## Supplemental Material

Supplemental Results
The baseline patient characteristics for all subgroups analyzed are shown in Table S1. Tables S2-S6 demonstrate the association between ECG metrics and cardiovascular death (CVD) in the validation cohort and low-risk subgroups, adjusting by TRS, LVEF and BNP as appropriate. None of the ECG metrics were significantly associated with CVD in a higher-risk subgroup (TRS $\geq 5$, Table S 7 ).

## Supplemental Tables

Table S1: Baseline patient characteristics for whole dataset (MERLIN placebo) and subpopulations. *: statistically significant difference (at the $5 \%$ level) compared to the validation cohort.

|  | Validation Cohort (LVEF \& BNP) | TRS $\leq 4$ | TRS $\geq 5$ | Lower Risk-1 $($ LVEF $>40$ $\& ~ T R S \leq 4)$ | Lower Risk-2 (BNP $\leq 80$ $\&$ TRS $\leq 4$ ) | Lower Risk-3 (BNP $\leq 80$ $\&$ LVEF $>40$ $\&$ TRS $\leq 4$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 1082 | 864 | 218 | 776 | 538 | 503 |
| CV Deaths | 45(4.5\%) | 22(2.7\%)* | 23(12.0\%)* | 17(2.3\%)* | 8(1.6\%)* | 6(1.3\%)* |
| Age, years, median (IQR) | 63(55-71) | $\begin{gathered} 61(54- \\ 69)^{*} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 69(65-74)* | $\begin{gathered} 61(54- \\ 69)^{*} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58(53- \\ 66)^{*} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 59(53- \\ 66)^{*} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Female (\%) | 37 | 37 | 39 | 39 | 36 | 38 |
| BMI, median (IQR) | 28(25-32) | 29(26-32) | 28(25-32) | 29(26-32) | $\begin{gathered} 29(26- \\ 33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29(26- \\ 32) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Diabetes mellitus (\%) | 35 | 32 | 48* | 32 | 34 | 34 |
| Hypertension (\%) | 78 | 75 | 91* | 75 | 76 | 77 |
| Current smoker (\%) | 24 | 26 | 20 | 26 | 26 | 26 |
| Previous MI (\%) | 36 | 28* | 71* | 26* | 27* | 25* |
| Index event (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstable angina | 52 | 52 | 50 | 53 | 64* | 64* |
| Myocardial infarction | 48 | 48 | 50 | 47 | 36* | 36* |
| ST depression $\geq 1 \mathrm{mV}$ (\%) | 39 | 35* | 58* | 35* | 27* | 27* |
| TIMI risk score (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Group 1 Low(1-2) | 25 | 31* | 0 * | 32* | 35* | 35* |
| Group 2 <br> Moderate(3-4) | 55 | 69* | 0* | 68* | 65* | 65* |
| Group 3 High(5-7) | 20 | 0* | 100* | 0* | 0* | 0* |
| LVEF measured (\%) | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| LVEF <40\% (\%) | 12 | 10 | 21* | 0* | 7* | 0* |
| BNP measured (\%) | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| BNP >80 (\%) | 42 | 38 | 57* | 35* | 0* | 0* |

Table S2: Multivariable models consisting of LVEF $\leq 40 \%$, TRS $\geq 5$, BNP $>80 \mathrm{pg} / \mathrm{ml}$, and a single ECG metric, as assessed on the validation cohort (MERLIN Placebo population with both LVEF and BNP measurements). There are 45 CVD in 1082 patients (4.5\%). Hazard ratios are computed relative to the upper quartile value in this population unless otherwise indicated. Metrics with significant hazard ratios are in bold.

