#### **REVIEW TOPIC OF THE WEEK**

# Clinical Utility of Intravascular Imaging and Physiology in Coronary Artery Disease

Gary S. Mintz, MD

#### ABSTRACT

Intravascular imaging and physiology techniques and technologies are moving beyond the framework of research to inform clinical decision making. Currently available technologies and techniques include fractional flow reserve; grayscale intravascular ultrasound (IVUS); IVUS radiofrequency tissue characterization; optical coherence tomography, the light analogue of IVUS; and near-infrared spectroscopy that detects lipid within the vessel wall and that has recently been combined with grayscale IVUS in a single catheter as the first combined imaging device. These tools can be used to answer questions that occur during daily practice, including: Is this stenosis significant? Where is the culprit lesion? Is this a vulnerable plaque? What is the likelihood of distal embolization or periprocedural myocardial infarction during stent implantation? How do I optimize acute stent results? Why did thrombosis or restenosis occur in this stent? One of the legacies of coronary angiography is to presume that one technique will answer all of these questions; however, that often has been proved inaccurate in contemporary practice. (J Am Coll Cardiol 2014;64:207-22) © 2014 by the American College of Cardiology Foundation

ore than 2 decades have passed since Drs. Nico Pijls and Bernard DeBruyne introduced fractional flow reserve (FFR) as a method of assessing coronary stenosis severity and since Dr. Paul Yock invented grayscale intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) that spawned second-generation intravascular imaging techniques such as: 1) IVUS radiofrequency tissue characterization, including virtual histology (VH)-IVUS, integrated backscatter IVUS, and iMap; 2) optical coherence tomography (OCT), the light analogue of IVUS; and 3) nearinfrared spectroscopy that detects lipid within the vessel wall and that has recently been combined with gravscale IVUS in a single catheter as the first combined imaging device. These tools have moved beyond the research setting. They are useful for answering questions that occur during daily practice including: Is this stenosis significant? Where is the culprit lesion? Is this a vulnerable plaque? What is the likelihood of distal embolization or

periprocedural myocardial infarction (MI) during stent implantation? How do I optimize acute stent results? Why did thrombosis or restenosis occur in this stent?

The subspecialty of interventional cardiology is data driven. Although correlations with histopathology are important, the ultimate benefit will be determined if these techniques improve clinical diagnosis, treatment, outcomes, and whether patients benefit, irrespective of technical or histopathological accuracy.

#### IS THIS STENOSIS SIGNIFICANT?

Three randomized trials (DEFER [Deferral Versus Performance of PTCA in Patients Without Documented Ischemia], FAME [Fractional Flow Reserve Versus Angiography for Multivessel Evaluation]-I, and FAME-II) established FFR (the ratio of distal to proximal pressure at maximum hyperemia) as the

From the Cardiovascular Research Foundation, New York, New York. Dr. Mintz has received speakers' bureau and fellowship support from Boston Scientific; and is a consultant to and receives research support from Volcano Corporation and InfraReDx, Inc.

#### ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

- **DES** = drug-eluting stent(s)
- FFR = fractional flow reserve
- ISR = in-stent restenosis
- IVUS = intravascular ultrasound

arterv

- LMCA = left main coronary
- MI = myocardial infarction
- MLA = minimum lumen area

**OCT** = optical coherence

- tomography
- **TCFA** = thin-cap fibroatheroma

VH = virtual histology

gold standard for assessing the significance of a non-left main coronary artery (LMCA) lesion. DEFER showed it was safe to defer percutaneous coronary intervention of lesions with an FFR >0.75 (1,2). The FAME-I trial found that treating lesions with an FFR >0.80 by using mostly first-generation drug-eluting stents (DES) was harmful, whereas not treating such lesions was costsaving (3,4). The FAME-II trial found that treating lesions with an FFR <0.80 with the use of optimal medical therapy alone was deleterious compared with optimal medical therapy plus DES implantation (5). Although initially more expensive, the increased cost of "optimal medical therapy

plus DES implantation" was decreased by one-half 1 year later (6).

Its predecessor, coronary flow reserve (CFR), measures the relative increase in coronary flow velocity during maximal hyperemia, reflecting both epicardial stenoses and the microcirculation, and is influenced by many factors affecting the microcirculation, such as diabetes, ventricular hypertrophy, and prior myocardial infarction. Unlike CFR, FFR is able to measure the actual volume of blood flow through a stenotic coronary artery as a percentage of normal hyperemic flow, because at maximum hyperemia, flow into a myocardial territory is proportional to pressure since the resistance is minimal and constant. FFR is independent of pressure, heart rate, contractility, and the status of the microcirculation and takes into account both antegrade and retrograde collateral blood flow, as well as the amount of viable myocardium.

There has been a recent renewal of interest in resting indices, such as iFR (instantaneous wave free ratio) or a hybrid approach combining iFR and FFR. However, the validity of these alternative physiologic approaches will depend on the clinical outcomes of randomized iFR vs. FFR trials, such as DEFINE-FLAIR or SwedeHeart.

Many studies have attempted to identify invasive imaging criteria that are equivalent to FFR or noninvasive testing. Although the IVUS minimum lumen area (MLA) in non-LMCA lesions is the parameter that best correlates with physiology, reported IVUS MLA cutoff thresholds range from 2.1 to 4.4 mm<sup>2</sup> (Table 1) (7-25) and are smaller in Asian patients than in studies of Western populations, the "most common" cutoff is approximately 3.0 mm<sup>2</sup>. Most IVUS studies show a relatively high negative predictive value but a low positive predictive value, indicating that using IVUS to justify the need for percutaneous intervention is wrong approximately one-half of the time. There have been no randomized IVUS trials comparable to DEFER, FAME-I, or FAME-II or randomized trials of IVUS deferral compared with FFR deferral. However, a recent propensity-matched study by de la Torre Hernandez et al. (26) suggests that clinical outcomes are similar whether IVUS or FFR is used to decide which lesions to stent or which to leave alone, although a greater number of lesions are stented with IVUS compared with FFR (72% vs. 51.2%; p < 0.0001).

Anatomic assessment of lesion severity is not improved with OCT, although OCT-derived MLA cutoffs are smaller than with IVUS (19,27-29). Some studies have "corrected" for vessel size (12,13,16,17), but none has factored in subtended viable myocardium.

In a recent substudy from the PROSPECT (Providing Regional Observations to Study Predictors of Events in the Coronary Tree) Study, non-fibroatheromas were associated with very few events at 3 years of follow-up, suggesting that tissue characterization and plaque composition may be an alternate method to predict lesion stability and defer intervention (30).

### LMCA LESIONS

Four angiographic studies (2 historic [31,32] and 2 contemporary [33,34]) indicated that agreement among experts regarding the significance of an LMCA lesion can be as low as 30% (Fig. 1). There have been 2 equivalent FFR and IVUS registry studies in patients with intermediate LMCA lesions in which an FFR >0.80 or an IVUS MLA >6.0 mm<sup>2</sup> was used to defer revascularization, with similar long-term results compared with patients with an FFR <0.80 or an MLA <6.0 mm<sup>2</sup> treated with revascularization (33,35). A study by Jasti et al. (36) in Western patients indicated that an IVUS MLA <6 mm<sup>2</sup> in the LMCA best correlated with an FFR <0.80, while a study in Korean patients suggested that 4.8 mm<sup>2</sup> was the preferred IVUS MLA cutoff (37), which is again consistent with the smaller MLA cutoffs found in Asian patients compared with Western patients.

