
Proceedings Paper:
Gosling, R. orcid.org/0000-0001-7465-3563, Morris, P. orcid.org/0000-0002-3965-121X, Lawford, P. orcid.org/0000-0001-7128-3843 et al. (2 more authors) (2019) Virtual (computed) FFR and Virtual Coronary Intervention (VCI) vs angiography for guiding PCI : a virtual study. In: Heart. British Cardiovascular Society Annual Conference 'Digital Health Revolution', 03-05 Jun 2019, Manchester, UK. BMJ Publishing Group , a45-a45.

https://doi.org/10.1136/heartjnl-2019-BCS.51

VFFR AND VCI VERSUS ANGIOGRPAHY FOR GUIDING PCI; A VIRTUAL STUDY

Rebecca C Gosling[1,2,3], Paul D Morris[1,2,3], Patricia V Lawford[1,3], D. Rodney Hose[1,3], Julian P Gunn[1,2,3].

[1] Department of Infection, Immunity and Cardiovascular Disease. University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK.
[2] Department of Cardiology, Northern General Hospital, Sheffield, UK.
[3] Insigneo Institute for In-silico medicine, Sheffield, UK.

Introduction

Using Fractional flow reserve (FFR) to guide percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) improves outcomes and reduces costs. In the FAME study(1), FFR guidance reduced the total length of stent per patient from 51.9mm to 37.9mm. However, invasive FFR is currently used in <10% of all cases (2). Angiography-based virtual (v) FFR solutions permit less invasive physiological assessment and lend themselves to virtual coronary intervention (VCI). VCI has been shown to predict the response to PCI with a high degree of accuracy(3). In this study, we sought to determine the potential impact of vFFR and VCI on real world stenting.

Methods

Patients who had undergone PCI without FFR guidance were identified from the Sheffield archive. A 3D reconstruction of the diseased artery was generated from the angiogram and imported into the VIRTUheart^{TM} workflow. Baseline vFFR was calculated using computational fluid dynamics (CFD) analysis(4). If vFFR was <0.80, VCI was performed(3). Three PCI strategies were modelled. First, the actual PCI procedure was replicated. Second, the FFR_{max} was determined; the minimal amount of stenting to achieve the best possible FFR(5). Third, the optimal strategy was determined; the minimal amount of stenting to achieve a post VCI FFR > 0.90. This value was chosen as it has previously been demonstrated to be associated with improved clinical outcomes(6). For each strategy, the total number and length of stent per patient was determined and compared to the actual procedure.

Results

Forty-three patients and 56 vessels were studied. Mean vFFR pre-PCI was 0.74 (±0.16). Twenty-four (43%) vessels had a baseline FFR > 0.80. For the actual procedure, mean post-PCI vFFR was 0.90 (±0.09). The number of stents per patient was 1.40 (±0.62). Total stent length per patient was 29.35mm (±15.23mm). Mean FFR_{max} was 0.92 (± 0.07). FFR_{max} was on average 0.02 (±0.03) higher than the corresponding actual post-PCI FFR. When the virtual procedure was planned to achieve FFR_{max}, the number of stents per patient was 0.93 (±1.02) (p=0.003). Total stent length per patient was 21.60mm (±26.6mm) (p=0.04). When the virtual procedure was planned to achieve a post VCI FFR > 0.90, the number of stents per patient was 0.93±1.02 (p=0.002). Total stent length per patient was 19.9mm(±24.9mm) (p=0.01).

Conclusion

In our cohort, 43% of vessels had a vFFR > 0.80 suggesting PCI could have been avoided. Using vFFR and VCI to plan PCI led to a significant reduction in the total number and length of stents recommended per patient. Further work on a larger cohort is required to determine if these findings would translate to improved clinical outcomes.

References

1. Tonino PA, De Bruyne B, Pijls NH et al. Fractional flow reserve versus angiography for guiding percutaneous coronary intervention. N Engl J Med 2009;360:213-24.
2. Zhang D, Lv S, Song X et al. Fractional flow reserve versus angiography for guiding percutaneous coronary intervention: a meta-analysis. Heart 2015;101:455-62.
3. Gosling RC, Morris PD, Silva Soto DA, Lawford PV, Hose DR, Gunn JP. Virtual Coronary Intervention: A Treatment Planning Tool Based Upon the Angiogram. JACC Cardiovasc Imaging 2018.
4. Morris PD, Ryan D, Morton AC et al. Virtual fractional flow reserve from coronary angiography: modeling the significance of coronary lesions: results from the VIRTU-1 (VIRTUal Fractional Flow Reserve From Coronary Angiography) study. JACC Cardiovasc Interv 2013;6:149-57.
5. Gosling RD, Morris PD, Lawford PV, Hose DR, Gunn JP. Personalised Fractional Flow Reserve: Novel Concept to Optimise Myocardial Revascularization. EuroIntervention 2018.
6. Nam CW, Hur SH, Cho YK et al. Relation of fractional flow reserve after drug-eluting stent implantation to one-year outcomes. Am J Cardiol 2011;107:1763-7.