



Commentary: Vasodilator Myocardial Perfusion Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Imaging Is Superior to Dobutamine Stress Echocardiography in the Detection of Relevant Coronary Artery Stenosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis on Their Diagnostic Accuracy

Attila Kardos^{1,2*}, Roxy Senior³ and Harald Becher⁴

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Gianluca Pontone,
 Monzino Cardiology Center
 (IRCCS), Italy

Reviewed by:

Grigorios Korosoglou,
 GRN Klinik Weinheim, Germany

*Correspondence:

Attila Kardos
attila.kardos@cardiov.ox.ac.uk

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to
 Cardiovascular Imaging,
 a section of the journal
 Frontiers in Cardiovascular Medicine

Received: 12 April 2021

Accepted: 05 May 2021

Published: 10 June 2021

Citation:

Kardos A, Senior R and Becher H
 (2021) Commentary: Vasodilator
 Myocardial Perfusion Cardiac
 Magnetic Resonance Imaging Is
 Superior to Dobutamine Stress
 Echocardiography in the Detection of
 Relevant Coronary Artery Stenosis: A
 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis
 on Their Diagnostic Accuracy.
Front. Cardiovasc. Med. 8:694323.
 doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2021.694323

¹ Department of Cardiology, Milton Keynes University Hospital, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom, ² School of Sciences and Medicine, University of Buckingham, Buckingham, United Kingdom, ³ Imperial College, National Heart and Lung Institute, London, United Kingdom, ⁴ ABACUS, Mazankowski Alberta Heart Institute, University of Alberta Hospital, Edmonton, AB, Canada

Keywords: stress echocardiography, cardiac MRI, chronic coronary syndrome, diagnostic accuracy and yield, discussion points

A Commentary on

Vasodilator Myocardial Perfusion Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Imaging Is Superior to Dobutamine Stress Echocardiography in the Detection of Relevant Coronary Artery Stenosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis on Their Diagnostic Accuracy

by Haberkorn, S. M., Haberkorn, S. I., Bönner, F., Kelm, M., Hopkin, G., and Petersen, S. E. (2021). *Front. Cardiovasc. Med.* 8:630846. doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2021.630846

We are grateful to the authors for sharing the results of this very precise and detailed analysis of comparing the diagnostic performance of perfusion cardiac magnetic resonance (pCMR) and dobutamine stress echocardiography (DSE) for the detection of coronary artery stenosis with the scientific readership as the two functional test modalities without associated harmful radiation (1). The authors found higher sensitivity for pCMR vs. DSE (0.88 vs. 0.720) with a negative likelihood ratio of 0.14 vs. 0.31, respectively. There was no difference in specificity. We acknowledge the precise nature of the work. However, we would like to raise some points that may be worthwhile considering.

(1) This meta-analysis takes historical studies into account using either DSE or pCMR that compared the functional test results to that of invasive or coronary CT angiography (CCTA) or invasive fractional flow reserve. Albeit these are the only data available for comparison, it may question the legitimacy of comparing two functional tests with different principles to address coronary artery disease (CAD) severity detection. With this in mind, one would look for studies that are comparing the effect of the same stressor (e.g., coronary vasodilators) that investigates the

accuracy of the imaging modality, i.e., echocardiography vs. CMR in detecting inducible ischemia and significant CAD. One such methodological comparison was showing no difference in the accuracy between echocardiography vs. CMR using vasodilator stress test in the same patients' cohort (2).

(2) The majority of the included DSE studies were performed before 2000 without using ultrasound-enhancing contrast agents (UECAs). Not until 2009, the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging recommended UECA to be used regularly during echocardiography where >2 segments of the left ventricle are not delineated properly (3). This certainly was a major step forward in improving interpretability and increasing operator confidence during stress echocardiography. However, recent comparisons of contrast-enhanced stress echocardiography with coronary angiography mainly used vasodilator stress test. Further randomized, prospective studies with contemporary imaging techniques and modalities, e.g., contrast-enhanced stress echocardiography, may help our understanding of the strength and weaknesses of those modalities.

