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## Angio-derived FFR in cath lab

-What is the basic principle of angio-derived FFR?

- What is the diagnostic performance of angioderived FFR?
- Can we use it in complex lesions?
- Can we use angio-derived FFR to PCI planning (Simulation of post procedural FFR, tandem lesion, number of stent, and stent length)?
- What is the potential clinical impact of post procedural QFR?
- From late loss to QFR: new parameter of device efficiency and QFR for event adjudication in the context of clinical trial

History of physiology


1975 D. Young $\frac{\Delta p}{\rho U^{2}}=\frac{K_{e}}{R e}+\frac{K_{t}}{2}\left(\frac{A_{0}}{A_{1}}-1\right)^{2}$
 $198{ }_{\downarrow}$ R. Kirkeeide
$1988_{\downarrow}$ PW. Serruys

Velocity wire
Flow-velocity validation
1991 Pressure wire
1993 P.W. Serruys (Double-wire Pressure-velocity)
1993 Håkan Emanuelsson, P.W. Serruys (SFR)
1993 Carlo Di Mario, P.W. Serruys (Hyperemic Index)


Fast virtual functional assessment of intermediate coronary lesions using routine angiographic data and blood flow simulation in humans: comparison with pressure wire fractional flow reserve
 Lampros S. Lakkas ${ }^{1}$, MD; Shimpei Nakatani ${ }^{3}$, MD; Christos V. Bourantas ${ }^{3}$, MD, PhD; Jurgen Ligthart ${ }^{3}$, BSc; Yoshinobu Onuma ${ }^{3}, \mathrm{MD}, \mathrm{PhD}$; Mauro Echavarria-Pinto ${ }^{4}$, MD; Georgia Tsirka ${ }^{1}$, MD; Anna Kotsia ${ }^{5}$, MD; Dimitrios N. Nikas ${ }^{1}$, MD, PhD, FESC; Owen Mogabgab ${ }^{5}$, MD; Robert-Jan van Geuns ${ }^{3}$, MD, PhD ; Katerina K. Naka ${ }^{1}$, MD, PhD, FESC; Dimitrios I. Fotiadis ${ }^{6}$, PhD ; Emmanouil S. Brilakis ${ }^{5}$, MD, PhD Héctor M. Garcia-Garcia ${ }^{3}$, MD, PhD; Javier Escaned ${ }^{4}$, MD, PhD, FESC; Felix Zijlstra ${ }^{3}$, MD, PhD; Lampros K. Michalis ${ }^{1}$, MD, MRCP, FESC; Patrick W. Serruys ${ }^{3,7 *}$, MD, PhD, FESC

- Virtual functional assessment index (vFAI) was derived from 3D-QCA.
- A Comparison with wire-FFR was studied in 139 lesions with intermediate stenosis.





Eurointervention 2014

## Fractional Flow Reserve Calculation From

## 3-Dimensional Quantitative Coronary

 Angiography and TIMI Frame CountA Fast Computer Model to Quantify the Functional Significance of Moderately Obstructed Coronary Arteries

Shengxian Tu, PHD, ${ }^{*}$ Emanuele Barbato, MD, PHD,$\dagger$ Zsolt Köszegi, MD, PHD, $\ddagger$ Junqing Yang, MD,§ Zhonghua Sun, MD, \| Niels R. Holm, MD, đ Balázs Tar, MD, $\ddagger$ Yingguang Li, MSc,* Dan Rusinaru, MD, $\dagger$ William Wijns, MD, PHD, $\dagger$ Johan H.C. Reiber, PHD*

- $\quad \mathrm{FFR}_{\mathrm{QCA}}$ was derived from 3D QCA and TIMI (Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction) frame count.
- $\quad \mathrm{FFR}_{\mathrm{OcA}}$ was retrospectively compared with wire-based FFR in 77 intermediate lesions.





## Available software in cath lab



## Quantitative Flow Ratio (QFR)



Data Transmission System
Two image runs with angle difference $\geq 25^{\circ}$

## 3D Reconstruction

Modified Frame Count


Without Inducing Hyperemia

## The Quantitative Flow Ratio (QFR)



## The Quantitative Flow Ratio (QFR)




## FFR angio (Cathworks)



The $F F R_{\text {angio }}$ is calculated as the ratio between the flow rate in the stenosed artery, and the flow rate in the same artery in the absence of the stenosis

## vFFR: flow of computation




2 angiograms 30 degrees apart for 3D
reconstruction


A pressure drop is
calculated based on 3D
reconstruction

vFFR without induced hyperemia

## Angio-derived FFR in cath lab

- What is the basic principle of angio-derived FFR?
- What is the diagnostic performance of angioderived FFR vs. wire-based FFR?
- Can we use QFR in complex lesions?
- Can we use angio-derived FFR to PCI planning (Simulation of post procedural FFR, tandem lesion, number of stent, and stent length)?
- What is the potential clinical impact of post procedural QFR?
- From late loss to QFR: new parameter of device efficiency and QFR for event adjudication in the context of clinical trial
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## Diagnostic performance of angiography-derived FFR a systematic review and Bayesian meta-analysis