| Risk Metric | Multivariable <br> 1-year <br> hazard ratio <br> (adjusted for <br> LVEF,BNP,TRS) | $95 \%$ CI | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MV>52.5 | $\mathbf{3 . 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 8 0 , 6 . 0 9 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0}$ |
| MV | $\mathbf{2 . 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 4 3 , 4 . 8 1 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 2}$ |
| DC $\leq \mathbf{2 . 5}$ (vs >4.5) | $\mathbf{2 . 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 0 0 , 5 . 7 3 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 5 0}$ |
| DC | $\mathbf{2 . 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 2 2 , 4 . 1 7 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 9}$ |
| HRV-LFHF | $\mathbf{2 . 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 2 0 , 4 . 0 9 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 1}$ |
| MVB | $\mathbf{2 . 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 1 5 , 3 . 8 9 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 6}$ |
| DC $\leq 4.5$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 1 2 , 3 . 8 5 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 2 1}$ |
| MVB>2.9 | $\mathbf{1 . 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 0 4 , 3 . 5 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 3 8}$ |
| DC $\leq 2.5$ | 1.77 | $(0.82,3.84)$ | 0.148 |
| HRV-SDANN | 1.53 | $(0.83,2.81)$ | 0.171 |
| HRT12 | 1.39 | $(0.75,2.58)$ | 0.299 |
| HRV-HRVI | 1.12 | $(0.59,2.13)$ | 0.728 |
| HRV-ASDNN | 1.09 | $(0.58,2.07)$ | 0.790 |
| HRV-SDNN | 1.03 | $(0.54,1.98)$ | 0.925 |
| HRT2 (vs 0) | 0.88 | $(0.33,2.36)$ | 0.805 |
| TWA | 0.82 | $(0.39,1.71)$ | 0.597 |
| HRT2 | 0.77 | $(0.32,1.89)$ | 0.574 |
| HRV-PNN50 | 0.76 | $(0.37,1.58)$ | 0.459 |
| HRV-RMSSD | 0.75 | $(0.35,1.61)$ | 0.452 |
| SAF | 0.68 | $(0.24,1.97)$ | 0.481 |

Table S3: Multivariable models consisting of LVEF $\leq 40 \%$, BNP>80pg/ml, and a single ECG metric, as assessed on patients with TRS $\leq 4$. There are 22 CVD in 864 patients (2.7\%). Hazard ratios are computed relative to the upper quartile value in this population unless otherwise indicated. Metrics with significant hazard ratios are in bold.

| Risk Metric | Multivariable <br> 1-year <br> hazard ratio <br> (adjusted for <br> LVEF,BNP) | $95 \%$ Cl | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MV>52.5 | $\mathbf{5 . 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{( 2 . 2 2 , 1 2 . 6 4 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0}$ |
| MV | $\mathbf{3 . 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 5 3 , 8 . 7 9 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 3}$ |
| MVB | $\mathbf{2 . 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 2 5 , 7 . 1 5 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 4}$ |
| MVB>2.9 | $\mathbf{2 . 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 1 9 , 6 . 8 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 8}$ |
| HRV-LFHF | 2.32 | $(0.98,5.53)$ | 0.057 |
| DC $\leq 4.5$ | 2.03 | $(0.85,4.84)$ | 0.110 |
| DC $\leq 2.5(v s>4.5)$ | 2.00 | $(0.58,6.88)$ | 0.272 |
| DC | 1.97 | $(0.82,4.73)$ | 0.132 |
| HRT2 (vs 0) | 1.91 | $(0.54,6.70)$ | 0.313 |
| HRT2 | 1.85 | $(0.60,5.74)$ | 0.284 |
| DC $\leq 2.5$ | 1.82 | $(0.59,5.65)$ | 0.300 |
| HRT12 | 1.71 | $(0.69,4.21)$ | 0.247 |
| SAF | 1.59 | $(0.45,5.65)$ | 0.474 |
| HRV-SDANN | 1.43 | $(0.59,3.45)$ | 0.423 |
| HRV-SDNN | 1.41 | $(0.59,3.40)$ | 0.442 |
| HRV-ASDNN | 1.18 | $(0.48,2.91)$ | 0.726 |
| HRV-PNN50 | 0.93 | $(0.34,2.53)$ | 0.890 |
| HRV-HRVI | 0.72 | $(0.26,1.98)$ | 0.526 |
| HRV-RMSSD | 0.68 | $(0.23,2.00)$ | 0.480 |
| TWA | 0.63 | $(0.21,1.88)$ | 0.411 |

Table S4: Multivariable models consisting of BNP>80pg/ml and a single ECG metric, as assessed on patients with Lower-Risk-1 subpopulation (TRS $\leq 4$ and LVEF $>40 \%$ ). There are 17 CVD in 776 patients (2.3\%). Hazard ratios are computed relative to the upper quartile value in this population unless otherwise indicated.

