FFR in multivessel disease & FAME study

Coronary Physiology in the Catheterization Laboratory European Heart House April 7-9, 2011

Pim A.L. Tonino, MD, PhD



A rather common patient in our cath lab today......

- 72-year-old male, stable angina class 3
- small non-STEMI 3 weeks earlier, no diagnostic Δ-ECG
- residual angina class 2-3
- positive exercise stress test

Coronary angiography



LCA

FAME STUDY patient # 1249 June 25th, 2007



RCA

FAME STUDY patient # 1249 June 25th, 2007

A rather common patient in our cath lab today......

- 72-year-old male, stable angina class 3
- small non-STEMI 3 weeks earlier, no diagnostic Δ-ECG
- residual angina class 2-3
- positive exercise stress test

Coronary angiography

- 50% LAD artery
- 50% Intermediate branch
- 90% LCX artery
- 70 % RCA proximal
- 50% RCA mid



How to proceed? It is not the question *IF* stenting is indicated, but *WHERE* and *HOW MANY*

Ischemia-producing coronary lesions cause symptoms and cardiac events



Hachamovitch et al., Circulation 1998

PCI of ischemic lesions \rightarrow better outcome



Shaw et al. COURAGE trial nuclear substudy. Circulation 2008

Ischemic lesions (FFR < 0.75) treated by stenting



DEFER-study, JACC 2007; 49 : 2105-2111

Functionally NON-significant stenoses

a functionally <u>non</u>-significant stenosis ("non-ischemic stenosis") generally gives <u>no</u> complaints

So, from the symptomatic point of view there is no reason to stent such lesion

Cardiac Death And Acute MI After 5 Years: functionally non-significant stenoses



Defer, JACC, 2008

So, functionally significant (= ischemic) lesions should be revascularized,

.....whereas it makes no sense to stent non-ischemic lesions

So, if we are able to accurately discriminate ischemic from non-ischemic lesions we can selectively treat the ischemic lesions by PCI and the non-ischemic lesions by medical treatment



Particularly in multivessel disease we often have <u>insufficient</u> information about stenosis-related myocardial ischemia



The angiogram poorly predicts presence of myocardial ischemia related to a specific coronary stenosis





Non-invasive tests aren't always performed pre-PCI

Only 44.5% (20.1% - 70.6%) of Medicare patients undergoing elective PCI, underwent stress-testing < 90 days before PCI



Lin et al. JAMA 2008



Non-invasive tests are frequently inaccurate in multivessel disease:

- *Excercise test:* non-conclusive, information per patient

- Nuclear scan: inaccurate in MVD (balanced ischemia, serial stenosis)



So we need FFR





intermediate branch



PW (Certus wire) in intermediate branch





PW in LAD artery











LCX after stenting (Endeavour 3.5 x 12)











Pressure Wire in RCA



LESSONS FROM THIS PATIENT:

- only 1 stent necessary ; cost-savings!
- if treatment was based upon angio and performed by "more agresssive" interventionalist (or had been randomized to angio-guided arm of FAME study), at least 3 and maybe 4 or 5 stents would have been placed



FFR-guided vs. Angio-guided multivessel PCI (125 patients) (event-free survival after 30 months)

Leesar et al, JACC 2005

But, does it matter to selectively stent ischemic stenoses? Does routine use of FFR in MVD impact prognosis? What about functional class? **Procedure time?**

The windtunnel for testing such an FFR-guided PCI strategy is a randomized trial




Participating Centers



USA (6)

Stanford University (William F. Fearon)

Northeast Cardiology, Bangor, Maine (Peter N. Ver Lee)

University of Louisville (Massoud Leesar)

St Louis University (Michael Lim)

University Hospital Virginia (Michael Ragosta)

University of South Carolina (Eric Powers)

EUROPE (14)

