Interventional physiology

Cardiac PET to guide PCI

Nils Johnson MD, MS, FACC, FESC

Associate Professor of Medicine Weatherhead Distinguished Chair of Heart Disease Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine and the Weatherhead PET Imaging Center McGovern Medical School at UTHealth (Houston) Memorial Hermann Hospital – Texas Medical Center United States of America



The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston Medical School



Disclosure Statement of Financial Interest

Within the past 12+ months, Nils Johnson has had a financial interest/arrangement or affiliation with the organization(s) listed below.

Affiliation/Financial Relationship

- Grant/research support (to <u>institution</u>)
- Licensing and associated consulting (to <u>institution</u>)
- Support for educational meetings/training (honoraria/fees donated to <u>institution</u>)
- PET software 510(k) from FDA (application by Lance Gould, to <u>institution</u>)
- Patent pending (USPTO serial number 62/597,134)

Organizations (alphabetical)

- St Jude Medical (for CONTRAST study)
- Volcano/Philips (for DEFINE-FLOW study)
- Boston Scientific (for smart-minimum FFR algorithm)
- Various, including academic and industry
- K113754 (cfrQuant, 2011)
- K143664 (HeartSee, 2014)
- K171303 (HeartSee update, 2017)
- SAVI and ΔP/Q methods

Clinical history

- 79 year-old man with new-onset but mild angina
- Risk factors were well treated
 - hypertension (calcium blocker)
 - dyslipidemia (statin)
 - prior tobacco (<10 pack-years)
- Pacemaker 6 years previously for bradycardia
- Subclinical carotid atherosclerosis by ultrasound
- Subclinical coronary calcium by CT (taking aspirin)
- Referred for PET scan

Cold Spot Imaging - spheres 9.5, 12.7, 15.9, 19.1, 25.4, 31.8 mm Jaszczak Phantom



Ideal image:
•Uniform tracer
•Sharp holes
•Smallest defect
0.95mm ≈ 1 cm



Courtesy of K. Lance Gould, MD, UTHealth (Houston)

Cold Spot Imaging - spheres 9.5, 12.7, 15.9, 19.1, 25.4, 31.8 mm Jaszczak Phantom SPECT



Courtesy of K. Lance Gould, MD, UTHealth (Houston)

Cold Spot Imaging - spheres 9.5, 12.7, 15.9, 19.1, 25.4, 31.8 mm Jaszczak Phantom SPECT PET



Courtesy of K. Lance Gould, MD, UTHealth (Houston)



Wikipedia "Goode homolosine projection"

"topographic" PET map (3D into 2D)

3D

make 2D minimal distortion



http://www.sos.noaa.gov/Education/earth_system.html



<u>"atlas"</u> high resolution *"color scheme"* relative uptake



cold saline

cath

lab

time-temperature curve



Conceptual link between PET and FFR



CFR by PET vs invasive FFR

FFR ≈ relative stress flow by PET



Johnson NP, Circ Cardiovasc Imaging. 2016 Sep;9(9). pii: e005435. (Figure 1)

Basic PET with relative uptake





PET flow ≈ "physiologic angiogram"



- Functional total occlusion of the proximal LCx
- Diffuse RCA disease, mid FFR≈0.75
- Moderate proximal LAD, distal FFR<0.6

LAD angiogram and physiology



LCx angiogram



(no FFR due to severity and +PET defect)

Septal

Septal

Septal

Anterior

mean 79%

Anterior

mean 72%

Anterior

RCA angiogram and physiology



PET ≈ "physiologic angiogram"

Fractional Flow Reserve (FFRpet)



Clinical course

- Underwent CABG
 - LIMA-LAD
 - SVG-OM
 - SVG-PDA
- Last clinic follow-up 15 months after CABG
- No angina, working out 3x/week

Case 1. Asymptomatic, 65 year-old

man



 PET performed for <u>research protocol</u> (no symptoms or changes)

Case 2. Asymptomatic, 63 year-old

man



 PET performed for <u>research protocol</u> (no symptoms or changes)

Who has the vulnerable plaque?



- both men aged ~65 years
- both PCI of LAD >10 years previously
- both asymptomatic and stable

Case 1 had vulnerable plaque



- biked 2 days later
- cardiac arrest
- resuscitated
- CABG when recovered





Case 2 had stable plaque





2013

- same PET scan
 for <u>over 15 years</u>
- caths confirm occluded
 2nd diagonal branch

vulnerable versus stable plaque



Why is worse relative defect stable?



* = adjusted for age, standard risk factors, known CAD, BMI, symptoms, EF, perfusion

vulnerable versus stable plaque



Why is worse relative defect stable?

vulnerable versus stable plaque





IMAGING VIGNETTE

Serial Quantitative Assessment of Absolute Coronary Flow and Flow Reserve With CAD Progression to Events

Stefano Sdringola, MD,* Nils P. Johnson, MD, MS,* Jagat Narula, MD, PHD,† K. Lance Gould, MD*



Sdringola, S. JACC Cardiovasc Imaging. 2013 Jun;6(6):735-8. (Figures 1 to 3)



- PCI of LAD
- Residual angina
- Why?



- PCI of LAD
- Residual angina
- Why?

Coronary Flow Capacity Map



- 17% Normal flow capacity comparable to healthy young volunteers. 24% No ischemia. Minimally reduced flow capacity.
- 40% No ischemia. Mildly reduced flow capacity.
- 6% Moderately reduced, sometimes angina or ST Δ with dipyridamole stress. 12% Severely reduced, usually angina and ST Δ with dipyridamole stress
 - (single contiguous region).
 - (10% Myocardial steal)



- PCI of LAD
- Residual angina
- Why?

Coronary Flow Capacity Map



- 17% Normal flow capacity comparable to healthy young volunteers. 24% No ischemia. Minimally reduced flow capacity. 40% No ischemia. Mildly reduced flow capacity.
- 6% Moderately reduced, sometimes angina or ST∆ with dipyridamole stress. 12% Severely reduced, usually angina and ST∆ with dipyridamole stress (single contiguous region).
 - (10% Myocardial steal)





- Non-obstructive LM by cath
- Residual angina
- Why?



- Non-obstructive LM by cath
- Residual angina
- Why?







careful re-review of cath underwent CTA and CABG

- Non-obstructive LM by cath
- Residual angina
- Why?



IMAGES IN INTERVENTION

Noninvasive Flow Reserve to Guide and Verify Percutaneous Coronary Intervention

Colin M. Barker, MD,* Nils P. Johnson, MD, MS,*† Stefano Sdringola, MD,*† K. Lance Gould, MD*†



Barker CM, JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2011 Aug;4(8):932-3. (Figures 1 and 2)