| Risk Metric | Multivariable <br> 1-year <br> hazard ratio <br> (adjusted for <br> BNP) | $95 \%$ CI | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MV>52.5 | $\mathbf{4 . 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 8 5 , 1 2 . 6 2 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ |
| MVB | $\mathbf{3 . 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 4 5 , 1 0 . 1 5 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 7}$ |
| MV | $\mathbf{2 . 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 1 3 , 7 . 7 2 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 2 7}$ |
| MVB>2.9 | $\mathbf{2 . 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 0 2 , 6 . 9 7 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 4 5}$ |
| HRV-LFHF | 1.55 | $(0.57,4.20)$ | 0.389 |
| HRT12 | 1.43 | $(0.52,3.97)$ | 0.488 |
| HRV-SDNN | 1.43 | $(0.53,3.88)$ | 0.486 |
| HRV-SDANN | 1.42 | $(0.52,3.86)$ | 0.490 |
| DC<=4.5 | 1.37 | $(0.50,3.75)$ | 0.541 |
| DC | 1.34 | $(0.49,3.67)$ | 0.570 |
| HRV-ASDNN | 1.10 | $(0.39,3.13)$ | 0.861 |
| HRV-PNN50 | 0.94 | $(0.31,2.90)$ | 0.920 |
| HRT2 (vs 0) | 0.82 | $(0.10,6.60)$ | 0.851 |
| HRT2 | 0.69 | $(0.09,5.28)$ | 0.722 |
| HRV-RMSSD | 0.64 | $(0.19,2.24)$ | 0.490 |
| TWA | 0.64 | $(0.19,2.24)$ | 0.490 |
| HRV-HRVI | 0.59 | $(0.17,2.05)$ | 0.406 |
| SAF | 0.00 | $(0.00$, Inf) | 0.994 |
| DC<=2.5 | 0.00 | $(0.00$, Inf) | 0.993 |
| DC $\leq 2.5 ~(v s>4.5)$ | 0.00 | $(0.00$, Inf) | 0.994 |

Table S5: Multivariable models consisting of LVEF $\leq 40 \%$ and a single ECG metric, as assessed on the LowerRisk-2 subpopulation (TRS $\leq 4$ and BNP $\leq 80 \mathrm{pg} / \mathrm{ml}$ ). There are 8 CVD in 538 patients (1.6\%). Hazard ratios are computed relative to the upper quartile value in this population unless otherwise indicated.

| Risk Metric | Multivariable <br> 1-year <br> hazard ratio <br> (adjusted for <br> LVEF) | $95 \%$ CI | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MVB | $\mathbf{7 . 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 5 2 , 4 0 . 0 9 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 4}$ |
| MVB>2.9 | $\mathbf{5 . 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 1 5 , 2 2 . 4 1 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 3 2}$ |
| MV>52.5 | $\mathbf{4 . 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 2 0 , 2 0 . 1 7 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 2 7}$ |
| MV | $\mathbf{4 . 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 0 4 , 1 8 . 8 6 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 4 4}$ |
| HRT2 (vs 0) | 4.29 | $(0.44,41.95)$ | 0.211 |
| DC $\leq 2.5$ (vs >4.5) | 3.86 | $(0.42,35.67)$ | 0.233 |
| HRT12 | 3.09 | $(0.69,13.85)$ | 0.140 |
| DC<=2.5 | 3.05 | $(0.37,24.85)$ | 0.297 |
| HRT2 | 2.94 | $(0.35,24.72)$ | 0.320 |
| DC<=4.5 | 2.71 | $(0.62,11.87)$ | 0.184 |
| DC | 2.39 | $(0.55,10.30)$ | 0.243 |
| HRV-LFHF | 1.67 | $(0.40,7.01)$ | 0.484 |
| HRV-PNN50 | 1.02 | $(0.20,5.03)$ | 0.985 |
| TWA | 0.98 | $(0.20,4.88)$ | 0.984 |
| HRV-ASDNN | 0.90 | $(0.18,4.47)$ | 0.893 |
| HRV-RMSSD | 0.39 | $(0.05,3.21)$ | 0.383 |
| HRV-SDANN | 0.38 | $(0.05,3.09)$ | 0.364 |
| HRV-SDNN | 0.37 | $(0.04,3.03)$ | 0.354 |
| SAF | 0.00 | $(0.00$, Inf) | 0.995 |
| HRV-HRVI | 0.00 | $(0.00$, Inf) | 0.994 |

