# Acute Myocardial Infarction and underlying stenosis severity

**Jacques Koolen** 

Catharina Hospital Eindhoven The Netherlands

# The majority of ACS occur

# at the site of mild lesions



# The mythe of the "dangerous" plaque

## (Vulnerable) Plaque: Facts and Fiction

# FACTS:

- plaques are very common
- majority of plaques has an excellent prognosis with medical treatment
- only few plaques are vulnerable
- strongest indicator with respect to prognosis is associated ischemia

# **FICTION:**

- every plaque is vulnerable
- every vulnerable plaque leads to ACS
- most ACS occurs in mild plaques
- screening of vulnerability can be done by imaging



Falk, Shah and Fuster, Circulation 1995

"Acute Coronary Syndromes most often occur at the site of mild stenoses"

**Do Myocardial Infarctions Evolve from Mild Stenoses ?** 

Serial Angiographic (Retrospective) Studies in Patients with MI and a Prior Coronary Angiogram

200

-160

-120

-80

-40

0

#### No QCA, No IVUS but unblinded "eyebolling"

| ΤΟται                          | 313       | (average <u>3.9 years</u> !!!) | All |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|-----|
| Total                          | 242       |                                |     |
| Hackett et al AJC 1989         | 10        | 21 months                      |     |
| Webster et al JACC 1990        | 30        | 55 months                      |     |
| Moise et al. AJC 1984          | 116       | 39 months                      | 68% |
| Giroud et al. AJC 1992         | 92        | 1 month to 11 years            |     |
| Little et al. Circulation 1988 | 42        | 4 days to 6.3 years            |     |
| Ambrose et al ACC 1988         | 23        | 1 month to 7 years             | 18% |
|                                | Number of | DelayAngio-MI                  | 14% |

# THE MYTHE OF THE "DANGEROUS" PLAQUE

The hypothesis of the occurrence of acute MI on such previously non-significant plaque is based upon

- 6 small retrospective studies
- with a total of 313 patients

• in whom the "index" catherization was performed an average of <u>3.9 years</u> before the acute event

All other literature (21 "meta-analyses" and hundreds of references), refer to these 6 studies !!!

To investigate the *risk of an individual plaque or stenosis* to rupture, not a retrospective analysis of <u>selected</u> patients experiencing an acute coronary syndrome should be studied, but *prospective follow-up over years* is mandatory in <u>unselected</u> patients !

In such study in >2500 stenoses, performed by Aldermann, Stenosis severity was strongly correlated to the risk of occlusion and events: *The risk of a severe stenosis was 20 x higher than for a non-significant plague.* 

Similar data have been obtained by IVUS and at pathologic Studies.

#### **Coronary Occlusion at <u>5 Years</u> as a Function of Stenosis Severity**

2161-**Occlusion at FU** 500 400 -300 200 100 -2% 10% 24% 1% 0 None 5-49% 50-80% 81-95% **Stenosis Severity at Baseline** 

**Coronary Segments (n)** 

% Occlusion at 5 Year



Adapted from Alderman et al. J Am Coll Cardiol 1993

#### **IVUS Examination: Clinical Outcome after Deferred Interventions**

300 pts; 13 mos F-U

- CSA = only independent predictor of events
- Independent predictors of TLR: diabetes, min CSA, AS
- When CSA > 4 mm<sup>2</sup>: - event rate: 4% - TLR: 2.8%



**Any Cardiac Event (%)** 

Abizaid AS et al. Circulation, 1999

#### Severity of Coronary Atherosclerosis at Sites of Plaque Rupture with Occlusive Thrombosis

b

Area Stenosis =



% of Total Number (n=182) of Stenoses

Qiao J-H et al. JACC 1991

# 250 consecutive patients with ST-elevation MI in the Catharina Hospital:

- reasonable estimation of pre-infarct stenosis severity possible in 156 patients
- angio's divided in 4 groups:

group 1: spontaneous reperfusion at first angio view
group 2: reperfusion after easy and uncomplicated
wiring
group 3: reperfusion after non-trivial wiring
group 4: no reperfusion.

angiographic assessment possible in gr 1 & 2

Frobert et al CCI, 2007, 70: 958-965



## Group 1: spontaneous reperfusion at first angio



## Group 2: reperfusion after easy and uncomplicated wiring



Group 3: reperfusion after complicated wiring → not suitable for analysis

## **Stenosis Severity at Primary PCI in AMI**

- 156 stenoses with distal flow enabling accurate QCA out of 250 <u>consecutive</u> Acute MI's
- In 92 %, underlying stenosis was > 50%
- In 71 %, underlying stenosis was > 70%



# 250 consecutive patients with ST-elevation MI in the Catharina Hospital:

- underlying stenosis angiographically significant in 92 % of the cases
- At meticulous anamnesis, 80 % of patients had recurrent chest pain in the year before the acute myocardial infarction occurred !!

The fact that acute coronary syndromes "sometimes" occur in relation to a previously insignificant plaque, does not mean that a plaque is more dangerous than a severe stenosis, *because*:

### Non-significant "plaques" :

Are 20 x more frequent than severe lesions. So, even if 50% of ACS would be related to such plaque, its *individual risk* is 20 times lower than the risk of a severe stenosis

#### <u>Non-significant "plaques" :</u>

Are often not giving complaints and therefore not treated in a similar way as a physiologically significant stenosis (aspirin, statines, stenting). Therefore, the "natural" outcome of severe lesions is positively influenced, whereas mild lesions remain silent and progress

### **CONCLUSIONS:**

- In contrary to what is often believed, the majority of acute myocardial infarctions occur on previously significant stenosis, especially when also hemodynamically significant.
- The risk of an individual mild or moderate plaque to rupture is extremely small and definitely < 1% per year with good medical treatment. (*Defer study, Courage trial*)
- In 80% of cases, AMI is preceded by repetitive episodes of ischemia in the year before
- PCI of (hemodynamically) significant stenosis makes sense, relieves angina and often improves outcome (FAME study !)
- non-significant stenosis can better be treated medically

## **COURAGE TRIAL: SOME CRITICAL NOTES**

How representative is the Courage Trial?
 → only 6% of eligible patients were truly included

- Two-way negative bias for PCI group:
  - In PCI group, selection of lesions to be stented was on the basis of angiography → at least 30% unnecessary stents, which unfavourably affects prognosis

2. In PCI group, also a number of ischemic lesions must have been missed, which also unfavouraby affects prognosis ( ACIP-trial, Circulation 1996)

In terms of functional class the PCI group did better than the medical group, *particularly in patients with proven ischemia* !