Both IVUS and FFR have limitations in assessing LMCA disease. Ideally, when clinically indicated, IVUS should be performed from both the left anterior descending and left circumflex coronary arteries to define the MLA within the LMCA and to accurately assess disease at the left anterior descending and left circumflex ostia (38,39). Patients with LMCA disease have not typically been included in the many FFR

TABLE 1 IVUS MLA Cutof	f Poin	ts Assoc	iated	With	Ischemia												
Ref. #	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13,14)	(15)	(16,17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(25)
Ν	112	70	51	53	14	94	236	170	205	267	47	304	544	169 LAD	323	206 LAD	700 LAD
Comparison technique used to assess ischemia	CFR	SPECT	FFR	FFR	FFR	FFR	FFR	SPECT	FFR	FFR	FFR	FFR	FFR	FFR	FFR	FFR	FFR
% abnormal	40	65	49	23	50	40	21	26	26	33	46	28	31	59	54	44	38
IVUS																	
Mean MLA (mm <sup>2</sup> )	4.4	4.3	3.9	3.9	3.5	2.3	2.6	2.1	3.5	3.0	2.6	3.5	3.3	3.0	2.9	3.1	2.5
MLA cut-off (mm <sup>2</sup> )	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	N/A	2.0	2.4	2.1	3.1	2.8	2.4	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.2 prox 2.5 mid	2.5
Other IVUS determinants of ischemia	LL				MLA/LL	PB LL	PB LAD	PB	Vessel size	Prox vs. Mid LAD		PB	LAD EEM	PB LL	PB LL LAD	LL Prox vs. Mid PB	LL PB
CFR = coronary flow reserve; EE	EM = e	external el	astic m	embrar	ne; FFR = fi	actiona	al flow res	erve; IVU	S = intravascul	ar ultrasoun	id; LAD	= left	anterior	descending	; LL =	lesion length; Mi	d = middle:

CFR = coronary flow reserve; EEM = external elastic membrane; FFR = fractional flow reserve; IVUS = intravascular ultrasound; LAD = left anterior descending; LL = lesion length; Mid = middle; MLA = minimum lumen area; PB = plaque burden; Prox = proximal; SPECT = single-photon emission computed tomography.

validation studies, and FFR may have limitations in the setting of a significant concomitant LAD stenosis (40,41).

### WHERE IS THE CULPRIT LESION?

in 30% to 35%, and a calcified nodule in 5%. The final common pathway is thrombus formation (42). Sometimes, the culprit lesion is evident clinically, but as seen in the VANQWISH (Veterans Affairs Non-Q-Wave Infarction Strategies in-Hospital) trial, nearly 50% of these patients either have no identifiable culprit or have multiple potential culprits (43).

In patients with acute coronary syndrome, plaque rupture occurs in 60% to 65% of cases, plaque erosion



This 47-year-old male patient was admitted to a coronary care unit because of chest pain, initially underwent diagnostic angiography followed by bypass surgery (left internal mammary artery to the left anterior descending and saphenous vein graft to the left circumflex artery) for an ostial left main stenosis similar to the one shown by the **white arrow** in this angiogram. He did well for approximately 1 month, developed recurrent pain. He was readmitted to the coronary care unit, underwent repeat angiography (which showed closure of both the internal mammary artery and saphenous vein grafts), and had repeat bypass surgery, this time using saphenous vein grafts to both the left anterior descending and left circumflex arteries. He again did well for about 1 month before developing recurrent chest pain. At this time, the patient was referred for an intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) study of the ostial left main stenosis. IVUS of the ostial stenosis **(white arrow)** showed no left main disease or lumen compromise. There was at most mild intimal thickening **(a)**. Note the shadowing caused by the aortic wall **(b)**. The guiding catheter had been retracted and was out of view. Adapted with permission of CRF Press from Intracoronary Ultrasound by Gary S. Mintz.



This middle-aged man presented with an acute coronary syndrome. (A) Angiography showed 2 potential culprit lesions: 1 in the left anterior descending (a) and 1 in the left circumflex (b) arteries. (B) Optical coherence tomography (OCT) imaging of the left anterior descending showed plaque rupture (c), but no thrombus formation. (C) OCT imaging of the left circumflex showed thrombus (d), identifying it as the culprit lesion, and presumed erosion. Illustration courtesy of Takashi Kubo, MD, and Takashi Akasa, MD, of Wakayama Medical University, Wakayama, Japan.

Previous studies have shown that positive remodeling is more common in culprit lesions of patients presenting with acute coronary syndrome and is seen in association with plaque rupture, yellow plaque color, and thrombus formation. Conversely, negative remodeling is more common in target lesions of patients presenting with stable symptoms (44-47). IVUS detects plaque ruptures in approximately onehalf of ST-segment elevation MI culprit lesions (48-50). However, the superior resolution and the



obligatory flushing with OCT sharply outline the plaque rupture cavity and residual fibrous cap fragment to optimize ruptured plaque identification (48); OCT can detect erosions (although there is some disagreement regarding the definition [48,51-53]); and OCT can identify and differentiate between red and white thrombus (54). However, red thrombus, which is almost universal in these patients, can shadow and obscure underlying plaque morphology (Fig. 2). Recent near-infrared spectroscopy data indicate that a maximum lipid core burden index >400 within a 4-mm segment is a signature of plaques causing an ST-segment elevation MI (55).

Other unusual culprit lesion morphologies that can be detected by using both IVUS and OCT include calcific nodules (53,56) and spontaneous coronary artery dissections (Fig. 3) (57,58).

### IS THIS A VULNERABLE PLAQUE?

The precursor of the ruptured, thrombotic plaque is the thin-cap fibroatheroma (TCFA), the most common type of vulnerable plaque (42). Although 1 early, small, grayscale IVUS study suggested that a large eccentric plaque containing a shallow echolucent zone is at increased risk for instability (59), to date only VH-IVUS has been shown to predict future nonculprit events. In the PROSPECT study, predictors of nonculprit events at 3 years were a VH-TCFA, an IVUS MLA <4.0 mm<sup>2</sup>, and an IVUS plaque burden >70% (60). These findings, especially the importance of a large plaque burden, were supported by the VIVA (VH-IVUS in Vulnerable Atherosclerosis) and ATHEROREMO-IVUS (European Collaborative Project on Inflammation and Vascular Wall Remodeling



in Atherosclerosis-Intravascular Ultrasound) studies (61,62).

Although VH-IVUS can only infer the presence of a TCFA by the presence of a necrotic core abutting the lumen, OCT is able to identify many features of a TCFA, including fibrous cap thickness  $<65 \mu$ m, macrophages in the fibrous cap, and an underlying lipid core (51). However, only 1 small OCT study has found that lesions with rapid progression (angiographic lumen loss >0.4 mm within 7 months) have an increased frequency of intimal laceration, microvessels (which may be a source of blood extravasation and intraplaque hemorrhage), lipid pools, TCFAs, macrophages, and intraluminal thrombi (63).

IVUS substudies of the PROSPECT study have highlighted the paradox between plaque ruptures or calcified nodules that cause acute coronary syndrome events versus the benign nature of secondary, nonculprit plaque ruptures or calcified nodules that are detected incidentally (64,65). Although positive remodeling was not an independent predictor of events in the PROSPECT, VIVA, or ATHEREMO-IVUS studies, a substudy from the PROSPECT study found that it is not just positive remodeling, but also the extremes of positive and negative remodeling that predicted events (66).

The appropriateness of using routine invasive imaging to screen for vulnerable plaques as part of primary or secondary prevention is the subject of debate and depends on the prevalence of vulnerable plaques, as well as how often and how rapidly they develop spontaneously, remain unstable, or stabilize (67,68); the impact of contemporary medical therapy on clinical events; and complications associated with routine 3-vessel invasive imaging (60). PROSPECT, VIVA, and ATHEROREMO-IVUS studies demonstrated that contemporary medical therapy mostly impacted revascularization and not hard events of death or MI (60-62). Currently, we cannot predict which plaques carry a risk of complications high enough to warrant prophylactic therapy, although a randomized substudy within the PROSPECT-II study will attempt to address this issue.

## WHAT IS THE LIKELIHOOD OF DISTAL EMBOLIZATION OR PERIPROCEDURAL MI DURING STENT IMPLANTATION?

Predictors of myonecrosis during stent implantation are a large, grayscale IVUS attenuated plaque ("shadowing" in the absence of calcification), especially when shadowing begins closer to the lumen



than to the adventitia (69-73) (Fig. 4); a large VH-IVUS necrotic core, VH-TCFA (74), or similar findings using integrated backscatter IVUS (75,76) or iMap (77); a large amount of OCT lipid or an OCT-TCFA (78-83); a large lipid-rich plaque detected by using near-infrared spectroscopy (84-86); and the presence of plaque rupture, whether detected by IVUS or OCT (79,87-90). The common denominator is the presence of a TCFA, with or without plaque rupture, that is responsible both for the imaging findings and for periprocedural MI during stent implantation (91-94). Conversely, the absence of these findings indicates a low probability of a periprocedural MI.

### HOW DO I OPTIMIZE ACUTE STENT RESULTS?

In both bare-metal stents and DES, the IVUS predictors of early stent thrombosis or in-stent restenosis (ISR) are underexpanded stent (**Fig. 5**) (95-112) and inflow/outflow track disease (e.g., dissections, significant plaque burden, edge stenosis) (99,104,105, 107,108,113-116), but not acute stent malapposition (108,110,117-119) as long as the stent is well expanded. Underexpansion refers to the size of the stent, whereas malapposition refers to the contact of the stent with the vessel wall. The 2 terms and concepts are not interchangeable, and the term



"underdeployment" is imprecise and unclear (**Fig. 6**). Although bigger is better regarding stent expansion and less is more with respect to stent edge plaque burden, acceptable procedural endpoints are a minimum stent area (98,101,104,106,109,111,112) and stent-edge plaque burden (113,115,116) that maximize the probability of long-term stent patency while minimizing the risk of stent failure (**Table 2**).