Table S6: Univariate 1-year hazard ratios for risk metrics, as assessed on the LowerRisk-3 subpopulation (BNP $\leq 80 \mathrm{pg} / \mathrm{ml}$ and LVEF $>40 \%$ and TRS $\leq 4$ ). There are 6 CVD in 503 patients (1.3\%). Hazard ratios are computed relative to the upper quartile value in this population unless otherwise indicated. Metrics with significant hazard ratios are in bold.

| Risk Metric | 1-year <br> Hazard <br> Ratio | $95 \%$ CI | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MVB | $\mathbf{1 4 . 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 7 4 , 1 2 7 . 7 1 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 4}$ |
| MVB>2.9 | $\mathbf{8 . 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 5 1 , 4 5 . 0 2 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 5}$ |
| MV>52.5 | $\mathbf{6 . 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 2 4 , 3 0 . 3 6 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 2 6}$ |
| MV | $\mathbf{5 . 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 . 0 8 , 3 2 . 3 3 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 4 0}$ |
| HRT2 (vs 0) | 5.49 | $(0.50,60.52)$ | 0.165 |
| HRT2 | 3.72 | $(0.42,33.28)$ | 0.240 |
| HRT12 | 3.26 | $(0.54,19.48)$ | 0.196 |
| DC | 2.99 | $(0.60,14.79)$ | 0.180 |
| DC $\leq 4.5$ | 2.02 | $(0.37,11.05)$ | 0.416 |
| TWA | 1.55 | $(0.28,8.46)$ | 0.615 |
| HRV-PNN50 | 1.49 | $(0.27,8.14)$ | 0.645 |
| HRV-ASDNN | 1.47 | $(0.27,8.04)$ | 0.655 |
| HRV-LFHF | 1.46 | $(0.27,7.98)$ | 0.662 |
| HRV-SDNN | 0.59 | $(0.07,5.09)$ | 0.635 |
| HRV-SDANN | 0.59 | $(0.07,5.06)$ | 0.632 |
| HRV-RMSSD | 0.59 | $(0.07,5.04)$ | 0.629 |
| DC $\leq 2.5$ | 0.00 | $(0.00$, Inf) | 0.995 |
| SAF | 0.00 | $(0.00$, Inf) | 0.997 |
| DC $\leq 2.5(v s>4.5)$ | 0.00 | $(0.00$, Inf) | 0.997 |
| HRV-HRVI | 0.00 | $(0.00$, Inf) | 0.995 |

Table S7: Multivariable models consisting of LVEF $\leq 40 \%$, BNP>80pg/ml, and a single ECG metric, as assessed on patients with TRS $\geq 5$. There are 23 CVD in 218 patients (12.0\%). Hazard ratios are computed relative to the upper quartile value in this population unless otherwise indicated. None of the metrics have significant hazard ratios.

| Risk Metric | Multivariable <br> 1-year <br> hazard ratio <br> (adjusted for <br> LVEF,BNP) | $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DC $\leq 2.5(v s>4.5)$ | 3.14 | $(0.93,10.59)$ | 0.066 |
| MV | 2.19 | $(0.91,5.25)$ | 0.080 |
| DC $\leq 4.5$ | 2.12 | $(0.88,5.09)$ | 0.093 |
| HRV-LFHF | 2.10 | $(0.88,5.01)$ | 0.093 |
| MVB>2.9 | 2.07 | $(0.87,4.94)$ | 0.101 |
| MV>52.5 | 2.07 | $(0.87,4.94)$ | 0.101 |
| DC $\leq 2.5$ | 1.74 | $(0.60,5.02)$ | 0.306 |
| DC | 1.53 | $(0.63,3.73)$ | 0.345 |
| HRV-SDANN | 1.30 | $(0.53,3.17)$ | 0.568 |
| MVB | 1.46 | $(0.60,3.58)$ | 0.407 |
| HRT12 | 1.17 | $(0.51,2.72)$ | 0.709 |
| HRV-ASDNN | 1.08 | $(0.42,2.76)$ | 0.872 |
| HRV-SDNN | 1.07 | $(0.42,2.73)$ | 0.895 |
| HRV-HRVI | 0.99 | $(0.38,2.56)$ | 0.978 |
| TWA | 0.93 | $(0.34,2.52)$ | 0.885 |
| HRV-RMSSD | 0.69 | $(0.23,2.06)$ | 0.511 |
| HRV-PNN50 | 0.65 | $(0.22,1.92)$ | 0.439 |
| HRT2 (vs 0) | 0.41 | $(0.09,1.99)$ | 0.271 |
| HRT2 | 0.35 | $(0.08,1.53)$ | 0.164 |
| SAF | 0.25 | $(0.03,1.93)$ | 0.185 |

