CAC score vs IVUS MLA: is this the right comparison?

Commentary on

Prevalence of a minimal luminal cross sectional area of coronary arteries < 4 mm² determined by intravascular ultrasound in patients with coronary artery calcium scores of 0-100, 100-200, 200-300, 300-400, and > 400 determined by cardiac computer tomography

John H. Shao, Wilbert S. Aronow, Gautham Ravipati, Kumar Kalapatapu, Melvin B. Weiss, Albert J. DeLuca, Craig E. Monsen, Carmen Sorbera, Robert N. Belkin, Anthony L. Pucillo

Arch Med Sci 2009; 5, 2: 172–174

Gary S. Mintz

Cardiovascular Research Foundation, New York, NY, USA

Submitted: 15 June 2009 Accepted: 19 June 2009

Arch Med Sci 2009; 5, 2: 175-176 Copyright © 2009 Termedia & Banach

Shao *et al.* report that coronary artery calcium (CAC) scores determined by computed tomography (CT) do not accurately predict significant obstructive coronary artery disease (CAD) determined by intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) [1]. Besides the fact that the study contains too few observations for meaningful comparison, is this finding surprising; and did this study ask the right question?

The authors used an IVUS minimum lumen area (MLA) < 4 mm² as an index of stenosis severity. While this has been correlated with intracoronary Doppler FloWire measured coronary flow reserve [2], myocardial perfusion imaging [3], and intracoronary pressure wire measured fractional flow reserve (FFR) [4], an MLA cut-off \geq 4 mm² is more indicative of a lesion that is not hemodynamically significant and in which intervention can be safely deferred [5] than of the converse - i.e., an MLA $< 4 \text{ mm}^2$ indicating hemodynamic significance necessitating intervention. Second, these validation studies were all done in > 3 mm major epicardial arteries excluding the left main coronary artery. Even in their small study (n = 25) the authors included one patient with a lesion in a diagonal branch and three patients with lesions in the left main coronary artery in which an equivalent IVUS threshold cut-off would be 6.0 mm² [6]; furthermore, the authors do not report vessel sizes or even proximal, mid, or distal lesion location. Third, it is not clear from this study why the particular arteries were studied by IVUS; lesions are widely distributed in all three arteries of patients with coronary artery disease. The baseline data from PROSPECT (Providing Regional Observations to Study Predictiors of Events in the Coronary Tree) shows that high risk patients have, on average, approximately 4.0-4.5 non-culprit lesions with a plaque burden > 40%, but only one of them has an MLA < 4 mm². A better gold standard would have been FFR to determine the presence of a hemodynamically significant lesion. Such a study would, ideally, include FFR of all three coronary arteries or, at least, of the coronary artery with the worst angiographic disease.

Corresponding author:

Prof. Gary S. Mintz Cardiovascular Research Foundation New York, NY, USA E-mail: Gsm18439@aol.com



What does CAC score actually measure? Previous studies have reported a strong relationship between CAC score and the subsequent risk of acute coronary events [7, 8]. The conventional explanation is that the CAC score correlates with overall plaque burden and the greater the overall plaque burden the more likely the presence of a vulnerable plaque whose rupture and thrombosis would lead to an event. While IVUS MLA is a more accurate measure of lumen compromise than is angiographic diameter stenosis, both are anatomic measures of stenosis severity; they do not measure plaque burden and cannot indicate the presence of a vulnerable plaque. A better comparison would have been CAC score vs IVUS plague burden or CAC score as a predictor of the presence of one or more vulnerable plaques. While greyscale IVUS cannot detect a thin-capped fibroatheroma (TCFA) - the most common type of vulnerable plaque, newer radio-frequency algorithms - integrated backscatter (IB)-IVUS [9] or virtual histology (VH)-IVUS or optical coherence tomography (OCT) [10] - have shown promise as TCFA detectors. There are other vulnerable plaque types as well – plaque erosions that can only be detected in vivo using OCT or calcific nodules that can be detected by greyscale IVUS. However, a study of CAC score to predict an IB-IVUS, VH-IVUS, or OCT-detected TCFA would have required a three vessel imaging study since it is now clear that TCFAs are relatively infrequent even in high risk patients [11, 12]. Finally, while there have been reported associations between CAC scores and angiographic lesion severity, those studies [1] have involved hundreds of patients [13], not the small number in the study by Shao et al. (1) and (2) suggest that only the highest calcium score may actually be predictive of an angiographically significant lesion [14].