Four meta-analyses of the randomized IVUS versus angiographic-guided bare-metal stent implantation

trials showed that IVUS guidance reduced restenosis, repeat revascularization, and major adverse cardiac events but not death or MI (120-123). Four meta-analyses of IVUS versus angiographic-guided DES studies (the most recent of which involving 3 randomized trials and 14 observational studies with 26,503 patients) found that IVUS guidance reduced stent thrombosis (124-127), MI (125-127), repeat revascularization (126,127), and mortality (124-127) despite using more stents and/or longer stents in

ef. #	N	Follow-Up	Stent	Acute Endpoint	MSA Location	Cutoff	Sensitivity	Specifici
98)	543	TLR	BMS	MSA		6.5 mm <sup>2</sup>	PPV = 17%,	NPV = 949
101)	60	IVUS MLA $<4 \text{ mm}^2$	BMS	MSA		6.5 mm <sup>2</sup>	63%	78%
	72		SES			5.0 mm <sup>2</sup>	76%	83%
(104)	543	Angiographic in-stent restenosis	SES	MSA		5.5 mm <sup>2</sup>	67%	67%
				Stent length		40 mm	81%	78%
(106)	482	Angiographic in-stent restenosis	BMS	MSA		6.4 mm <sup>2</sup>	c statistic	= 0.64
	1,098		PES			5.7 mm <sup>2</sup>	c statistic	2 = 0.64
(109) 403	Angiographic in-stent restenosis	SES	MSA	LM	8.2 mm <sup>2</sup>	80%	81%	
				POC	7.2 mm <sup>2</sup>	100%	78%	
					LAD ostium	6.3 mm <sup>2</sup>	73%	85%
					LCX ostium	5.0 mm <sup>2</sup>	78%	78%
(111)	541	Angiographic in-stent restenosis	SES	MSA		5.5 mm <sup>2</sup>	72%	66%
	229		EES			5.4 mm <sup>2</sup>	60%	60%
	220		ZES			5.3 mm <sup>2</sup>	57%	62%
(112)	106	IVUS MLA $<4 \text{ mm}^2$	DES	MSA	Main vessel	6.1 mm <sup>2</sup>	PPV =	91%
					Side branch	4.8 mm <sup>2</sup>	PPV =	- 70%
(115)	255	Angiographic edge restenosis	BMS	Edge plaque burden		48%	c statistic	2 = 0.70
	276		PES			47%	c statistic	:= 0.69
(116)	433	Angiographic edge restenosis	E-ZES	Edge plaque burden		56.3%	67%	86%
	422		R-ZES			57.3%	80%	87%
	813		EES			54.2%	86%	80%

TABLE 2 IVUS Studies and Cutpoints for Acute MSA, Stent Length, and/or Edge Plaque Burden That Were Predictors of Events

BMS = bare-metal stent(s); DES = drug-eluting stent(s); EES = everolimus-eluting stent(s); IVUS = intravascular ultrasound; LCX = left circumflex; LM = left main; MSA = minimum stent area; NPV = negative predictive value; PES = paclitaxel-eluting stent(s); POC = polygon of confluence; PPV = positive predictive value; SES = sirolimus-eluting stent(s); TLR = target lesion revascularization; ZES = zotarolimus-eluting stent(s).

IVUS-guided patients. A propensity score-matched analysis was possible in 9 studies (124,126), and there was no evidence of heterogeneity or publication bias. IVUS guidance was associated with a larger post-procedure angiographic minimum lumen diameter with no evidence of increased periprocedural MI (127). Two studies questioned the value of IVUS guidance in MI patients undergoing primary percutaneous intervention (128,129), but the ADAPT-DES (Assessment of Dual Antiplatelet Therapy With Drug-Eluting Stents) study suggested the opposite: that IVUS guidance had its greatest impact in MI patients (130). Most recently, a study reporting patient-level data from 4 Spanish registries showed that IVUS guidance reduced cardiac death, MI, and repeat revascularization in patients undergoing DES implantation for unprotected LMCA disease (131).

To date, there has been only 1 study of OCT versus angiographic-guided DES implantation, with relative benefits found similar to the IVUS meta-analyses (120-123). These findings suggest that it might not be the individual imaging technique per se that is

TABLE 3 Causes of Stent Failure (Thron	1bosis or Re	stenosis	5) Detect	ted By U	sing Intrava	scular Imaging	9		
	Ba	re-Meta	l Stents			Drug	g-Eluting	Stents	
	Stent Thro	mbosis	Reste	enosis	Stent Thrombosis			Restenosis	
	<30 days	>1 yr	<5 ys	>5 ys	<30 days	30 days-1 yr	>1 yr	<18 months	>18 months
Procedure-related complications including underexpansion, edge plaque burden or dissection, geographic miss	Х		Х		Х			х	
Intimal hyperplasia			х					Х	
Neoatherosclerosis		Х		х			х		Х
Late malapposition or aneurysm formation							х		
Stent fracture	Х	Х			Х		Х		Х
Uncovered stent struts						Х	Х		

216

beneficial but the increased information provided compared with angiography alone (132). Advocates of OCT have cited superior resolution, enhanced imaging during flushing, ease of image interpretation, and detection of dissections, tissue protrusion, and malapposition not seen on IVUS (133-135). However, unlike IVUS, there are no established concepts regarding stent sizing by using OCT, and there are little data on OCT criteria for optimal stent implantation or predictors of adverse events. For example, there is no agreement whether an OCT-measured minimum stent area is larger, smaller, or the same as IVUS (133-136). Enhanced OCT detection of stent edge dissections, tissue prolapse, thrombus, or stentvessel wall malapposition is not associated with predicting adverse events (137-140). One small, randomized, blinded study comparing IVUS- versus OCT-guided DES implantation found that, because of its limited penetration, less aggressive OCT stent sizing is associated with more stent underexpansion and a larger reference segment plaque burden compared with IVUS (136).

Although FFR has a limited role in stent optimization, it is probably the best technique to determine whether a jailed side branch is compromised after provisional bifurcation stenting (141-145). Most of the

PRE-INTERVENTION ASSESSMENT	Preferred Technique	Alternative Technique	
Is this non-left main coronary artery (LMCA) stenosis significant?	Fractional flow reserve (FFR)	Intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) May be used to exclude a stenosis, but should not be used to justify percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI)	
Is this LMCA stenosis significant?	Intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) Fractional flow reserve (FFR)	n/a	
Where is the culprit lesion?	Optical coherence tomography (OCT)	n/a	
Is this a vulnerable plaque?	Virtual histology intravascular ultrasound (VH-IVUS)	n/a	
What is the likelihood of distal embolization or periprocedural myocardial infarction (MI) during stent implanation?	Intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) Virtual histology intravascular ultrasound (VH-IVUS) Optical coherence tomography (OCT) Near-infrared spectroscopy (NIRS)	n/a	
PCI GUIDANCE	Preferred Technique	Alternative Technique	
How do I optimize acute stent results?	Intravascular ultrasound (IVUS)	Optical coherence tomography (OCT)	
Is this jailed sidebranch significant?	Fractional flow reserve (FFR)	n/a	
FOLLOW UP	Preferred Technique	Alternative Technique	
Why did this stent thrombose or restenose?	Optical coherence tomography (OCT)	Intravascular ultrasound (IVUS)	

CENTRAL ILLUSTRATION Recommended Intravascular Imaging and Physiology Techniques in Coronary Heart Disease Based on the Current Literature

time, the angiographic appearance of side branch ostial lumen compromise is an artifact, and FFR is >0.80 because lumen compromise is due to carina shift that is eccentric and focal and not due to plaque shift.

# WHY DID THROMBOSIS OR RESTENOSIS OCCUR IN THIS STENT?

While most causes of stent thrombosis and ISR (**Table 3**) have been elucidated with IVUS, they can also be detected with OCT. The emergence of neoatherosclerosis as an important cause of late stent failure (146-156), and observations regarding the relationship between lack of stent strut tissue coverage and late/very late stent thrombosis (157,158), neither of which can be identified by using IVUS (148), indicate that OCT may be the imaging technology of choice in this clinical setting.

