

Redefining successful primary PCI

Peter J. McCartney^{1,2} and Colin Berry^{1,2*}

¹British Heart Foundation Glasgow Cardiovascular Research Centre, Institute of Cardiovascular and Medical Sciences, 126 University Place, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8TA, UK; and ²West of Scotland Heart and Lung Centre, Golden Jubilee National Hospital, Glasgow, UK

Online publish-ahead-of-print 21 November 2018

This editorial refers to ‘Intramycardial hemorrhage and prognosis after ST-elevation myocardial infarction’ by S.J. Reinstadler et al., pp. 138–146.

Restoration of coronary blood flow with primary percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) is an effective treatment for ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI), and primary PCI is the evidence-based standard of care for STEMI patients presenting within 12 h of symptom onset.¹ On the other hand, restoration of epicardial blood flow results in reperfusion injury with failed myocardial perfusion in approximately 50% of patients,² typically in the context of a successful primary PCI procedure. Procedure success defined as normal antegrade coronary blood flow is achieved in >95% of patients during daily practice.^{3,4}

Failed myocardial reperfusion is a complex, heterogeneous microvascular problem. Several mechanisms have been implicated, including intra-vascular problems, such as distal embolization of thrombus/atheroma and extravascular problems, such as extrinsic microvascular compression due to intracellular (e.g. cardiomyocyte) and extracellular oedema.⁵ Taken together, these pathologies manifest clinically as microvascular obstruction (MVO).

Endothelial cells may be more resistant to ischaemia than the cardiac myocyte,⁶ but eventually sustained ischaemia leads to endothelial dysfunction. Endothelial damage leads to impaired capillary integrity, tissue oedema and extravasation of red blood cells into the extracellular space. Multiple studies have shown that MVO and intramycardial haemorrhage (IMH) are closely related. In general, IMH does not occur in the absence of MVO but, on the other hand, MVO commonly occurs in the absence of IMH.² The dynamic nature of MVO supports the concept that it may be reversible and thus a therapeutic target. On the other hand, IMH is a downstream pathological consequence of irreversible microvascular damage.⁷ The occurrence of IMH therefore represents failed myocardial reperfusion, and a failure of the therapeutic strategy.

MVO is a predictor of poor outcome independent of infarct size.⁸ Patients with MVO are more likely to develop heart failure post-MI with increased mortality. The prognostic significance of IMH has been the subject of much debate. In a study of 286 patients presenting with acute STEMI, we found that myocardial haemorrhage (identified by

T2* imaging) was more closely associated with all-cause death and heart failure during 2.3 years follow-up when compared with MVO alone.²

The pathophysiological mechanisms linking IMH with worse outcomes independent of infarct size and MVO are incompletely understood. Key to this may be persistent local tissue inflammation within the infarct core in response to persistence of haemoglobin breakdown products and accumulation of deoxygenated iron residues and tissue fibrosis. These pathologies prevent the natural healing process that otherwise would normally occur in reperfused myocardium in the absence of MVO and IMH. Cigarette smoking and a history of hypertension are risk factors for IMH. Carberry et al. demonstrated that persistent iron affected one in five patients who survived through to 6 months post-STEMI and was associated with adverse LV remodelling, worsening ejection fractions at 6 months. Systemic inflammation at baseline, reflected by the neutrophil count, was a univariable associate of persistent iron at 6 months, and presenting heart rate and a history of hypertension were multivariable associates.⁹ Additionally, iron deposition within the infarcted myocardium may have deleterious effects on the electrical stability of the heart and so may increase the likelihood of compromising ventricular arrhythmias and sudden cardiac death post-MI.¹⁰

Cardiovascular magnetic resonance (CMR) is the only method available to clinicians to detect this problem *in vivo*. T2* imaging is generally accepted as the reference method for the assessment of IMH in STEMI patients,¹¹ and T2* imaging is increasingly available as an option in standard CMR protocols. Blood degradation products such as deoxyhaemoglobin exert a paramagnetic effect, reducing the T2* signal, represented by hypointense areas within the infarct core. Still, local signal loss due to artefact can complicate the imaging read-out, especially if supporting features such as reduced wall motion and infarction are absent.

Reinstadler et al.¹² provide additional evidence for the clinical importance of IMH characterized by T2* imaging post-STEMI. They conducted a prospective multicentre study of 264 STEMI patients presenting within 12 h of symptom onset undergoing primary PCI. The primary endpoint was a composite of death, reinfarction, and new congestive heart failure at 12 months. Sixty patients had IMH, of these, 9 (15%) had major adverse cardiac events (MACE), whereas

The opinions expressed in this article are not necessarily those of the Editors of *EHJCI*, the European Heart Rhythm Association or the European Society of Cardiology.

* Corresponding author. Tel: +44 0141 3303325; Fax: +44 (0) 141 330 6794. E-mail: colin.berry@glasgow.ac.uk

© The Author(s) 2018. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the European Society of Cardiology.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