Table S8: Correlation of MVB and MV with other risk metrics across the placebo population. To normalize for the different numerical ranges of the different metrics, continuous risk metrics are dichotomized at the upper quartile in the placebo population. For categorical risk metrics with more than two categories, the highest risk categories are used: HRT=2 and $T R S \geq 5$.

| Risk Metric | MVB | MV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MV | $\mathbf{0 . 7 4 5}$ | 1.000 |
| HRV-SDNN | 0.095 | 0.007 |
| HRV-SDANN | 0.146 | 0.078 |
| HRV-ASDNN | 0.083 | 0.018 |
| HRV-RMSSD | -0.088 | -0.125 |
| HRV-PNN50 | -0.128 | -0.148 |
| HRV-HRVI | 0.139 | 0.071 |
| HRV-LFHF | 0.400 | 0.419 |
| HRT | 0.180 | 0.184 |
| DC | 0.382 | 0.370 |
| SAF | 0.204 | 0.213 |
| TWA | 0.044 | 0.051 |
| BNP80 | 0.166 | 0.155 |
| TRG | 0.069 | 0.059 |
| LVEF40 | 0.177 | 0.174 |

Table S9: Correlation of MVB and MV with baseline characteristics across the placebo population. To normalize for the different numerical ranges of the variables, continuous variables are dichotomized at the upper quartile in the placebo population unless otherwise indicated.

| Variable | MVB | MV |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| AGE $\geq 65$ | 0.148 | 0.188 |
| Gender | 0.022 | 0.003 |
| BMI>30 | 0.054 | 0.018 |
| Diabetes Mellitus | 0.086 | 0.067 |
| Hypertension | 0.046 | 0.055 |
| Smoker | -0.067 | -0.086 |
| Previous MI | 0.003 | 0.016 |
| PCI | 0.001 | -0.004 |
| CHF | 0.03 | 0.041 |
| Ventricular <br> Arrhythmia | 0.058 | 0.052 |
| Resuscitation | 0.042 | 0.056 |
| Creatine <br> Clearance <60 | 0.106 | 0.113 |
| Index Event | 0.094 | 0.068 |
| ST depression | 0.069 | 0.071 |
| Prior Angiography | 0.000 | -0.001 |
| Aspirin | -0.086 | -0.068 |
| B-Blocker | -0.042 | -0.047 |
| Statin | 0.002 | 0.015 |
| Heart Rate | 0.361 | 0.284 |

Table S10: AUC and Category-free Net Reclassification Index (cfNRI) comparing addition of MVB to models incorporating TRS, LVEF, and BNP as appropriate. Since meaningful improvements in discrimination can be masked by small changes in AUC, ${ }^{1}$ the statistical difference in the model was quantified by reclassification. 95\% confidence intervals (CI) were computed using a nonparametric stratified bootstrap approach with 2000 repeats. *The small number of events in this population made it difficult to reach convergence in the logistic regression models.

| Population | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ \text { patient } \\ \text { s } \\ \text { (CVD } \\ \text { rate) } \end{gathered}$ | Reference Model | AUC of Model Including MVB (Referen ce Model) | cfNRI_event (95\% CI) | cfNRI_nonev ent $(95 \% \mathrm{CI})$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { cfNRI } \\ (95 \% \mathrm{Cl}) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Entire placebo | $\begin{gathered} 1082 \\ (4.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | TRS,LVEF, BNP | $\begin{gathered} 0.761 \\ (0.735) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -6.67 \\ (-33.3,28.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 52 \\ (45.4,57.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45.3 \\ (12.9,75.7) \end{gathered}$ |
| TRS $\leq 4$ | $\begin{gathered} 864 \\ (2.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | LVEF,BNP | $\begin{gathered} 0.725 \\ (0.661) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.09 \\ (-27.3,54.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51.5 \\ (44.9,57.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60.6 \\ (16.7,103) \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TRS } \leq 4, \text { LVEF }> \\ & 40 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 776 \\ (2.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | BNP | $\begin{gathered} 0.762 \\ (0.651) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17.6 \\ (-29.4,64.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51.5 \\ (44.9,57.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 69.2 \\ (21.6,115) \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { TRS } \leq 4, \mathrm{BNP} \leq 8 \\ 0^{*} \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 538 \\ (1.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | LVEF | $\begin{gathered} 0.801 \\ (0.594) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (-5.83 e- \\ 15,100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51.7 \\ (43.8,58.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 102 \\ (29.3,155) \end{gathered}$ |