OCT studies have shown that neoatherosclerosis occurs earlier after DES than bare-metal stents, occurs with greater frequency with many types of DES versus bare-metal stents, can present as either ISR or very late stent thrombosis, and may be responsible for the majority of very late stent thrombosis; it is associated with greater clinical instability at the time of presentation (ACS in ISR and STEMI in very late stent thrombosis) and periprocedural MI at the time of treatment of ISR or stent thrombosis (146-156). However, it should be noted that OCT findings in stent thrombosis may depend on whether aspiration thrombectomy is performed before (154) or after (157) OCT imaging, because aspiration will remove not only thrombus but also fragments of atherosclerotic plaques such as foamy macrophages, cholesterol crystals, and a thin fibrous cap (159). Other than neoatherosclerosis, the clinical impact of OCT patterns on neointimal tissue (i.e., heterogeneous vs. homogeneous vs. layered vs. peri-strut low-intensity areas [160-169]) are not clear.

# SUMMARY AND BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTATION

There are 3 main barriers to implementing an intravascular imaging and physiology program: cost, expertise, and convincing interventional cardiologists of the limitations of relying on coronary angiography alone. In some countries, the cost of these techniques can dwarf that of the other materials used during percutaneous intervention. Education is problematic; interpretation is not intuitive, not even with OCT (170); and requires an understanding of artifacts, limitations, and confounders, like all medical imaging techniques. One of the legacies of coronary angiography is to presume that one technique will answer all of these questions; however, that often has been proved inaccurate in contemporary practice. Although there may be few randomized trials, the utility of these techniques to answer routine clinical questions is undeniable (Central Illustration).

**REPRINT REQUESTS AND CORRESPONDENCE:** Dr. Gary S. Mintz, Cardiovascular Research Foundation, 111 East 59th Street, New York, New York 10022. E-mail: gmintz@crf.org.

#### REFERENCES

**1.** Berger A, Botman KJ, MacCarthy PA, et al. Long-term clinical outcome after fractional flow reserve-guided percutaneous coronary intervention in patients with multivessel disease. J Am Coll Cardiol 2002;46:438-42.

**2.** Pijls NH, van Schaardenburgh P, Manoharan G, et al. Percutaneous coronary intervention of functionally nonsignificant stenosis: 5-year follow-up of the DEFER study. J Am Coll Cardiol 2007;49: 2105-11.

**3.** 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.

**4.** Fearon WF, Bornschein B, Tonino PA, et al. Economic evaluation of fractional flow reserveguided percutaneous coronary intervention in patients with multivessel disease. Circulation 2010; 122:2545-50.

**5.** De Bruyne B, Pijls NH, Kalesan B, et al. Fractional flow reserve-guided PCI versus medical therapy in stable coronary disease. N Engl J Med 2012;367:991-1001.

**6.** Fearon WF, Shilane D, Pijls NH, et al. Costeffectiveness of percutaneous coronary intervention in patients with stable coronary disease and abnormal fractional flow reserve. Circulation 2013; 128:1335-40.

**7.** Abizaid A, Mintz GS, Pichard AD, et al. Clinical, intravascular ultrasound, and quantitative angiographic determinants of the coronary flow reserve before and after percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty. Am J Cardiol 1998;82:423-8.

**8.** Nishioka T, Amanullah AM, Luo H, et al. Clinical validation of intravascular ultrasound imaging for assessment of coronary stenosis severity: comparison with stress myocardial perfusion imaging. J Am Coll Cardiol 1999;33:1870-8.

**9.** Takagi A, Tsurumi Y, Ishii Y, et al. Clinical potential of intravascular ultrasound for physiological assessment of coronary stenosis: relationship between quantitative ultrasound tomography and pressure-derived fractional flow reserve. Circulation 1999;100:250-5.

**10.** Briguori C, Anzuini A, Airoldi F, et al. Intravascular ultrasound criteria for the assessment of the functional significance of intermediate coronary artery stenoses and comparison with fractional flow reserve. Am J Cardiol 2001;87:136-41.

**11.** Takayama T, Hodgson JM. Prediction of the physiologic severity of coronary lesions using 3D IVUS: validation by direct coronary pressure measurements. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2001;53: 48-55.

**12.** Lee CH, Tai BC, Soon CY, et al. New set of intravascular ultrasound-derived anatomic criteria for defining functionally significant stenoses in small coronary arteries (results from Intravascular Ultrasound Diagnostic Evaluation of Atherosclerosis in Singapore [IDEAS] study). Am J Cardiol 2010;105:1378-84.

**13.** Kang SJ, Lee JY, Ahn JM, et al. Validation of intravascular ultrasound-derived parameters with

fractional flow reserve for assessment of coronary stenosis severity. Circ Cardiovasc Interv 2011;4: 65–71.

14. Kang SJ, Ahn JM, Song H, et al. Usefulness of minimal luminal coronary area determined by intravascular ultrasound to predict functional significance in stable and unstable angina pectoris. Am J Cardiol 2012;109:947-53.

**15.** Ahn JM, Kang SJ, Mintz GS, et al. Validation of minimal luminal area measured by intravascular ultrasound for assessment of functionally significant coronary stenosis comparison with myocardial perfusion imaging. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2011; 4:665-71.

**16.** Ben-Dor I, Torguson R, Gaglia MA Jr., et al. Correlation between fractional flow reserve and intravascular ultrasound lumen area in intermediate coronary artery stenosis. Euro-Intervention 2011;7:225-33.

**17.** Ben-Dor I, Torguson R, Deksissa T, et al. Intravascular ultrasound lumen area parameters for assessment of physiological ischemia by fractional flow reserve in intermediate coronary artery stenosis. Cardiovasc Revasc Med 2012;13:177-82.

**18.** Koo BK, Yang HM, Doh JH, et al. Optimal intravascular ultrasound criteria and their accuracy for defining the functional significance of intermediate coronary stenoses of different locations. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2011;4: 803-11.

**19.** Gonzalo N, Escaned J, Alfonso F, et al. Morphometric assessment of coronary stenosis relevance with optical coherence tomography: a comparison with fractional flow reserve and intravascular ultrasound. J Am Coll Cardiol 2012; 59:1080-9.

**20.** Waksman R, Legutko J, Singh J, et al. FIRST: fractional flow reserve and intravascular ultrasound relationship study. J Am Coll Cardiol 2013; 61:917–23.

**21.** Stone GW. VERDICT/FIRST: prospective, multicenter study examining the correlation between IVUS and FFR parameters in intermediate lesions. Available at: http://www.tctmd.com/show.aspx? id=114442. Accessed September 3, 2013.

**22.** Kwan TW, Yang S, Xu B, et al. Optimized quantitative angiographic and intravascular ultrasound parameters predicting the functional significance of single de novo lesions in the left anterior descending artery. Chin Med J (Engl) 2012;125:4249-53.

**23.** Chen SL, Xu B, Chen JB, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of quantitative angiographic and intravascular ultrasound parameters predicting the functional significance of single de novo lesions. Int J Cardiol 2013;168:1364–9.

24. Yang HM, Tahk SJ, Lim HS, et al. Relationship between intravascular ultrasound parameters and fractional flow reserve in intermediate coronary artery stenosis of left anterior descending artery–intravascular ultrasound volumetric analysis. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2014;83:386–94.

**25.** Kang SJ, Ahn JM, Han S, et al. Sex differences in the visual-functional mismatch between coronary angiography or intravascular ultrasound versus fractional flow reserve. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2013;6:562-8. **26.** de la Torre Hernandez JM, Lopez-Palop R, Garcia Camarero T, et al. Clinical outcomes after intravascular ultrasound and fractional flow reserve assessment of intermediate coronary lesions. Propensity score matching of large cohorts from two institutions with a differential approach. EuroIntervention 2013;9:824-30.

**27.** Shiono Y, Kitabata H, Kubo T, et al. Optical coherence tomography-derived anatomical criteria for functionally significant coronary stenosis assessed by fractional flow reserve. Circ J 2012;76: 2218–25.

**28.** Reith S, Battermann S, Jaskolka A, et al. Relationship between optical coherence tomography derived intraluminal and intramural criteria and haemodynamic relevance as determined by fractional flow reserve in intermediate coronary stenoses of patients with type 2 diabetes. Heart 2013;99:700-7.

**29.** Pawlowski T, Prati F, Kulawik T, Ficarra E, Bil J, Gil R. Optical coherence tomography criteria for defining functional severity of intermediate lesions: a comparative study with FFR. Int J Cardiovasc Imaging 2013;29:1685-91.

