

# Visual-Functional Mismatch Between Coronary Angiography and Fractional Flow Reserve


**Seung-Jung Park, MD., PhD.**

University of Ulsan, College of Medicine  
Asan Medical Center, Seoul, Korea

M/72,

Recent developed Effort chest pain, Hyperlipidemia, Smoker

We took a coronary angiogram first,



Visual  
Estimation  
85%



CardioVascular Research Foundation





UNIVERSITY OF ULSAN  
COLLEGE MEDICINE



ASAN  
Medical Center

# IVUS




MLA  $2.8 \text{ mm}^2$

# FFR

## Intravenous adenosine, 160 µg/kg/min




# Treadmill test



Stage 4 Negative


# Thallium SPECT



Normal

# Dobutamine Stress EchoCG

Diastole




Systole

Baseline

Stimulation

## Negative


# Visual - Functional Mismatch



**Angiographic DS(%) : 85%**  
**IVUS MLA : 2.8 mm<sup>2</sup>**

**FFR : 0.84**  
**Treadmill test : Negative**  
**Thallium spect : Normal**  
**Stress Echo : Normal**

# Reverse Mismatch



Visual Estimation : 30%

FFR : 0.70

IVUS MLA: 4.5 mm<sup>2</sup>

Treadmill test: + stage 2  
Thallium spect : + large  
LAD


# How many Mismatches ?

# Mismatch Disease in the Cath Lab

Comparison analysis; Angiography vs. FFR (n=3000)

FFR

QCA



**Mismatches ;  
Significant Stenosis (>50%)  
with Negative FFR**

**Reverse Mismatches ;  
Insignificant Stenosis (<50%)  
with Positive FFR**

# Background

- Lesion severity determined by coronary angiography has not been well-correlated with the physiologic significance of the stenosis
- However, the reasons why mismatches between the two, are still poorly understood.

# Methods 1

## Computational Simulation

- Numerical simulation was performed using a commercial computational fluid dynamics simulation code, ANSYS FLUENT® release 13.0
- A built-in porous media model in ANSYS FLUENT® release 13.0 was used to simulate microvascular bed resistance change of myocardium due to change of coronary severity under hyperemic flow condition

## Methods 2

### Clinical Data in 1000 Patients

- Between November 2009 and June 2011, in a prospective cohort, 1000 consecutive patients with 1129 coronary lesions, underwent angiographic, IVUS, and FFR assessment prior to intervention (*ClinicalTrials.gov numbers NCT01366404*)
- All patients were aged 35-85 years and had one target vessel with >30% of QCA-DS on visual estimation

# FFR theory


FFR is determined by

1. Size of myocardium
2. Many lesion specific local factors at maximal hyperemia.

# Methods 1


## Computational Simulation Study

# Steady-state 3D Simulation under Hyperemic Condition




# Recirculation (Vortex)

Why  
Can make a Energy Loss of Fluid  
Pressure Drop? → Pressure Drop



# Steady-state 3D Simulation under Hyperemic Condition


FFR 0.62



Recirculation

# Pressure Drop due to Energy Loss of Fluid by Vortex Flow

$$1 : P_1 + \frac{1}{2}pv_1^2 = Pt_1 \quad 2 : P_2 + \frac{1}{2}pv_2^2 = Pt_2 \quad 3 : P_3 + \frac{1}{2}pv_3^2 = Pt_3$$




$$Pt_1 > Pt_2$$


$$Pt_1 \gg Pt_4$$

Courtesy of Prof. Shim

# Degree of Stenosis





# Different Morphology




# Different Lesion Length

Degree of stenosis : 50%



# Lesion Eccentricity (cross-sectional)


Eccentric Model



FFR

0.71

Concentric Model




CSA  
: 1.83 mm<sup>2</sup>

0.77

CSA  
: 1.83 mm<sup>2</sup>


FFR theory

# Vulnerable Plaque Simulation




**Plaque rupture  
Thrombus, surface roughness**


# Presence of Plaque Rupture



FFR : 0.62




0.68



0.66


0.58

# Different Surface Roughness




# Rupture and Roughness


70 %



70 %, Rupture



70 %, Rupture and Roughness



# FFR is influenced by Many Lesion Specific Factors

---

- Degree of diameter stenosis
- Reference vessel diameter (myocardium)
- Lesion morphology
- Eccentricity
- Lesion length
- Plaque burden, Plaque rupture
- Surface roughness (thrombus)
- Viscous friction, flow separation, turbulence, and eddies

# Conclusion 1

1. Although the same degree of stenosis can make a **different FFR value** according to the different lesion morphologic factors.
2. FFR, a **very sensitive index** integrating various local factors, is more reliable than angiographically determined stenosis severity.

