VERIFY (VERification of Instantaneous Wave-Free Ratio and Fractional Flow Reserve for the Assessment of Coronary Artery Stenosis Severity in EverydaY Practice)

A Multicenter Study in Consecutive Patients

Colin Berry, MBCHB, PHD,*† Marcel van 't Veer, MSC, PHD,‡ Nils Witt, MD, PHD,§ Petr Kala, MD,|| Otakar Bocek, MD,|| Stylianos A. Pyxaras, MD,¶ John D. McClure, MSC, PHD,* William F. Fearon, MD,# Emanuele Barbato, MD, PHD,¶ Pim A. L. Tonino, MD, PHD‡ Bernard De Bruyne, MD, PHD,¶ Nico H. J. Pijls, MD, PHD,‡ Keith G. Oldroyd, MBCHB, MD,†

Glasgow, United Kingdom; Eindhoven, the Netherlands; Stockholm, Sweden; Brno, Czech Republic; Aalst, Belgium; and Stanford, California

Objectives	This study sought to compare fractional flow reserve (FFR) with the instantaneous wave-free ratio (iFR) in pa- tients with coronary artery disease and also to determine whether the iFR is independent of hyperemia.	
Background	FFR is a validated index of coronary stenosis severity. FFR-guided percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) im- proves clinical outcomes compared to angiographic guidance alone. iFR has been proposed as a new index of stenosis severity that can be measured without adenosine.	
Methods	We conducted a prospective, multicenter, international study of 206 consecutive patients referred for PCI and a retrospective analysis of 500 archived pressure recordings. Aortic and distal coronary pressures were measured in duplicate in patients under resting conditions and during intravenous adenosine infusion at 140 μ g/kg/min.	
Results	Compared to the FFR cut-off value of \leq 0.80, the diagnostic accuracy of the iFR value of \leq 0.80 was 60% (95% confidence interval [CI]: 53% to 67%) for all vessels studied and 51% (95% CI: 43% to 59%) for those patients with FFR in the range of 0.60 to 0.90. iFR was significantly influenced by the induction of hyperemia: mean \pm SD iFR at rest was 0.82 \pm 0.16 versus 0.64 \pm 0.18 with hyperemia (p < 0.001). Receiver operating characteristics confirmed that the diagnostic accuracy of iFR was similar to resting Pd/Pa and trans-stenotic pressure gradient and significantly inferior to hyperemic iFR. Analysis of our retrospectively acquired dataset showed similar results.	
Conclusions	iFR correlates weakly with FFR and is not independent of hyperemia. iFR cannot be recommended for clinical decision making in patients with coronary artery disease. (Comparison of Fractional Flow Reserve Versus Instant Wave- Free Ratio for Assessment of Coronary Artery Stenosis Severity in Routine Practice; NCT01559493) (J Am Coll Car- diol 2013;61:1421-7) © 2013 by the American College of Cardiology Foundation	

Fractional flow reserve (FFR) is a pressure-derived index of coronary stenosis severity and represents the ratio of maximal blood flow in a stenotic artery to maximal flow in the same artery in the absence of any stenosis (1-4). It has been well validated (5-7), and in patients with multivessel coro-

nary disease undergoing percutaneous intervention (PCI), FFR guidance improves health and economic outcomes

See page 1436

From the *BHF Glasgow Cardiovascular Research Centre, Institute of Cardiovascular and Medical Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom; †West of Scotland Regional Heart and Lung Centre, Golden Jubilee National Hospital, Glasgow, United Kingdom; ‡Catharina Ziekenhuis, Eindhoven, the Netherlands; §Karolinska Institute, Department of Clinical Science and Education, Division of Cardiology, Södersjukhuset, Stockholm, Sweden; ||University Hospital Brno and Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic; ¶Cardiovascular Center Aalst, OLV-Clinic, Aalst, Belgium; and the #Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Stanford University Medical Center, Stanford, California. St. Jude Medical provided the coronary pressure wires as an unrestricted research grant. Dr. Berry has received