(3) Although the diagnostic accuracy is essential, the prediction of outcome and/or risk stratification following a test is probably more important. In this respect, both pCMR (4–6) and DSE (7–9) have robust data, although with no head-to-head

comparative studies. Stress echocardiography has consistently shown that a normal study identifies a low-risk cohort who needs no further testing, while significant ischemia identifies a high-risk group. In addition, the Mayo Clinic group has shown the same outcome in patients with abnormal stress echo findings regardless of the degree of coronary artery stenosis by Invasive Coronary Angiography (10). This meta-analysis did not evaluate outcome prediction nor risk stratification.

(4) Thus, current European Society of Cardiology and American Heart Association guidelines for chest pain assessment in chronic coronary syndrome patients with intermediate pretest probability recommend a non-invasive functional test [stress echocardiography, single-photon emission computed tomography, CMR] as well as an anatomical test, such as CCTA as the initial test, guided by the local expertise and infrastructure (11). In order to recommend CMR as a first-line diagnostic test, further comparative studies on risk stratification, management-based outcome, and cost-effectiveness need to be demonstrated.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors listed have made a substantial, direct and intellectual contribution to the work, and approved it for publication.

REFERENCES

- Haberkorn SM, Haberkorn SI, Bönner F, Kelm M, Hopkin G, Petersen SE. Vasodilator myocardial perfusion cardiac magnetic resonance imaging is superior to dobutamine stress echocardiography in the detection of relevant coronary artery stenosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis on their diagnostic accuracy. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* (2021) 8:630846. doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2021.630846
- Arnold JR, Karamitsos TD, Pegg TJ, Francis JM, Olszewski R, Searle N, et al. Adenosine stress myocardial contrast echocardiography for the detection of coronary artery disease: a comparison with coronary angiography and cardiac magnetic resonance. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging.* (2010) 3:934–43. doi: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2010.06.011
- Senior R, Becher H, Monaghan M, Agati L, Zamorano J, Vanoverschelde JL, et al. Contrast echocardiography: evidence-based recommendations by European Association of Echocardiography. *Eur J Echocardiogr.* (2009) 10:194–212. doi: 10.1093/ejehocardiography/jep005
- Heitner JF, Kim RJ, Kim HW, Klem I, Shah DJ, Debs D, et al. Prognostic value of vasodilator stress cardiac magnetic resonance imaging: a multicenter study with 48,000 patient-years of follow-up. *JAMA Cardiol.* (2019) 4:256–64. doi: 10.1001/jamacardio.2019.0035
- Kwong RY, Ge Y, Steel K, Bingham S, Abdullah S, Fujikura K, et al. Cardiac magnetic resonance stress perfusion imaging for evaluation of patients with chest pain. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* (2019) 74:1741–55. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2019.07.074
- Pezel T, Hovasse T, Kinnel M, Untersee T, Champagne S, Toupin S, et al. Prognostic value of stress cardiovascular magnetic resonance in asymptomatic patients with known coronary artery disease. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson.* (2021) 23:19. doi: 10.1186/s12968-021-00721-8
- Marwick TH, Case C, Sawada S, Vasey C, Short L, Lauer M. Use of stress echocardiography to predict mortality in patients with diabetes and known or suspected coronary artery disease. *Diabetes Care.* (2002) 25:1042–8. doi: 10.2337/diacare.25.6.1042
- Yao SS, Bangalore S, Chaudhry FA. Prognostic implications of stress echocardiography and impact on patient outcomes: an effective gatekeeper for coronary angiography and revascularization. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr.* (2010) 23:832–9. doi: 10.1016/j.echo.2010.05.004
- Cortigiani L, Borelli L, Raciti M, Bovenzi F, Picano E, Molinaro S, et al. Prediction of mortality by stress echocardiography in 2835 diabetic and 11 305 nondiabetic patients. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging.* (2015) 8:e002757. doi: 10.1161/CIRCIMAGING.114.002757
- From AM, Kane G, Bruce C, Pellikka PA, Scott C, McCully RB. Characteristics and outcomes of patients with abnormal stress echocardiograms and angiographically mild coronary artery disease (<50% stenoses) or normal coronary arteries. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr.* (2010) 23:207–14. doi: 10.1016/j.echo.2009.11.023
- Knuuti J, Wijns W, Saraste A, Capodanno D, Barbato E, Funck-Brentano C, et al. 2019 ESC guidelines for the diagnosis and management of chronic coronary syndromes. *Eur Heart J.* (2020) 41:407–77. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehz425

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2021 Kardos, Senior and Becher. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.