Table S11: Evaluation of calibration of models incorporating TRS, LVEF, BNP, and MVB as appropriate (as per Table S10). Since all variables are dichotomized (Methods), categories were chosen corresponding to unique probabilities instead of deciles (16,8,4,4 categories respectively). P-values were computed using the Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness of fit test ${ }^{2}$.

| Population | $\#$ <br> patients <br> (CVD <br> rate) | Model | p |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Entire placebo | 1082 <br> $(4.5 \%)$ | TRS,LVEF, <br> BNP,MVB | 0.74 |
| TRS $\leq 4$ | 864 <br> $(2.7 \%)$ | LVEF,BNP, <br> MVB | 0.43 |
| TRS $\leq 4$, LVEF>40 | 776 <br> $(2.3 \%)$ | BNP,MVB | 0.14 |
| TRS $\leq 4$, BNP $\leq 80$ | 538 <br> $(1.6 \%)$ | LVEF,MVB | 0.13 |
|  |  |  |  |

Table S12: Discrimination performance of MVB using segments of the ECG. The ECG signal is first pre-processed as per the steps in MVB. Next, the beat-to-beat morphologic distance time series is computed. The distance attributed to each quarter of the ECG segment is then computed, resulting in 4 values for each original MD value: MD1, MD2, MD3, and MD4; MD=MD1+MD2+MD3+MD4. This results in 4 new time series which summarize the variability in partial segments of the ECG. The remaining steps of conversion to the frequency domain, summing the energy in the range every 2 to 7 heartbeats, and taking the 90th percentile are identical. The AUC for MVB computed using the entire segment is the highest, suggesting that the variability measured by MVB can occur in any part of the cardiac cycle across different patients.

| Quarter- <br> segment | AUC for MVB |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.6078 |
| 2 | 0.6293 |
| 3 | 0.6443 |
| 4 | 0.6868 |
| Entire <br> Segment | 0.7253 |

Supplementary Figures


Figure S1: Optimizing the diagnostic beat-frequency for maximum AUC in the derivation cohort (DISPERSE2-TIMI 33 clinical trial, N=764). Figure 2 summarizes the procedure for computing Morphologic Variability in Beatspace (MVB). The input ECG signal converted into a beat-to-beat difference time series termed the Morphologic Distance (MD) time series. The MD time series is then segmented into 5 -minute windows, transformed into the beatfrequency domain, and the energy in the diagnostic beat-frequency range is summed for each window. The $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile of these energies over all 5 -minute windows in 24 hours is termed the MVB for the patient. This figure illustrates the procedure of optimizing the diagnostic beatfrequency. Each point represents the AUC for death within 90 days, computed using a diagnostic beat-frequency with lower and upper limits defined by the x-y axes. For example, the value of 0.73 (indicated by the arrow) means that a diagnostic beat-frequency of every 2 to 7 beats results in an AUC of 0.73 . This is also the peak AUC; thus we define the optimal diagnostic beat-frequency to be every 2 to 7 beats. The inset illustrates the Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve for this optimal diagnostic beat-frequency.


Figure S2: Rate of cardiovascular death by quartiles of MVB. Population definitions and baseline characteristics are stated in Table S1. Briefly, Lower-Risk-1 indicates TRS $\leq 4$ and LVEF $>40 \%$, Low-Risk-2 indicates BNP $\leq 80 \mathrm{pg} / \mathrm{ml}$ and TRS $\leq 4$, and Lower-Risk-3 indicates BNP $\leq 80 \mathrm{pg} / \mathrm{ml}$ and LVEF $>40 \%$ and TRS $\leq 4$. "missing" bars in the bottom two quartiles for the lower-risk-2 and lower-risk-3 populations indicate no deaths occurred in those populations.
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