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I do not think diagnostic angiography without FFR can any longer be considered to be an optimal standard of care for patients with chest pain
You cannot rely on what you see at angiography if your currency is “significance”
Our current practice for assessment & management of angina is flawed & confused.......
What is our current philosophy for the investigation & treatment of patients with stable angina?

“Everyone with chest pain should have an angiogram”

“Only patients with objective evidence of ischaemia should have an angiogram”

“A significant stenosis is better off being treated”
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When someone presents with chest pain that we think is angina, what is it that we actually want to know?

**Whether they have:**

- Atheroma?
- “Significant” coronary artery disease?
- Impaired prognosis?

How much of this can we address by doing a coronary angiogram?
CAD present?  

Benefit from statin/ramipril?  

Symptoms due to this CAD?  

Needs re-vascularisation?
Why is ischaemia so important?
12000 patients with similar coronary stenosis severity at angio

“In patients with a similar degree of anatomic disease the most important predictor of outcome is the presence and extent of inducible ischaemia.”

The risk for death or MI in the next 5 years is thus 20 times higher for an ischaemic lesion compared to a non-ischaemic one.

**Figure 1.** Rate of hard cardiac events (death or nonfatal MI) in patients with normal and abnormal stress SPECT images.
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Ischaemia is the dominant factor to determine clinical outcome
How can we test for ischaemia?

Non-invasive tests have important limitations......

- Poor diagnostic value (ETT!!)

- Limited access (stress MRI/echo/MPI)
In people without confirmed CAD, in whom stable angina cannot be diagnosed or excluded based on clinical assessment alone, estimate the likelihood of CAD (see table 1). Take the clinical assessment and the resting 12-lead ECG into account when making the estimate. Arrange further diagnostic testing as follows:

- If the estimated likelihood of CAD is 61–90%, offer invasive coronary angiography as the first-line diagnostic investigation if appropriate (see recommendations 1.3.4.4 and 1.3.4.5).
- If the estimated likelihood of CAD is 30–60%, offer functional imaging as the first-line diagnostic investigation (see recommendation 1.3.4.6).
- If the estimated likelihood of CAD is 10–29%, offer CT calcium scoring as the first-line diagnostic investigation (see recommendation 1.3.4.7). [1.3.3.16]

- Do not use exercise ECG to diagnose or exclude stable angina for people without known CAD. [1.3.6.5]
So... Should everyone have an angiogram?
LIMITATIONS OF CORONARY ANGIOGRAPHY
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That wasn't chicken
Multivessel Disease.....
Stents or Surgery?
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Pressure Wire: Our perfect “let out” device

"It's not high-definition anything. It's a window."
RCA:
Min FFR = 0.96

LAD:
Min FFR = 0.84

Intermediate:
Min FFR = 0.84

Diagonal
Min FFR = 0.82

Multivessel Disease
Stents or Surgery?
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What does this mean for routine angiogram-guided practice??

- How many patients have PCI who didn’t need it?
- How many patients have CABG when they didn’t need it?
- How many patients are reassured or given OMT when they need revasc?

What does the literature tell us about the FFR at the stage of the angiogram?
Patient with chest pain

Test for evidence of reversible ischaemia

Diagnostic Angiogram

OMT  DEFER  FAME  FAME 2  PCI  CABG

University Hospital Southampton NHS
Non-randomised "prospectively allocated"
137 patients (312 vessels)

FFR-PCI  57 patients, 128 vessels ....... 48 patients, 53 vessels
Conventional PCI: 80 patients, 184 vessels
Figure 2. (A) Percentage of patients with 2- and 3-vessel disease outlined before FFR measurements. (B) Percentage of patients with significant 1-vessel or 2-vessel stenosis or no significant coronary artery stenosis depicted after FFR measurements.
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Hypothesis

That, in patients having diagnostic coronary angiography, routine assessment of FFR may influence management strategy derived from diagnostic angiography alone.