When performing any scientific study, it is important to first ask the right question and second to select the best analytic modalities to answer that question – or, as reviewers are fond to emphasize, to formulate a correct hypothesis.

References

- 1. Shao JH, Aronow WS, Ravipati G, et al. Prevalence of a minimal luminal cross sectional area of coronary arteries < 4 mm² determined by intravascular ultrasound in patients with coronary artery calcium scores of 0-100, 100-200, 200-300, 300-400, and > 400 determined by cardiac computer tomography. Arch Med Sci 2009; 5: 175-6.
- 2. Abizaid A, Mintz GS, Pichard AD, et al. Clinical, intravascular ultrasound, and quantitative angiographic determinants of the coronary flow reserve before and after percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty. Am J Cardiol 1998; 82: 423-8.
- 3. Nishioka T, Amanullah AM, Luo H, et al. Clinical validation of intravascular ultrasound imaging for assessment of coronary stenosis severity: comparison with stress myocardial perfusion imaging. J Am Coll Cardiol 1999; 33: 1870-8.

- 4. Takagi A, Tsurumi Y, Ishii Y, Suzuki K, Kawana M, Kasanuki H. Clinical potential of intravascular ultrasound for physiological assessment of coronary stenosis: relationship between quantitative ultrasound tomography and pressure-derived fractional flow reserve. Circulation 1999; 100: 250-5.
- 5. Abizaid AS, Mintz GS, Mehran R, et al. Long-term follow-up after percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty was not performed based on intravascular ultrasound findings: importance of lumen dimensions. Circulation 1999; 100: 256-61.
- 6. Jasti V, Ivan E, Yalamanchili V, Wongpraparut N, Leesar MA. Correlations between fractional flow reserve and intravascular ultrasound in patients with an ambiguous left main coronary artery stenosis. Circulation 2004; 110: 2831-6.
- 7. Arad Y, Spadaro LA, Goodman K, Newstein D, Guerci AD. Prediction of coronary events with electron beam computed tomography. J Am Coll Cardiol 2000; 36: 1253-60.
- 8. Detrano R, Guerci AD, Carr JJ, et al. Coronary calcium as a predictor of coronary events in four racial or ethnic groups. N Engl J Med 2008; 358: 1336-45.
- 9. Sano K, Kawasaki M, Ishihara Y, et al. Assessment of vulnerable plaques causing acute coronary syndrome using integrated backscatter intravascular ultrasound. J Am Coll Cardiol 2006; 47: 734-41.
- Kume T, Okura H, Yamada R, et al. Frequency and spatial distribution of thin-cap fibroatheroma assessed by 3-vessel intravascular ultrasound and optical coherence tomography. Circ J 2009; 73: 1086-91.
- Burke AP, Virmani R, Galis Z, Haudenschild CC, Muller JE. 34th Bethesda Conference: Task force #2 – What is the pathologic basis for new atherosclerosis imaging techniques? J Am Coll Cardiol 2003; 41: 1874-86.
- Cheruvu PK, Finn AV, Gardner C, et al. Frequency and distribution of thin-cap fibroatheroma and ruptured plaques in human coronary arteries: a pathologic study. J Am Coll Cardiol 2007; 50: 940-9.
- 13. Rumberger JA, Sheedy PF, Breen JF, Schwartz RS. Electron beam computed tomographic coronary calcium score cutpoints and severity of associated angiographic lumen stenosis. J Am Coll Cardiol 1997; 29: 1542-8.
- 14. Ho JS, Fitzgerald SJ, Stolfus LL, et al. Relation of a coronary artery calcium score higher than 400 to coronary stenoses detected using multidetector computed tomography and to traditional cardiovascular risk factors. Am J Cardiol 2008; 101: 1444-7.