King's College Hospital, London) (Ph.MacCarthy) Cardiovascular Center Aalst (B. De Bruyne) Catharina Hospital Eindhoven (N.Pijls) Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen (T.Engstrom) Klinikum der Universitat Munchen (V.Klauss) Aarhus University Hospital (Ole Frobert) **University Hospital Bergmannsheil** (Waldemar Bojara) Sodersjukhhuset, Stockholm (I Herzfeld) Helsingborgs Lasarett (F Schersten) Klinikum Darmstadt (Gerald Werner) **Bristol Royal Infirmary** (A.Baumbach) Staedt. Krankenhaus, Bogenhausen (G.Riess) Glasgow Western Infirmary (Keith Oldroyd) Royal Victoria Hospital, Belfast (Ganesh Manoharan)



Baseline

	Angio- Guided n = 496	FFR- Guided n = 509	P Value
Age, mean ±SD	64±10	65±10	0.47
Male, %	73	75	0.30
Diabetes, %	25	24	0.65
Hypertension, %	66	61	0.10
Current smoker, %	32	27	0.12
Hyperlipidemia, %	73	72	0.62
Previous MI, %	36	37	0.84
NSTE ACS, %	36	29	0.11
Previous PCI , %	26	29	0.34
LVEF, mean ±SD	57±12	57±11	0.92
LVEF < 50% , %	27	29	0.47

Tonino et al. N Engl J Med. 2009



	Angio- Guided n = 496	FFR- Guided n = 509	P Value
Age, mean ±SD	64±10	65±10	0.47
Male, %	73	75	0.30
Diabetes, %	25	24	0.65
Hypertension, %	66	61	0.10
Current smoker, %	32	27	0.12
Hyperlipidemia, %	73	72	0.62
Previous MI, %	36	37	0.84
NSTE ACS, %	36	29	0.11
Previous PCI , %	26	29	0.34
LVEF, mean ±SD	57±12	57±11	0.92
LVEF < 50% , %	27	29	0.47

Tonino et al. N Engl J Med. 2009

Procedural data

		Angio- Guided n = 496	FFR- Guided n = 509	P Value
	Indicated lesions / patient	2.7±0.9	2.8±1.0	0.34
	Stents / patient	2.7 ± 1.2	1.9 ± 1.3	<0.001
	Procedure time (min)	70 ± 44	71 ± 43	0.51
	Contrast agent used (ml)	302 ± 127	272 ± 133	<0.001
	Equipment cost (US \$)	6007	5332	<0.001
	Length of hospital stay (days)	3.7 ± 3.5	3.4 ± 3.3	0.05
Ton	ino et al. N Engl J Med. 2009			

Adverse events after 1 year

	Angio- Guided n = 496	FFR- Guided n = 509	P Value
Total no. of MACE	113	76	0.02
Death	15 (3.0)	9 (1.8)	0.19
Myocardial Infarction	43 (8.7)	29 (5.7)	0.07
CABG or repeat PCI	47 (9.5)	33 (6.5)	0.08
Death or Myocardial Infarction	55 (11.1)	37 (7.3)	0.04
Death, MI, CABG, or re-PCI	91 (18.3)	67 (13.2)	0.02

Tonino et al. N Engl J Med. 2009





1 year economic evaluation

Bootstrap Simulation



Fearon et al. Circulation, December, 2010

Adverse events after 2 years

	Angio- Guided n = 496	FFR- Guided n = 509	P Value
Total no. of MACE	139	105	0.01
Individual Endpoints			
Death	19 (3.8)	13 (2.6)	0.25
Myocardial Infarction	48 (9.7)	31 (6.1)	0.03
CABG or repeat PCI	61 (12.3)	53 (10.4)	0.35
Composite Endpoints			
Death or Myocardial Infarction	63 (12.7)	43 (8.4)	0.03
Death, MI, CABG, or re-PCI	110 (22.2)	90 (17.7)	0.07

Tonino et al. N Engl J Med. 2009

Freedom from angina



Does this mean we really have to measure all lesions with FFR in MVD patients?



FAME angiographic substudy: FFR mandatory in all MVD PCI, in all stenoses of 50-90%

How does FAME fit with other recently performed RCT's to (DES) stenting in Multivessel Disease ?

→ Keynote lecture

Why is outcome of FFR guided procedures so good?



Intrinsic risk of death and myocardial infarction ?