research grant support from St. Jude Medical. Dr. Witt has received speakers' fees and honoraria from St. Jude Medical. Dr. Fearon has received research support from St. Jude Medical. Dr. Tonino has received research grant support from St. Jude Medical. Dr. De Bruyne has received speakers fees and research grant support from St. Jude Medical. Dr. Pijls is a consultant to St. Medical; and has received research grants from Abbott, Maquet, and St. Jude Medical. Dr. Oldroyd has received speakers' fees from St. Jude Medical and Volcano. All other authors have reported that they have no relationships relevant to the contents of this paper to disclose.

Manuscript received March 20, 2012; revised manuscript received August 4, 2012, accepted September 11, 2012.

Abbreviations	
and Acronyms	angi
ACC = American College of	resu
Cardiology	has
ESC = European Society of	men
Cardiology	Soci
FFR = fractional flow	class
reserve	the A
iFR = instantaneous wave-	ogy
free ratio	quir
Pa = aortic pressure	is m
Pd = distal coronary	ical
pressure	sine
PCI = percutaneous	thes
coronary intervention	patie
	lessr
	ing

compared to treatment based on lography alone (8-10). As a lt, FFR guidance during PCI received a class 1A recomidation from the European ety of Cardiology (11) and a IIA recommendation from American College of Cardiol-(12). FFR measurements ree that myocardial resistance inimal and constant. In clinpractice, intravenous adenoinfusion is used to establish e conditions. Although most ents experience some breathness and chest tightness duradenosine infusion, these

symptoms are generally well tolerated (13). The instantaneous wave-free ratio (iFR) has been proposed as an index of stenosis severity that is independent of hyperemia and can be measured without the need for adenosine (14). The concept of iFR is based on the hypothesis that there is a diastolic "wave-free" period (WFP) when microvascular resistance is already constant and minimal. An iFR value of ≤ 0.83 has been suggested as having diagnostic accuracy comparable to the commonly used FFR cutoff of ≤ 0.80 . We studied consecutive unselected patients referred for angiography with or without PCI to compare FFR to iFR and to determine whether iFR is independent of hyperemia.

Methods

The study protocol was approved by the institutional review board or ethics committee at each participating center, and all patients provided written informed consent. This study is registered at the National Institutes of Health Clinical

Table 1	Baseline Characteristics (n = 206)	
Age (yrs)		$\textbf{65.2} \pm \textbf{10.2}$
Male		146 (71)
Mean body mass index (kg/m ²)		$\textbf{27.7} \pm \textbf{4.6}$
Risk factors		
Cigarette smoker		64 (31)
Diabetes		50 (24)
Hypercholesterolemia		127 (62)
Treated hypertension		137 (67)
Family history		71 (35)
Mean % of left ventricular ejection fraction		56 ± 11
Stable angina		140 (68)
Unstable angina		46 (22)
No. of previous MIs in the culprit artery territory		28 (14)
Index artery		
LAD		133 (64)
Cx		28 (14)
RCA		45 (22)
No significant disease		16 (8)
Single-vessel disease		85 (41)
Two-vessel disease		64 (31)
Three-vessel disease		41 (20)
Medication		
Aspirin		181 (88)
Clopidogrel or ticagrelor or prasugrel		94 (46)
ACE inhibitor or ARB		139 (68)
Beta-blocker		161 (78)
Statin		169 (82)
Calcium antagonist		49 (24)
Long-acting nitrate		45 (22)
Insulin		19 (9)
Oral antic	33 (16)	

Values are mean \pm SD or n (%).

 $\label{eq:ACE} ACE = angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB = angiotensin receptor blocker; Cx = circumflex coronary artery; LAD = left anterior descending coronary artery; MI = myocardial infarction; RCA = right coronary artery.$

Trials website (NCT01559493). All consecutive patients referred for FFR-guided angiography with or without PCI during a 5-week period from January 4 to February 10, 2012,



Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5983213

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/5983213

Daneshyari.com