# Methods 2

Clinical Data  
in 1000 Patients

# Prospective Cohort, 1000 patients (1129 lesions)

100% QCA analysis  
100% FFR  
100% IVUS assessment and  
core lab analysis

*(ClinicalTrials.gov numbers NCT01366404)*

# Inclusion Criteria,

All patients were aged 35-85 years and had one target vessel with >30% diameter stenosis on visual estimation.

# Clinical Characteristics (overall pt.)

Age (years)	61±9
Male	731 (73%)
Diabetes, N (%)	322 (32%)
Hypertension, N (%)	589 (59%)
Smoking, N (%)	493 (49%)
Hyperlipidemia, N (%)	670 (67%)
Previous PCI, N (%)	122 (12%)
Left main coronary artery disease	63 (6%)
Clinical manifestation	
Stable angina, N (%)	742 (74%)
Unstable angina, N (%)	219 (22%)
Non-ST elevation MI, N (%)	39 (4%)

# Lesion Characteristics (overall lesions)

Lesion location	N=1129
Syntax No 5 (LMCA)	63 (6%)
Syntax No 6 (proximal LAD)	236 (21%)
Syntax No 7 (mid LAD)	432 (38%)
Syntax No 8 (distal LAD)	36 (3%)
Syntax No 11 (proximal LCX)	39 (3%)
Syntax No 13 (distal LCX)	60 (5%)
Syntax No 1 (proximal RCA)	111 (10%)
Syntax No 2 (mid RCA)	114 (10%)
Syntax No 3 (distal RCA)	38 (3%)
FFR in non-left main lesions	0.82±0.09
FFR in left main lesions	0.80±0.09
FFR <0.80	368 (32.6%)

# QCA and IVUS Data in 1066 Non-LM Lesions


Angiographic findings	
Proximal reference lumen diameter, mm	3.4±0.5
Distal reference lumen diameter, mm	2.8±0.5
Minimal lumen diameter, mm	1.5±0.4
Diameter stenosis, %	51.4±12.2
Lesion length (mm)	19.4±12.2
IVUS findings	
Proximal reference mean lumen area, mm <sup>2</sup>	9.10±3.3
Proximal reference mean EEM area, mm <sup>2</sup>	15.6±4.9
Distal reference mean lumen area, mm <sup>2</sup>	7.3±2.9
Distal reference mean EEM area, mm <sup>2</sup>	11.4±4.9
Minimal lumen area, mm <sup>2</sup>	2.7±1.2
Plaque burden at the minimal lumen area site, %	73.6±12.1
Plaque rupture	123 (11.5%)

# QCA and IVUS Data in 63 LM Lesions


<b>Angiographic findings</b>	
Proximal reference lumen diameter, mm	3.8±0.6
Distal reference lumen diameter, mm	3.4±0.5
Minimal lumen diameter, mm	1.9±0.5
Diameter stenosis, %	47.0±11.1
Lesion length (mm)	11.1±8.3
<b>IVUS findings</b>	
EEM at the minimal lumen area site, mm <sup>2</sup>	18.0±5.4
Minimal lumen area, mm <sup>2</sup>	5.0±2.1
Plaque burden at the minimal lumen area site, %	70.3±14.4
Plaque rupture	22 (34.9%)

# How many Mismatches ?


1066 Non-LM lesions



63 LM lesions




# Frequencies of Mismatch




# Cut-off of QCA-DS to Predict FFR <0.80

## Non-LMCA



Sensitivity 66%  
Specificity 67%  
PPV 48%  
NPV 81%  
Accuracy 66%

## LMCA



Sensitivity 61%  
Specificity 59%  
Accuracy 60%

# Correlations of Variables with FFR

	Non-LM lesions		LM lesions	
	r	p	r	p
Angiographic DS	-0.395	p<0.001	-0.428	p<0.001
Angiographic MLD	0.414	p<0.001	0.436	p<0.001
Lesion length	-0.235	p<0.001	-0.216	0.089
Minimal lumen area	0.467	p<0.001	0.560	p<0.001
Plaque burden	-0.350	p<0.001	-0.473	p<0.001