Tu et al. CFD


Morris et al. CFD


Kornowsky et al. FFRangio


Papafaklis et al. Math


Trobs et al. CFD


Tu et al. QFR Math

## Diagnostic performance of angiography-derived FFR a systematic review and Bayesian meta-analysis

| Study | Number of lesions | Technology | Process | Reference Standard | Threshold | Prevalence of ischaemia (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WIFI II, 2017 | 240 | QFR | Mathematical formula | IV FFR | $\leq 0.8$ | 28 |
| FAVOR II Europe and Japan, 2017 | 317 | QFR | Mathematical formula | IV FFR | $\leq 0.8$ | 29 |
| Tar et al., 2017 | 68 | MEDIS 3D-QCA | Mathematical formula | IV FFR | $\leq 0.8$ | 42 |
| Yazaki et al., 2017 | 151 | QFR | Mathematical formula | IV FFR | $\leq 0.8$ | 27 |
| FAVOR II China, 2017 | 328 | QFR | Mathematical formula | IV FFR | $\leq 0.8$ | 32 |
| FAVOR Pilot, 2016 | 84 | QFR | Mathematical formula | IV FFR | $\leq 0.8$ | 24 |
| Morris et al., 2013 | 35 | Virtual fractional flow reserve derived | CFD | IV FFR | $\leq 0.8$ | 17 |
| Pellicano et al., 2017 | 203 | $\mathrm{FFR}_{\text {angio }}$ | Rapid flow analysis | IV or IC FFR | $\leq 0.8$ | 32 |
| Tu et al., 2014 | 77 | FFReca | CFD | IV FFR | $\leq 0.8$ | 23 |
| Kornowski et al., 2016 | 101 | FFR ${ }_{\text {angio }}$ | Rapid flow analysis | IV or IC FFR | $\leq 0.8$ | 30 |
| Trobs et al., 2015 | 100 | Syngo IZ3D for anatomic reconstruction | CFD | IV or IC FFR | $\leq 0.8$ | 23 |
| van Rosendael et al., 2017 | 15 | QFR | Mathematical formula | IV FFR | $\leq 0.8$ | 13 |
| Legutko et al., 2017 | 123 | QFR | Mathematical formula | NA | $\leq 0.8$ | 40 |

## Diagnostic performance of angiography-derived FFR a systematic review and Bayesian meta-analysis

Forest Plots of Sensitivity and Specificity

| Studies | TP | FP | TN | FN |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WIFI Study | 66 | 20 | 132 | 22 |  |
| FAVOR II Europe \& Japan | 92 | 26 | 187 | 12 |  |
| Papafaklis et al. | 47 | 12 | 75 | 5 |  |
| Tar et al. | 24 | 4 | 21 | 8 |  |

Estimates $\left.\begin{array}{cc}95 \% \text { Credible } \\ \text { intervals }\end{array}\right\}$

Estimates

Yaz et al. FAVOR II China FAVOR Pilot Morris et al. Pellicano et al. Tu et al. Kornowski et al. Trobs et al. van Rosendael et al. Legutko et al.

Summary

## Forest Plots o

Studies WIFI Study FAVOR II Europe \& Jap Papafaklis et al. Tar et al. Tar et al.
Yazakiet al. FAVOR II China FAVOR Pilot Morris et al. Pellicano et al. Tu et al. Kornowski et al. Kornowski et Trobs et al. van Rosendael et al. Legutko et al.

Summary

Sensitivity 89\% (95\% Crl 84\% to 93\%)
Specificity 90\% (95\% Crl 88\% to 92\%) +LR 9.05 (95\% Crl 7.1 to 11.3) -LR 0.12 (95\% Crl 0.07 to 0.19)


| 9.71 | 5.69 to 15.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10.32 | 7.43 to 15.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8.51 | 5.50 to 12.87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11.01 | 7.45 to 17.63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8.79 | 5.65 to 13.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.12 | 5.08 to 14.87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10.98 | 7.25 to 16.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.05 | 7.06 to 11.29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\infty$ | ${ }_{0} 0$ | 0.10 | 0.15 | 0.20 | 0.5 | ${ }^{0.30}$ | ${ }^{035}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

0.02 to 0.29 0.05 to 0.19 0.09 to 0.38 0.02 to 0.17 0.09 to 0.34 0.03 to 0.37
0.01 to 0.12 0.01 to 0.12
7.06 to 11.29

## Bayesian Meta-regression


A. Method for pressure drop computation

B. Software for FFR estimation

C. Type of analysis


No difference in Diagnostic Performance (AUC) between type of method for pressure drop computation, Software or online/offline analysis.

## On-line vs Off-line QFR: Insight from FAVOR III China

ROC for the discrimination of functionally significant stenosis


On-line
AUC 0.96
Accuracy 92.7


Off-line AUC 0.97
Accuracy 93.3

On-line QFR showed excellent predictive value and comparable accuracy to Off-line.