**30.** Dohi T, Mintz GS, McPherson JA, et al. Nonfibroatheroma lesion phenotype and long-term clinical outcomes: a substudy analysis from the PROSPECT study. J Am Coll Cardiol Img 2013;6: 908–16.

**31.** Fisher LD, Judkins MP, Lesperance J, et al. Reproducibility of coronary arteriographic reading in the coronary artery surgery study (CASS). Cathet Cardiovasc Diagn 1982;8:565-75.

**32.** Cameron A, Kemp HG Jr., Fisher LD, et al. Left main coronary artery stenosis: angiographic determination. Circulation 1983;68:484–9.

**33.** Hamilos M, Muller O, Cuisset T, et al. Longterm clinical outcome after fractional flow reserve-guided treatment in patients with angiographically equivocal left main coronary artery stenosis. Circulation 2009;120:1505–12.

**34.** Lindstaedt M, Spiecker M, Perings C, et al. How good are experienced interventional cardiologists at predicting the functional significance of intermediate or equivocal left main coronary artery stenoses? Int J Cardiol 2007;120:254-61.

**35.** de la Torre Hernandez JM, Hernández Hernandez F, Alfonso F, et al. Prospective application of pre-defined intravascular ultrasound criteria for assessment of intermediate left main coronary artery lesions results from the multicenter LITRO study. J Am Coll Cardiol 2011;58: 351-8.

**36.** Jasti V, Ivan E, Yalamanchili V, et al. Correlations between fractional flow reserve and intravascular ultrasound in patients with an ambiguous left main coronary artery stenosis. Circulation 2004;110:2831-6.

**37.** Kang SJ, Lee JY, Ahn JM, et al. Intravascular ultrasound-derived predictors for fractional flow reserve in intermediate left main disease. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2011;4:1168-74.

**38.** Oviedo C, Maehara A, Mintz GS, et al. Intravascular ultrasound classification of plaque distribution in left main coronary artery bifurcations: where is the plaque really located? Circ Cardiovasc Interv 2010;3:105-12. **39.** Oviedo C, Maehara A, Mintz GS, et al. Is accurate intravascular ultrasound evaluation of the left circumflex ostium from a left anterior descending to left main pullback possible? Am J Cardiol 2010:105:948-54.

**40.** Daniels DV, van't Veer M, Pijls NH, et al. The impact of downstream coronary stenoses on fractional flow reserve assessment of intermediate left main disease. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2012;5: 1021-5.

**41.** Yong AS, Daniels D, De Bruyne B, et al. Fractional flow reserve assessment of left main stenosis in the presence of downstream coronary stenoses. Circ Cardiovasc Interv 2013;6:161-5.

**42.** Naghavi M, Libby P, Falk E, et al. From vulnerable plaque to vulnerable patient: a call for new definitions and risk assessment strategies: part I and part II. Circulation 2003;108:1664-72. 1772-8.

**43.** Kerensky RA, Wade M, Deedwania P, Boden WE, Pepine CJ. Revisiting the culprit lesion in non-Q-wave myocardial infarction. Results from the VANQWISH trial angiographic core laboratory. J Am Coll Cardiol 2002;39:1456–63.

**44.** Gyongyosi M, Yang P, Hassan A, et al. Arterial remodeling of native human coronary arteries in patients with unstable angina pectoris: a prospective intravascular ultrasound study. Heart 1999;82:68-74.

**45.** Takano M, Mizuno K, Okamatsu K, Yokoyama S, Ohba T, Sakai S. Mechanical and structural characteristics of vulnerable plaques: analysis by coronary angioscopy and intravascular ultrasound. J Am Coll Cardiol 2001;38:99–104.

**46.** Schoenhagen P, Ziada KM, Kapadia SR, Crowe TD, Nissen SE, Tuzcu EM. Extent and direction of arterial remodeling in stable versus unstable coronary syndromes: an intravascular ultrasound study. Circulation 2000;101: 598-603.

**47.** Nakamura M, Nishikawa H, Mukai S, et al. Impact of coronary artery remodeling on clinical presentation of coronary artery disease: an intravascular ultrasound study. J Am Coll Cardiol 2001; 37:63–9.

**48.** Kubo T, Imanishi T, Takarada S, et al. Assessment of culprit lesion morphology in acute myocardial infarction: ability of optical coherence tomography compared with intravascular ultrasound and coronary angioscopy. J Am Coll Cardiol 2007;50:933–9.

**49.** Hong MK, Mintz GS, Lee CW, et al. Comparison of coronary plaque rupture between stable angina and acute myocardial infarction: a threevessel intravascular ultrasound study in 235 patients. Circulation 2004;110:928-33.

**50.** Hong YJ, Jeong MH, Choi YH, et al. Differences in intravascular ultrasound findings in culprit lesions in infarct-related arteries between ST segment elevation myocardial infarction and non-ST segment elevation myocardial infarction. J Cardiol 2010;56:15-22.

**51.** Tearney GJ, Regar E, Akasaka T, et al. Consensus standards for acquisition, measurement, and reporting of intravascular optical coherence tomography studies: a report from the International Working Group for Intravascular Optical Coherence Tomography Standardization and Validation. J Am Coll Cardiol 2012;59: 1058-72.

**52.** Prati F, Uemura S, Souteyrand G, et al. OCTbased diagnosis and management of STEMI associated with intact fibrous cap. J Am Coll Cardiol Img 2013;6:283-7.

**53.** Jia H, Abtahian F, Aguirre AD, et al. In vivo diagnosis of plaque erosion and calcified nodule in patients with acute coronary syndrome by intravascular optical coherence tomography. J Am Coll Cardiol 2013;62:1748-58.

**54.** Kume T, Akasaka T, Kawamoto T, et al. Assessment of coronary arterial thrombus by optical coherence tomography. Am J Cardiol 2006; 97:1713-7.

**55.** Madder RD, Goldstein JA, Madden SP, et al. Detection by near-infrared spectroscopy of large lipid core plaques at culprit sites in patients with acute ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2013;6:838-46.

**56.** Duissaillant GR, Mintz GS, Pichard AD, et al. Intravascular ultrasound identification of calcified intraluminal lesions misdiagnosed as thrombi by coronary angiography. Am Heart J 1996;132: 687-9.

**57.** Maehara A, Mintz GS, Castagna MT, et al. Intravascular ultrasound assessment of spontaneous coronary artery dissection. Am J Cardiol 2002;89:466-8.

**58.** Alfonso F, Paulo M, Gonzalo N, et al. Diagnosis of spontaneous coronary artery dissection by optical coherence tomography. J Am Coll Cardiol 2012;59:1073–9.

**59.** Yamagishi M, Terashima M, Awano K, et al. Morphology of vulnerable coronary plaque: insights from follow-up of patients examined by intravascular ultrasound before an acute coronary syndrome. J Am Coll Cardiol 2000;35:106-11.

**60.** Stone GW, Maehara A, Lansky AJ, et al. A prospective natural-history study of coronary atherosclerosis. N Engl J Med 2011;364:226-35.

**61.** Calvert PA, Obaid DR, O'Sullivan M, et al. Association between IVUS findings and adverse outcomes in patients with coronary artery disease: the VIVA (VH-IVUS in Vulnerable Atherosclerosis) study. J Am Coll Cardiol Img 2011;4:894–901.

62. Cheng JM, Garcia-Garcia HM, de Boer SP, et al. In vivo detection of high-risk coronary plaques by radiofrequency intravascular ultrasound and cardiovascular outcome: results of the ATHEROREMO-IVUS study. Eur Heart J 2014;35: 639–47.

**63.** Uemura S, Ishigami K, Soeda T, et al. Thin-cap fibroatheroma and microchannel findings in optical coherence tomography correlate with subsequent progression of coronary atheromatous plaques. Eur Heart J 2012;33:78-85.

**64.** Xie Y, Mintz GS, Yang J, et al. Frequency, morphology, and clinical outcome of non-culprit plaque ruptures in patients with acute coronary syndrome in the PROSPECT study. J Am Coll Cardiol Img 2014. in press.

**65.** Xu Y, Mintz GS, Tam A, et al. Prevalence, distribution, predictors, and outcomes of patients with calcified nodules in native coronary arteries: a

3-vessel intravascular ultrasound analysis from Providing Regional Observations to Study Predictors of Events in the Coronary Tree (PROS-PECT). Circulation 2012;126:537-45.