# - Multivariable Analysis - Why Mismatches

# Independent Factors for “Mismatch”

	Beta	SE	p-value	Adjusted OR	95% CI
Age	0.040	0.012	<0.001	1.040	1.017 – 1.064
Female	0.430	0.250	0.085	1.537	0.942 – 2.508
LAD location	-1.094	0.227	<0.001	0.335	0.214 – 0.522
Plaque rupture	-0.956	0.334	0.004	0.385	0.200 – 0.740
Lesion length	-0.033	0.008	<0.001	0.966	0.950 – 0.982
IVUS-MLA	0.687	0.189	0.001	1.989	1.371 – 2.886
Plaque burden	-0.050	0.014	<0.001	0.951	0.926 – 0.977
QCA-MLD	0.086	0.040	0.034	1.089	1.007 – 1.179

\* assessed by GEE in 937 patients with 1066. non-LMCA lesions  
 included age, female gender, lesions length, LAD location, proximal segment, plaque rupture,  
 RLD, MLA, plaque burden, and averaged RLD

# Independent Factors Predicting “Reverse-Mismatch”

	Beta	SE	p-value	Adjusted OR	95% CI
Age	-0.044	0.015	0.003	0.957	0.929 – 0.985
LAD location	1.691	0.457	<0.001	5.427	2.216 – 13.29
Plaque rupture	1.150	0.452	0.011	3.159	1.301 – 7.667
IVUS-MLA	-1.064	0.203	<0.001	0.345	0.232 – 0.514
Plaque burden	0.032	0.014	0.027	1.032	1.003 – 1.061

- \* assessed by GEE in 937 patients with 1066. non-LMCA lesions
- included age, female gender, lesions length, LAD location, proximal segment, plaque rupture, RLD, MLA, plaque burden, and averaged RLD

# Independent Predictors

## -Multivariable Analysis-

### Mismatch

- Older age
- Non-LAD location
- Shorter lesion length
- Larger MLA by IVUS
- Larger MLD by QCA
- Smaller PB

### Reverse-Mismatch

- Younger age
- LAD location
- Plaque Rupture
- Smaller MLA by IVUS
- Larger PB

# Conclusions

- The discrepancy between coronary angiography and FFR, was attributable to various clinical and lesion-specific factors frequently unrecognizable in diagnostic coronary angiography.
- Thus, FFR, a clinical ischemia index integrating various local factors, is more reliable than angiographically determined stenosis severity.

A landscape photograph showing a range of mountains in the background, their peaks obscured by a light blue haze. In the foreground, there are dark, silhouetted mountain ridges covered in dense forests. The overall color palette is cool, dominated by blues and greens.

Thank You !!

summitMD.com

# - Univariate Analysis - Why Mismatches

# Comparison of Clinical Data

	QCA-DS>50%		QCA-DS≤50%	
	FFR<0.80	FFR≥0.80 <i>Mismatch</i>	FFR≥0.80	FFR<0.80 <i>Rev-mismatch</i>
N	262	343	386	75
Age (years)	59.7±10.0	62.1±10.0 <sup>#</sup>	62.9±9.2	59.7±10.0*
Female, N (%)	55 (21%)	107 (31%) <sup>#</sup>	103 (27%)	13 (17%)
Diabetes, N (%)	82 (31%)	111 (32%)	121 (31%)	17 (23%)
Hypertension, N (%)	157 (60%)	201 (59%)	227 (59%)	43 (57%)
Smoking, N (%)	142 (54%)	160 (47%)	195 (51%)	45 (60%)
ACS, N (%)	72 (28%)	101 (29%)	115 (30%)	20 (27%)
LAD, N (%)	201 (77%)	191 (56%) <sup>#</sup>	246 (64%)	66 (88%)*
LCX, N (%)	14 (5%)	49 (14%) <sup>#</sup>	30 (8%)	6 (8%)
RCA, N (%)	47 (18%)	103 (30%) <sup>#</sup>	110 (29%)	3 (4%)*