## Impact of QFR on clinical outcomes is under-investigation

## Pre-procedural QFR

## FAVOR III -RCT-

## Europe-Japan

- QFR vs FFR
- Non-inferiority study


## 1:1 Randomization



FFR-Guided
$N=1,000$

- FFR $\leq 0.8$ : PCI treatment
- FFR>0.8: Medica alone


## China

- QFR vs present practice
- Superiority study

- Primary endpoint: MACE at 1Y: all-cause death, MI, any ID revascularization

Secondary Endpoints: Procedure time, contrast volume, fluoroscopy time etc.

Secondary Endpoints: Cost-effectiveness at $1 Y$ etc.

NCT03656848

## Angio-derived FFR in cath lab

- What is the basic principle of angio-derived FFR?
- What is the diagnostic performance of angioderived FFR vs. wire-based FFR?
- Can we use QFR in complex lesions?
- Can we use angio-derived FFR to PCI planning (Simulation of post procedural FFR, tandem lesion, number of stent, and stent length)?
- What is the potential clinical impact of post procedural QFR?
- From late loss to QFR: new parameter of device efficiency and QFR for event adjudication in the context of clinical trial

Case example of functional SYNTAX score calculation by QFR


Asano T, OnumaY, Serruys PW et al. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2019 Feb 11;12(3):259-270.

# Reclassification of functional SYNTAX score 

 derived from QFR and iFR/FFR ( $\mathrm{N}=138$ )

Functional SYNTAX score derived from QFR yielded significantly improved risk classification compared to anatomic SYNTAX Score.
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- What is the basic principle of angio-derived FFR?
- What is the diagnostic performance of angioderived FFR vs. wire-based FFR?
- Can we use QFR in complex lesions?
- Can we use angio-derived FFR to PCI planning (Simulation of post procedural FFR, tandem lesion, number of stent, and stent length)?
- What is the potential clinical impact of post procedural QFR?
- From late loss to QFR: new parameter of device efficiency and QFR for event adjudication in the context of clinical trial


## QFR version 2.0 (work in progress)

- Full screen user interface
- Easy and visible workflow
- Automatic end-diastolic detection from ECG
- Reduction of all redundant information on and around the images
- Reduction of mouse miles



## Angio-derived FFR in cath lab
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## Impact of QFR on clinical outcomes is under-investigation

## Post-procedural QFR

## HAWKEYE NCT02811796

-prospective observational study-
Aim: To assess the relationship between post-QFR and adverse events

## 600 patients

# Successful PCI with post procedural QFR assessment (off-line) 

## Primary endpoint: DOCE at 1Y: cardiac death, TV-MI, TLR

Primary result will be presented at euroPCR2019

## QFR for Event Adjudication of Clinically Indicated Repeat Revascularization <br> The Academic Research Consortium-2 Consensus Document (ARC-2)

Table 7 Fractional Flow Reserve and Quantitative Coronary Analysis for Event Adjudication of Clinically Indicated Repeat Revascularizations

1:Core laboratory-reported fractional flow reserve $\leq 0.80$ or instant wave-free ratio $\leq 0.89$

2:Site-reported fractional flow reserve $\leq 0.80$ or instant wave-free ratio $\leq 0.89$
3. Quantitative coronary analysis* diameter stenosis $>50 \%$ (based on the average of multiple views) with either recurrent symptoms or positive noninvasive functional test
4. Quantitative coronary analysis* diameter stenosis $>70 \%$ (based on the average of multiple views) regardless of other criteria
5. Quantitative coronary analysis diameter stenosis $>70 \%$ (based on the worst view) regardless of other criteria


## ARC-2 gives priority to functional assessment with FFR or equivalent technique.

ARC-2 recommends that resting dp/da, contrast/saline FFR, QFR, and FFR $_{\text {CT }}$, although not yet widely available, can be used for adjudication purposes if specified in the protocol.

## Conclusion

$\checkmark$ Commercially available online-QFR and on-site-FFR ${ }_{\text {angio }}$ demonstrated feasibility and similar diagnostic accuracy compared to wire-based FFR in the prospective observational trials. Meta-analysis demonstrated that angio-derived FFR is reliable surrogate for invasive wire-based FFR irrespective of computational approaches and software packages.
$\checkmark$ Assessment of functional SYNTAX score by QFR was feasible in selected 3VD cases. With a new version of software, simulation of post-stenting QFR is feasible, which could further guide planning of PCI (stent length, number of stent etc).
$\checkmark$ In context of clinical trial, angio-derived FFR could be used to evaluate efficacy of coronary device. According to ARC-2, in the context of clinical trial, QFR could be utilized to adjudicate ischemia driven revascularization.
$\checkmark$ Impact of both pre- and post-procedural QFR on clinical outcomes is underinvestigation in prospective randomized trials. If clinical noninferiority to wire based FFR and/or superiority to angio-guided approach is established, angioderived FFR could become standard approach.
$\checkmark$ Angio-derived FFR will change our practice in cath lab.