**66.** Inaba S, Mintz GS, Farhat H, et al. Impact of positive and negative lesion site remodeling on clinical outcomes: insights from PROSPECT. J Am Coll Cardiol Img 2014;7:70-8.

**67.** Kubo T, Maehara A, Mintz GS, et al. The dynamic nature of coronary artery lesion morphology assessed by serial virtual histology intravascular ultrasound tissue characterization. J Am Coll Cardiol 2010;55:1590-7.

**68.** Zhao Z, Witzenbichler B, Mintz GS, et al. Dynamic nature of nonculprit coronary artery lesion morphology in STEMI: a serial IVUS analysis from the HORIZONS-AMI trial. J Am Coll Cardiol Img 2013;6:86-95.

**69.** Okura H, Taguchi H, Kubo T, et al. Atherosclerotic plaque with ultrasonic attenuation affects coronary reflow and infarct size in patients with acute coronary syndrome: an intravascular ultrasound study. Circ J 2007;71:648–53.

**70.** Lee SY, Mintz GS, Kim SY, et al. Attenuated plaque detected by intravascular ultrasound: clinical, angiographic, and morphologic features and post-percutaneous coronary intervention complications in patients with acute coronary syndromes. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2009;2:65-72.

**71.** Wu X, Mintz GS, Xu K, et al. The relationship between attenuated plaque identified by intravascular ultrasound and no-reflow after stenting in acute myocardial infarction: the HORIZONS-AMI (Harmonizing Outcomes With Revascularization and Stents in Acute Myocardial Infarction) trial. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2011;4:495-502.

**72.** Shiono Y, Kubo T, Tanaka A, et al. Impact of attenuated plaque as detected by intravascular ultrasound on the occurrence of microvascular obstruction after percutaneous coronary intervention in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2013; 6:847-53.

**73.** Jang JS, Jin HY, Seo JS, et al. Meta-analysis of plaque composition by intravascular ultrasound and its relation to distal embolization after percutaneous coronary intervention. Am J Cardiol 2013;111:968-72.

**74.** Claessen BE, Maehara A, Fahy M, Xu K, Stone GW, Mintz GS. Plaque composition by intravascular ultrasound and distal embolization after percutaneous coronary intervention. J Am Coll Cardiol Img 2012;5:S111–8.

**75.** Uetani T, Amano T, Ando H, et al. The correlation between lipid volume in the target lesion, measured by integrated backscatter intravascular ultrasound, and post-procedural myocardial infarction in patients with elective stent implantation. Eur Heart J 2008;29:1714–20.

**76.** Shibuya M, Okamura A, Hao H, et al. Prediction of distal embolization during percutaneous coronary intervention for unstable plaques with grayscale and integrated backscatter intravascular ultrasound. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2013;81: E165-72.

**77.** Utsunomiya M, Hara H, Sugi K, Nakamura M. Relationship between tissue characterisations with

40MHz intravascular ultrasound imaging and slow flow during coronary intervention. Euro-Intervention 2011;7:340-6.

**78.** Tanaka A, Imanishi T, Kitabata H, et al. Lipidrich plaque and myocardial perfusion after successful stenting in patients with non-ST-segment elevation acute coronary syndrome: an optical coherence tomography study. Eur Heart J 2009; 30:1348-55.

**79.** Yonetsu T, Kakuta T, Lee T, et al. Impact of plaque morphology on creatine kinase-MB elevation in patients with elective stent implantation. Int J Cardiol 2011;146:80-5.

**80.** Lee T, Yonetsu T, Koura K, et al. Impact of coronary plaque morphology assessed by optical coherence tomography on cardiac troponin elevation in patients with elective stent implantation. Circ Cardiovasc Interv 2011;4:378-86.

**81.** Porto I, Di Vito L, Burzotta F, et al. Predictors of periprocedural (type IVa) myocardial infarction, as assessed by frequency-domain optical coherence tomography. Circ Cardiovasc Interv 2012;5:89-96.

**82.** Imola F, Occhipinti M, Biondi-Zoccai G, et al. Association between proximal stent edge positioning on atherosclerotic plaques containing lipid pools and postprocedural myocardial infarction (from the CLI-POOL Study). Am J Cardiol 2013;111: 526-31.

**83.** Ikenaga H, Ishihara M, Inoue I, et al. Longitudinal extent of lipid pool assessed by optical coherence tomography predicts microvascular noreflow after primary percutaneous coronary intervention for ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction. J Cardiol 2013;62:71–6.

**84.** Goldstein JA, Maini B, Dixon SR, et al. Detection of lipid-core plaques by intracoronary near-infrared spectroscopy identifies high risk of periprocedural myocardial infarction. Circ Cardiovasc Interv 2011;4:429-37.

**85.** Raghunathan D, Abdel-Karim AR, Papayannis AC, et al. Relation between the presence and extent of coronary lipid core plaques detected by near-infrared spectroscopy with postpercutaneous coronary intervention myocardial infarction. Am J Cardiol 2011;107:1613-8.

**86.** Brilakis ES, Abdel-Karim AR, Papayannis AC, et al. Embolic protection device utilization during stenting of native coronary artery lesions with large lipid core plaques as detected by near-infrared spectroscopy. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2012;80:1157-62.

**87.** Ohshima K, Ikeda S, Kadota H, et al. Cavity volume of ruptured plaque is an independent predictor for angiographic no-reflow phenomenon during primary angioplasty in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction. J Cardiol 2011;57:36-43.

**88.** Endo M, Hibi K, Shimizu T, et al. Impact of ultrasound attenuation and plaque rupture as detected by intravascular ultrasound on the incidence of no-reflow phenomenon after percutaneous coronary intervention in ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2010;3:540–9.

**89.** Hong YJ, Jeong MH, Choi YH, et al. Predictors of no-reflow after percutaneous coronary

intervention for culprit lesion with plaque rupture in infarct-related artery in patients with acute myocardial infarction. J Cardiol 2009;54:36-44.

**90.** Hong YJ, Jeong MH, Choi YH, et al. Positive remodeling is associated with more plaque vulnerability and higher frequency of plaque prolapse accompanied with post-procedural cardiac enzyme elevation compared with intermediate/ negative remodeling in patients with acute myocardial infarction. J Cardiol 2009;53:278-87.

**91.** Wu X, Maehara A, Mintz GS, et al. Virtual histology intravascular ultrasound analysis of nonculprit attenuated plaques detected by grayscale intravascular ultrasound in patients with acute coronary syndromes. Am J Cardiol 2010;105:48-53.

92. Lee T, Kakuta T, Yonetsu T, et al. Assessment of echo-attenuated plaque by optical coherence tomography and its impact on post-procedural creatine kinase-myocardial band elevation in elective stent implantation. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2011;4:483-91.

**93.** Kubo T, Matsuo Y, Ino Y, et al. Optical coherence tomography analysis of attenuated plaques detected by intravascular ultrasound in patients with acute coronary syndromes. Cardiol Res Pract 2011;2011:687515.

**94.** Pu J, Mintz GS, Biro S, et al. Insights into echoattenuated plaques, echolucent plaques, and plaques with spotty calcification: Novel findings from comparisons among intravascular ultrasound, near-infrared spectroscopy, and pathologic histology in 2,294 human coronary artery segments. J Am Coll Cardiol 2014;63:2220-33.

**95.** Kasaoka S, Tobis JM, Akiyama T, et al. Angiographic and intravascular ultrasound predictors of in-stent restenosis. J Am Coll Cardiol 1998;32: 1630-5.

**96.** de Feyter PJ, Kay P, Disco C, Serruys PW. Reference chart derived from post-stentimplantation intravascular ultrasound predictors of 6-month expected restenosis on quantitative coronary angiography. Circulation 1999;100: 1777–83.

**97.** Castagna MT, Mintz GS, Leiboff BO, et al. The contribution of "mechanical" problems to in-stent restenosis: an intravascular ultrasonographic analysis of 1090 consecutive in-stent restenosis lesions. Am Heart J 2001;142:970-4.

**98.** Morino Y, Honda Y, Okura H, et al. An optimal diagnostic threshold for minimal stent area to predict target lesion revascularization following stent implantation in native coronary lesions. Am J Cardiol 2001;88:301–3.

**99.** Ziada KM, Kapadia SR, Belli G, et al. Prognostic value of absolute versus relative measures of the procedural result after successful coronary stenting: importance of vessel size in predicting long-term freedom from target vessel revascularization. Am Heart J 2001;141:823–31.