Ischemic lesion→ intrinsic risk 5 % per yearNon-ischemic lesion→ intrinsic risk 1 % per yearStented stenosis→ intrinsic risk 3 % per year

"stent 'm all"
intrinsic risk 12% → 12%
"stent only the ischemic ones"
intrinsic risk 12 → 8 %
both strategies eliminate ischemia
intrinsic risk 12 → 8 %

FAME study: CONCLUSIONS (1)



Routine measurement of FFR during PCI with DES in patients with multivessel disease, when compared to current angiography guided strategy

 Reduces the rate of the composite endpoint of death, myocardial infarction, re-PCI and CABG at 1 year by ~ 30%

 Reduces mortality and myocardial infarction at 1 year by ~ 35 %

FAME study: CONCLUSIONS (2)



Routine measurement of FFR during PCI with DES in patients with multivessel disease, when compared to current angiography guided strategy

- Is cost-saving and does not prolong the procedure
- Reduces the number of stents used
- Decreases the amount of contrast agent used
- Results in a similar, if not better, functional status

FAME

Routine measurement of FFR during DES-stenting in patients with multivessel disease is superior to current angiography guided treatment.

It improves outcome of PCI significantly

It supports the evolving paradigm of

"Functionally Complete Revascularization", i.e. stenting of ischemic lesions and medical treatment of non-ischemic ones.

FAME

Routine measurement of FFR during DES-stenting in patients with multivessel disease is superior to current angiography guided treatment.

It improves outcome of PCI significantly

It supports the evolving paradigm of

"Functionally Complete Revascularization", i.e. stenting of ischemic lesions and medical treatment of non-ischemic ones.

FFR now Class I Level A in ESC guidelines!



European Heart Journal doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehq277



Guidelines on myocardial revascularization

Page 36 of 55

ESC/EACTS Guidelines

 Table 33
 Recommendations for specific percutaneous coronary intervention devices and pharmacotherapy

	Class ^a	Level ^b	Ref. ^c
FFR-guided PCI is recommended for detection of ischaemia-related lesion(s) when objective evidence of vessel-related ischaemia is not available.	I	A	15, 28
		•	45, 46,



<u>What to do ?</u>

- 1. CABG anyway (3-vessel disease)
- 2. PCI of RCA lesions only
- 3. Nuclear test (MIBI Spect)
- 4. PCI of all lesions (5 stents)
- 5. further invasive diagnostic testing (FFR)



Start of procedure:

sensor close to tip of JR guiding catheter to verify equal pressures at that point







RCA:

FFR = 0.34







RCA after one stent:

FFR = 0.74

recording before any stent



Why do we find gradient across proximal stenosis after having stented the distal one ?







RCA after 2 stents:

FFR = 0.87



<u>Before entering into LCA:</u> verify again equal pressures when sensor at tip of the guiding catheter







LCX:

FFR = 0.94





Diag branch: FFR = 0.49





Diag branch after stenting: FFR = 0.81 (*no recording found*)







LAD:

FFR = 0.83

In summary:

- RCA (2 stenoses) : FFR 0.34 → 0.74 → 0.84 (2 stents)
- MOCX : FFR 0.94 → no stent
- Diag branch: FFR $0.49 \rightarrow 0.81$ (1 stent)
- LAD: FFR 0.83 → no stent

Total time of procedure: 21.26 h \rightarrow 22.12 h = 46 min

Case performed by Guus Brueren

Patient participated in FAME study

What about ref diameter, vessel size?

*Reference diameter:*FAME 2.5mm
Pivotal DES trials 2.6-2.8mm

selection bias single vessel disease excluding lesions <2.5mm less extensive disease

→ Most studies on PCI in MVD: no QCA (MASII, ARTS, SYNTAX)

What about ref diameter, vessel size?

	Angio-guided group	FFR-guided group
% lesions proximal	29%	32%
% lesions prox or mid	71%	73%

So, FAME does not represent 'smaller' vessels, but the early DES trials represent 'larger' vessels

MACE in SYNTAX – 3VD and FAME



MACCE in SYNTAX – 3VD and FAME

similar definition of MACCE, including CVA and excluding CKMB 3-5 x N


FUNCTIONAL CLASS in COURAGE - SYNTAX – 3VD and FAME



TREATMENT OPTIONS FOR MVD





TREATMENT OPTIONS FOR MVD



