-

tricular tachycardia proves that not all ventricular tachycardia is caused by "protected localized reentry" (4).

KELLEY P. ANDERSON, MD  
*Assistant Professor of Medicine*  
JAY W. MASON, MD, FACC  
*Professor of Medicine  
Division of Cardiology  
University of Utah Medical Center  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84132*

### References

1. Waldo AL, Henthorn RW, Plumb VJ, MacLean WAH. Demonstration of the mechanism of transient entrainment and interruption of ventricular tachycardia with rapid atrial pacing. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1984;3:422-30.
2. Brugada P, Wellens HJJ. Entrainment as an electrophysiologic phenomenon. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1984;3:451-4.
3. Anderson KP, Swerdlow CD, Mason JW. Entrainment of ventricular tachycardia. *Am J Cardiol* 1984;53:335-40.
4. Josephson ME, Horowitz LN, Farshidi A, Spielman SR, Michelson EL, Greenspan AM. Sustained ventricular tachycardia: evidence for protected localized reentry. *Am J Cardiol* 1978;42:416-24.

### Reply

Waldo et al. have emphasized that transient entrainment can only be established by fulfilling one of three criteria: 1) constant fusion beats during rapid pacing at a constant rate except for the last captured beat; 2) progressive fusion (constant fusion beats at different rapid pacing rates but different degrees of fusion at the different rate); and 3) interruption of the tachycardia by rapid pacing associated with localized conduction block to a site followed by activation of that site from a different direction and with a shorter conduction time by the next pacing impulse. If one of these criteria can be fulfilled, Waldo et al. (1,2) have suggested this is best explained by reentry. Similarly, Brugada and Wellens (3) stated that "unless otherwise proved, demonstration of transient entrainment of tachycardia using the criteria of Waldo et al. is a very easy way to demonstrate that reentry is the underlying mechanism of the arrhythmia" (3). Thus, both Waldo et al. (1,2) and Brugada and Wellens (3) emphasize the point that one must be able to demonstrate one of the proposed criteria in order to demonstrate transient entrainment and, therefore, reentry. Furthermore, they have emphasized that with available data, only reentry can satisfactorily explain the observations that fulfill any of the three proposed criteria.

We agree it is likely that "... a large area of physiologic or anatomic block between the muscle depolarized by the entraining stimulus and that depolarized by the wave front emerging from the site of reentry is required for fusion to be manifest during entrainment." However, we do not understand clearly their statement that "the point or points at which the wave of excitation from the reentrant circuit engages the rest of the myocardium must be separate from the path over which the entraining wave front gains access to the circuit, so that access is not blocked by the wave front that just emerged from the circuit." The point is that to obtain transient entrainment, there must be an excitable gap in the reentrant circuit. The wave front from the pacing impulse which