**100.** Cheneau E, Leborgne L, Mintz GS, et al. Predictors of subacute stent thrombosis: results of a systematic intravascular ultrasound study. Circulation 2003;108:43-7.

**101.** Sonoda S, Morino Y, Ako J, et al. Impact of final stent dimensions on long-term results following sirolimus-eluting stent implantation:

serial intravascular ultrasound analysis from the sirius trial. J Am Coll Cardiol 2004;43:1959-63.

**102.** Fujii K, Mintz GS, Kobayashi Y, et al. Contribution of stent underexpansion to recurrence after sirolimus-eluting stent implantation for in-stent restenosis. Circulation 2004;109:1085-8.

**103.** Fujii K, Carlier SG, Mintz GS, et al. Stent underexpansion and residual reference segment stenosis are related to stent thrombosis after sirolimus-eluting stent implantation: an intravascular ultrasound study. J Am Coll Cardiol 2005;45: 995-8.

**104.** Hong MK, Mintz GS, Lee CW, et al. Intravascular ultrasound predictors of angiographic restenosis after sirolimus-eluting stent implantation. Eur Heart J 2006;27:1305-10.

**105.** Okabe T, Mintz GS, Buch AN, et al. Intravascular ultrasound parameters associated with stent thrombosis after drug-eluting stent deployment. Am J Cardiol 2007;100:615-20.

**106.** Doi H, Maehara A, Mintz GS, et al. Impact of post-intervention minimal stent area on 9-month follow-up patency of paclitaxel-eluting stents: an integrated intravascular ultrasound analysis from the TAXUS IV, V, and VI and TAXUS ATLAS Workhorse, Long Lesion, and Direct Stent Trials. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2009;2:1269-75.

**107.** Liu X, Doi H, Maehara A, et al. A volumetric intravascular ultrasound comparison of early drugeluting stent thrombosis versus restenosis. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2009;2:428-34.

**108.** Choi SY, Witzenbichler B, Maehara A, et al. Intravascular ultrasound findings of early stent thrombosis after primary percutaneous intervention in acute myocardial infarction: a Harmonizing Outcomes with Revascularization and Stents in Acute Myocardial Infarction (HORIZONS-AMI) substudy. Circ Cardiovasc Interv 2011;4:239–47.

**109.** Kang SJ, Ahn JM, Song H, et al. Comprehensive intravascular ultrasound assessment of stent area and its impact on restenosis and adverse cardiac events in 403 patients with unprotected left main disease. Circ Cardiovasc Interv 2011;4:562–9.

**110.** Choi SY, Maehara A, Cristea E, et al. Usefulness of minimum stent cross sectional area as a predictor of angiographic restenosis after primary percutaneous coronary intervention in acute myocardial infarction (from the HORIZONS-AMI Trial IVUS substudy). Am J Cardiol 2012;109: 455-60.

**111.** Song HG, Kang SJ, Ahn JM, et al. Intravascular ultrasound assessment of optimal stent area to prevent in-stent restenosis after zotarolimus-, everolimus- and sirolimus-eluting stent implantation. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2012 Jul 19 [E-pub ahead of print].

**112.** Hahn JY, Song YB, Lee SY, et al. Serial intravascular ultrasound analysis of the main and side branches in bifurcation lesions treated with the T-stenting technique. J Am Coll Cardiol 2009;54: 110-7.

**113.** Sakurai R, Ako J, Morino Y, et al. Predictors of edge stenosis following sirolimus-eluting stent deployment (a quantitative intravascular ultrasound analysis from the SIRIUS trial). Am J Cardiol 2005;96:1251-3.

**114.** Costa MA, Angiolillo DJ, Tannenbaum M, et al. Impact of stent deployment procedural factors on long-term effectiveness and safety of sirolimus-eluting stents (final results of the multicenter prospective STLLR trial). Am J Cardiol 2008;101:1704–11.

**115.** Liu J, Maehara A, Mintz GS, et al. An integrated TAXUS IV, V, and VI intravascular ultrasound analysis of the predictors of edge restenosis after bare metal or paclitaxel-eluting stents. Am J Cardiol 2009;103:501-6.

**116.** Kang SJ, Cho YR, Park GM, et al. Intravascular ultrasound predictors for edge restenosis after newer generation drug-eluting stent implantation. Am J Cardiol 2013;111:1408-14.

**117.** Kimura M, Mintz GS, Carlier S, et al. Outcome after acute incomplete sirolimus-eluting stent apposition as assessed by serial intravascular ultrasound. Am J Cardiol 2006;98:436-42.

**118.** Steinberg DH, Mintz GS, Mandinov L, et al. Long-term impact of routinely detected early and late incomplete stent apposition: an integrated intravascular ultrasound analysis of the TAXUS IV, V, and VI and TAXUS ATLAS workhorse, long lesion, and direct stent studies. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2010;3:486-94.

**119.** Guo N, Maehara A, Mintz GS, et al. Incidence, mechanisms, predictors, and clinical impact of acute and late stent malapposition after primary intervention in patients with acute myocardial infarction: an intravascular ultrasound substudy of the Harmonizing Outcomes with Revascularization and Stents in Acute Myocardial Infarction (HORI-ZONS-AMI) trial. Circulation 2010;122:1077-84.

**120.** Casella G, Klauss V, Ottani F, Siebert U, Sangiorgio P, Bracchetti D. Impact of intravascular ultrasound-guided stenting on long-term clinical outcome: a meta-analysis of available studies comparing intravascular ultrasound-guided and angiographically guided stenting. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2003;59:314–21.

**121.** Parise H, Maehara A, Stone GW, Leon MB, Mintz GS. Meta-analysis of randomized studies comparing intravascular ultrasound versus angiographic guidance of percutaneous coronary intervention in pre-drug-eluting stent era. Am J Cardiol 2011;107. 374–32.

**122.** Sburzzi G, de Quandros AS, Ribiero RA, et al. Intracoronary ultrasound-guided stenting improves outcomes: a meta-analysis of randomized trials. Arq Bras Cardiol 2012;98:35-44.

**123.** de Figueiredo Neto JA, Nogueira IAL, Figueiro MF, Buehler AM, Berwanger O. Angioplasty guided by intravascular ultrasound: metaanalysis of randomized clinical trials. Arq Bras Cardiol 2013;101:106-16.

**124.** Zhang Y, Farooq V, Garcia-Garcia HM, et al. Comparison of intravascular ultrasound versus angiography-guided drug-eluting stent implantation: a meta-analysis of one randomised trial and ten observational studies involving 19,619 patients. EuroIntervention 2012;8:855–65.

**125.** Klersy C, Ferlini M, Raisaro A, et al. Use of IVUS guided coronary stenting with drug eluting stent. A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled clinical trials and high

quality observational studies. Int J Cardiol 2013; 170:54-63.

**126.** Jang JS, Song YJ, Kang W, et al. Intravascular ultrasound-guided implantation of drug-eluting stents to improve outcome: a meta-analysis. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2014;7:233-43.

**127.** Ahn JM, Kang SJ, Yoon SH, et al. Meta-analysis after intravascular ultrasound-guided versus angiography-guided drug-eluting stent implantation in 26,503 patients enrolled in three randomized and fourteen observation studies. Am J Cardiol 2014;113:138–47.

**128.** Maluenda G, Lemesle G, Ben-Dor I, et al. Impact of intravascular ultrasound guidance in patients with acute myocardial infarction undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2010;75:86–92.

**129.** Ahmed K, Jeong MH, Chakraborty R, et al. Role of intravascular ultrasound in patients with acute myocardial infarction undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention. Am J Cardiol 2011; 108:8-14.

**130.** Witzenbichler B, Maehara A, Weisz G, et al. Relationship between intravascular ultrasound guidance and clinical outcomes after drug-eluting stents: the Assessment of Therapy With Drug-Eluting Stents (ADAPT-DES) Study. Circulation 2014;129:463-70.

**131.** de la Torre Hernandez JM, Baz Alonzo JA, Gomez Hospital JA, et al. Clinical impact of intravascular ultrasound guidance in drug-eluting stent implantation for unprotected left main coronary artery disease: pooled analysis at the patient-level of 4 registries. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2014;7:244–54.

**132.** Prati F, Di Vito L, Biondi-Zoccai G, et al. Angiography alone versus angiography plus optical coherence tomography to guide decision-making during percutaneous coronary intervention: the Centro per la Lotta contro l'Infarto-Optimisation of Percutaneous Coronary Intervention (CLI-OPCI) study. EuroIntervention 2012;8:823–9.