Or, in other words:

“How different is our management with FFR compared with angio alone?”
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Patient being investigated for chest pain

Diagnostic Coronary Angiogram by Cardiologist 1

FFR* of all patent vessels of stentable (≥2.25mm) diameter by Cardiologist 2

*FFR < 0.8

Primary endpoint based upon the difference between Plan 1 and Plan 2

TREATMENT PLAN 1
Medical/PCI/CABG/more info

Cardiologist 1 shown FFR results

TREATMENT PLAN 2
Medical/PCI/CABG/more info
RESULTS
Summary

In a total of 64 cases (32%), FFR leads to a change in the judgement as to whether a coronary artery has a “significant” lesion compared to angiogram alone.
Management of population by angiogram versus FFR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medical</th>
<th>PCI</th>
<th>CABG</th>
<th>Further Info</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLAN 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further info</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fishers exact test  $p<0.0001$

**Summary**
- Agreement about category of management in 147 out of 200 (74%)
- ie after FFR management change in 26% of cases
Results: Indication for revascularisation of individual coronaries by angiogram & FFR

- In a total of 36 (ie 18%) cases the angiogram would have got indication for left anterior descending revascularisation wrong according to FFR...

- In a total of 27 (ie 13.5%) cases the angiogram would have got indication for circumflex revascularisation wrong according to FFR

- In a total of 17 (ie 8.5%) cases the angiogram would have got indication for right coronary artery revascularisation wrong according to FFR
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Limitations

- No clinical outcome
- High denominator... selection of cases...
- CTOs not part of this trial
- Already VERY unpopular with non-interventional cardiologists!
IMPLICATIONS

- These results have potentially important implications for clinical practice:
  - management of patients with stable angina by angiogram alone is flawed
  - management of patients would be improved by routine use of FFR at the diagnostic stage

- A large scale randomised trial of angiographic- versus FFR-guided assessment & management of patients undergoing diagnostic angiography with stable angina is now warranted

- Could we really see FFR as part of angio routinely?
- Would diagnostic angio only be done by interventionists?
- Or... can non-interventional cardiologists do FFR without PCI training/back up?
- Will the surgeons accept FFR-guided practice?
The data confirm that one-third of a large patient population shows discordance between angiogram $\geq 50\%$DS and FFR $\leq 0.8$ thresholds of stenosis severity. Left main stenoses are often underestimated by the classical $50\%$ DS cut-off compared with FFR. This discordance offers physiologic insights for future trials. It is hypothesized that the discordance
54 yr Asian male
Hypercholesterolaemia; HT
Developed angina with +ve ETT 2005
Sept 05 Angiogram showed
• 30% LMS
• 90% mid LAD
• 60% mid RCA
Proceeded to stent LAD: Taxus 3x16
Good symptomatic relief until March 06
Recurrent exertional symptoms and +ve ETT
14/2/07 Further standby angiogram
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University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust
- n=1075 consecutive patients undergoing diagnostic angiography including an FFR Investigation

- Patients had to have at least 1 angiographically ambiguous lesion

- Primary objective was to describe the rate of reclassification of the patient’s coronary revascularisation strategy by an intention to use FFR in patients referred for coronary angiography
A Change of Revascularization strategy in 43% of patients

Overall n=1075
Medical n=587
PCI n=409
CABG n=79

« A priori » strategy
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Conclusion—This study shows that performing FFR during diagnostic angiography is associated with reclassification of the revascularization decision in about half of the patients. It further demonstrates that it is safe to pursue a revascularization strategy divergent from that suggested by angiography but guided by FFR. (Circulation. 2014;129:00-00.)
“SAME TIME, SAME PLACE”

Angiogram with FFR:
(a) definitive diagnosis & (b) ischaemia-directed PCI
Current strategies for diagnosis & management of chest pain are confused

Current patient-level treatment is not ischaemia-driven in most cases

Current lesion-level treatment is not ischaemia-driven or targeted

Routine FFR at the coronary angiogram stage would facilitate patient-level & lesion-level tailored therapy in the same manner as in FAME 1 & 2, but at an earlier stage of the care pathway

If treatment was ischaemia-tailored the results of COURAGE & SYNTAX may have been very different?

RIPCORD 2 will help us understand this....

USE FFR LIBERALLY IN YOUR PRACTICE: FOR THE SAKE OF YOUR PATIENTS!!
I do not think diagnostic angiography **without FFR** can any longer be considered to be an optimal standard of care for patients with chest pain.....

**DO YOU???????**