# *p value* <0.05, vs. 262 lesions with QCA-DS>50 and FFR<0.80

\* *p value* <0.05, vs. 386 lesions with QCA-DS≤50% and FFR≥0.80

# Comparison of QCA and IVUS Findings

	QCA-DS>50%		QCA-DS≤50%	
	FFR<0.80	FFR≥0.80 <i>Mismatch</i>	FFR≥0.80	FFR<0.80 <i>Rev-mismatch</i>
N	262	343	386	75
Proximal segment	91 (35%)	129 (38%)	139 (36%)	27 (36%)
Distal segment	29 (11%)	58 (17%) <sup>#</sup>	42 (11%)	5 (7%)
Lesions length, mm	24.1±13.4	18.8±10.6 <sup>#</sup>	16.7±11.2	19.3±12.3
QCA-DS, %	62.3±9.2	57.6±7.4 <sup>#</sup>	40.1±6.6	43.2±5.2*
QCA-MLD, mm	1.2±0.3	1.4±0.3 <sup>#</sup>	1.9±0.3	1.7±0.3*
Averaged RLD, mm	3.1±0.5	3.2±0.5 <sup>#</sup>	3.1±0.5	3.0±0.5*
MLA, mm <sup>2</sup>	1.9±0.7	2.6±0.9 <sup>#</sup>	3.4±1.3	2.4±0.8*
Plaque burden, %	80.8±8.7	74.7±9.9 <sup>#</sup>	67.8±13.0	73.1±12.1*
Plaque rupture	44 (17%)	35 (10%) <sup>#</sup>	32 (8%)	12 (16%)*

# *p value* <0.05, vs. 262 lesions with QCA-DS>50 and FFR<0.80

\* *p value* <0.05, vs. 386 lesions with QCA-DS≤50% and FFR≥0.80

# Comparison of Clinical Data in LM

	QCA-DS>50%		QCA-DS≤50%	
	FFR<0.80	FFR≥0.80 <i>Mismatch</i>	FFR≥0.80	FFR<0.80 <i>Rev-mismatch</i>
N	15	8	24	16
Age (years)	61.8±11.5	63.8±10.3	60.8±12.4	56.1±9.8
Age (years)	4 (27%)	2 (25%)	9 (38%)	2 (13%)
Female, N (%)	5 (33%)	2 (25%)	98 (33%)	6 (38%)
Diabetes, N (%)	11 (73%)	3 (38%)	12 (50%)	8 (50%)
Hypertension, N (%)	8 (53%)	5 (62%)	9 (38%)	12 (75%)*
ACS, N	8 (53%)	2 (25%)	13 (54%)	7 (44%)

# *p value <0.05, vs. 15 lesions with QCA-DS>50 and FFR<0.80*

\* *p value <0.05, vs. 24 lesions with QCA-DS≤50% and FFR≥0.80*

# Comparison of QCA and IVUS in LM

	QCA-DS>50%		QCA-DS≤50%	
	FFR<0.80	FFR≥0.80 <i>Mismatch</i>	FFR≥0.80	FFR<0.80 <i>Rev-mismatch</i>
N	15	8	24	16
Lesions length, mm	14.7±13.4	6.5±1.9	9.4±5.1	12.8±6.4
QCA-DS, %	60.0±7.8	55.9±8.4	40.0±6.8	41.3±5.7
QCA-MLD, mm	1.4±0.3	1.6±0.4	2.3±0.4	2.1±0.4
Averaged RLD, mm	3.5±0.5	3.7±0.6	3.6±0.5	3.5±0.5
MLA, mm <sup>2</sup>	3.4±1.6	4.8±1.6 <sup>#</sup>	6.6±2.0	4.2±1.4*
Plaque burden, %	81.0±8.4	69.5±18.3	61.2±14.3	73.1±9.6*
EEM area, mm <sup>2</sup>	18.3±3.8	19.4±8.7	18.8±5.8	16.1±3.5
Plaque rupture	10 (67%)	3 (38%)	4 (17%)	8 (50%)*

# *p value* <0.05, vs. 15 lesions with QCA-DS>50 and FFR<0.80

\* *p value* <0.05, vs. 24 lesions with QCA-DS≤50% and FFR≥0.80