**133.** Bezerra HG, Attizzani GF, Sirbu V, et al. Optical coherence tomography versus intravascular ultrasound to evaluate coronary artery disease and percutaneous coronary intervention. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2013;6:228-36.

**134.** Fujino Y, Bezerra HG, Attizzani GF, et al. Frequency-domain optical coherence tomography assessment of unprotected left main coronary artery disease—a comparison with intravascular ultrasound. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2013;82: E173–83.

**135.** Kubo T, Akasaka T, Shite J, et al. OCT compared with IVUS in a coronary lesion assessment: the OPUS-CLASS study. J Am Coll Cardiol Img 2013;6:1095-104.

**136.** Habara M, Nasu K, Terashima M, et al. Impact of frequency-domain optical coherence tomography guidance for optimal coronary stent implantation in comparison with intravascular ultrasound guidance. Circ Cardiovasc Interv 2012;5:193-201.

**137.** Kume T, Okura H, Miyamoto Y, et al. Natural history of stent edge dissection, tissue protrusion and incomplete stent apposition detectable only on optical coherence tomography after stent

implantation-preliminary observation. Circ J 2012; 76:698-703.

**138.** Chamié D, Bezerra HG, Attizzani GF, et al. Incidence, predictors, morphological characteristics, and clinical outcomes of stent edge dissections detected by optical coherence tomography. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2013;6:800-13.

**139.** Kawamori H, Shite J, Shinke T, et al. Natural consequence of post-intervention stent malapposition, thrombus, tissue prolapse, and dissection assessed by optical coherence tomography at midterm follow-up. Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging 2013:14:865-75.

**140.** Im E, Kim BK, Ko YG, et al. The incidences, predictors, and clinical outcomes of acute and late stent malapposition detected by optical coherence tomography after drug-eluting stent implantation. Circ Cardiovasc Interv 2014;7:88-96.

**141.** Koo BK, Kang HJ, Youn TJ, et al. Physiologic assessment of jailed side branch lesions using fractional flow reserve. J Am Coll Cardiol 2005; 46:633-7.

**142.** Koo BK, Park KW, Kang HJ, et al. Physiological evaluation of the provisional side-branch intervention strategy for bifurcation lesions using fractional flow reserve. Eur Heart J 2008;29: 726-32.

**143.** Nam CW, Hur SH, Koo BK, et al. Fractional flow reserve versus angiography in left circumflex ostial intervention after left main crossover stenting. Korean Circ J 2011;41:304–7.

**144.** Ahn JM, Lee JY, Kang SJ, et al. Functional assessment of jailed side branches in coronary bifurcation lesions using fractional flow reserve. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2012;5:155-61.

**145.** Kang SJ, Ahn JM, Kim WJ, et al. Functional and morphological assessment of side branch after left main coronary artery bifurcation stenting with cross-over technique. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2014;83:545-52.

**146.** Takano M, Yamamoto M, Inami S, et al. Appearance of lipid-laden intima and neovascularization after implantation of bare-metal stents extended late-phase observation by intracoronary optical coherence tomography. J Am Coll Cardiol 2009;55:26–32.

**147.** Lee CW, Kang SJ, Park DW, et al. Intravascular ultrasound findings in patients with very late stent thrombosis after either drug-eluting or baremetal stent implantation. J Am Coll Cardiol 2010; 55:1936-42.

**148.** Hou J, Qi H, Zhang M, et al. Development of lipid-rich plaque inside bare metal stent: possible mechanism of late stent thrombosis? An optical coherence tomography study. Heart 2010;96: 1187-90.

**149.** Kang SJ, Mintz GS, Akasaka T, et al. Optical coherence tomographic analysis of in-stent neo-atherosclerosis after drug-eluting stent implantation. Circulation 2011;123:2954-63.

**150.** Habara M, Terashima M, Nasu K, et al. Difference of tissue characteristics between early and very late restenosis lesions after bare-metal stent implantation: an optical coherence tomography study. Circ Cardiovasc Interv 2011;4:232-8.

**151.** Yonetsu T, Kim JS, Kato K, et al. Comparison of incidence and time course of neoatherosclerosis between bare metal stents and drug-eluting stents using optical coherence tomography. Am J Cardiol 2012;110:933–9.

**152.** Yonetsu T, Kato K, Kim SJ, et al. Predictors for neoatherosclerosis: a retrospective observational study from the optical coherence tomography registry. Circ Cardiovasc Imaging 2012;5:660–6.

**153.** Habara M, Terashima M, Nasu K, et al. Morphological differences of tissue characteristics between early, late, and very late restenosis lesions after first generation drug-eluting stent implantation: an optical coherence tomography study. Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging 2013;14: 276-84.

**154.** Kang SJ, Lee CW, Song H, et al. OCT analysis in patients with very late stent thrombosis. J Am Coll Cardiol Img 2013;6:695-703.

**155.** Amabile N, Souteyrand G, Ghostine S, et al. Very late stent thrombosis related to incomplete neointimal coverage or neoatherosclerotic plaque rupture identified by optical coherence tomography imaging. Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging 2013; 15:24–31.

**156.** Ali ZA, Roleder T, Narula J, et al. Increased thin-cap neoatheroma and periprocedural myo-cardial infarction in drug-eluting stent restenosis: multimodality intravascular imaging of drug-eluting and bare-metal stents. Circ Cardiovasc Interv 2013;6:507–17.

**157.** Guagliumi G, Sirbu V, Musumeci G, et al. Examination of the in vivo mechanisms of late drug-eluting stent thrombosis: findings from optical coherence tomography and intravascular ultrasound imaging. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2012; 5:12-20.

**158.** Won H, Shin DH, Kim BK, et al. Optical coherence tomography derived cut-off value of uncovered stent struts to predict adverse clinical outcomes after drug-eluting stent implantation. Int J Cardiovasc Imaging 2013;29:1255-63.

**159.** Yamaji K, Inoue K, Nakahashi T, et al. Bare metal stent thrombosis and in-stent neoatherosclerosis. Circ Cardiovasc Interv 2012;5:47–54.

**160.** Lee SJ, Kim BK, Kim JS, et al. Evaluation of neointimal morphology of lesions with or without in-stent restenosis: an optical coherence tomography study. Clin Cardiol 2011;34:633–9.

**161.** Kwon SW, Kim BK, Kim TH, et al. Qualitative assessment of neointimal tissue after drugeluting stent implantation: comparison between follow-up optical coherence tomography and intravascular ultrasound. Am Heart J 2011;161: 367-72.

**162.** Choi JH, Granada JF, Kim JS, et al. OCTverified peri-strut low-intensity areas and the extent of neointimal formation after 3 years following stent implantation. J Am Coll Cardiol Img 2012;5:1156–60.

**163.** Kim JS, Hong MK, Shin DH, et al. Quantitative and qualitative changes in DES-related neointimal tissue based on serial OCT. J Am Coll Cardiol Img 2012;5:1147-55.

**164.** Hou J, Jia H, Liu H, et al. Neointimal tissue characteristics following sirolimus-eluting stent

implantation: OCT quantitative tissue property analysis. Int J Cardiovasc Imaging 2012;28: 1879-86.

**165.** Otake H, Shite J, Ikeno F, et al. Evaluation of the peri-strut low intensity area following sirolimus- and paclitaxel-eluting stents implantation: insights from an optical coherence tomography study in humans. Int J Cardiol 2012; 157:38-42.

**166.** Ishibashi K, Tanaka A, Kitabata H, et al. Clinical significance of low signal intensity area surrounding stent struts identified by optical coherence tomography. Int Heart J 2013;54:7-10. **167.** Ino Y, Kubo T, Kitabata H, et al. Difference in neointimal appearance between early and late restenosis after sirolimus-eluting stent implantation assessed by optical coherence tomography. Coron Artery Dis 2013;24:95-101.

**168.** Nagoshi R, Shinke T, Otake H, et al. Qualitative and quantitative assessment of stent restenosis by optical coherence tomography: comparison between drug-eluting and bare-metal stents. Circ J 2013;77:652-60.

**169.** Goto K, Takebayashi H, Kihara Y, et al. Appearance of neointima according to stent type and restenotic phase: analysis by optical coherence tomography. EuroIntervention 2013;9: 601-7.

**170.** Abnousi F, Waseda K, Kume T, et al. Variability in quantitative and qualitative analysis of intravascular ultrasound and frequency domain optical coherence tomography. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2013;82:E192-9.

KEY WORDS fractional flow reserve, intravascular ultrasound, near-infrared spectroscopy, optical coherence tomography, radiofrequency IVUS