

## Cardiac MRI & Coronary CTA in 2022

Christopher A. Hanson, MD, FACC

Director of Cardiac MRI; Sparrow Thoracic and Cardiovascular Institute

Assistant Professor of Medicine; Michigan State University College of Human Medicine

## Disclosures

I have no personal or professional financial relationship or interest with any proprietary entity producing healthcare goods/or services.

## Objectives

- Part I Cardiac MRI
  - Overview of common indications and techniques

#### • Part II - Coronary CTA

- Common indications
- 2021 Chest Pain Guidelines



## Part I – Cardiac MRI in 2022

- What does Cardiac MRI (CMR) really offer in 2022?
- Why should I order this study?

## What does CMR really offer?

- 1) Gold standard for the quantitative assessment of cardiac morphology, volume and function
- 2) Tissue characterization
  - Edema (acute, potentially reversible injury)
  - Necrosis or scar (irreversible injury and viability)
  - Infiltration/storage (abnormal tissue components)
  - Pericardial assessment (physiology and tissue assessment)
  - ➤Cardiac mass assessment
- 3) Velocity encoding data (assessing flow through regurgitant lesions, stenosis, etc.)
- 4) Perfusion (rest and stress); we won't touch on this today.

## Cardiac morphology, volume and function - SSFP Imaging

High temporal resolution and excellent contrast of SSFP make it ideal for evaluation of wall motion and volumetric measurement, which require clear delineation between myocardium and blood pool



## - SSFP Imaging





## Imaging the Right Ventricle



## Arrhythmogenic Right Ventricular Cardiomyopathy





## Non-Compaction





## Volume and function



Ventricles	LV	Range	RV	Range
Ejection Fraction (%)	59		52	
Stroke Volume (ml)	90.6		88.9	
End-Diastolic Volume Index (ml/m²)	85.6		95.7	
End-Systolic Volume Index (ml/m <sup>2</sup> )	34.8		45.8	
End-Diastolic Volume (ml)	153		171	
End-Systolic Volume (ml)	62.0		81.7	
Heart Rate (bpm)	68		68	
Peak Filling Rate (ml/s)	513		806	
Peak Ejection Rate (ml/s)	571		661	
Cardiac Output (I/min)	6.2		6.0	
Cardiac Output Index (I/min/m <sup>2</sup> )	3.46		3.39	
Stroke Volume Index (ml/m <sup>2</sup> )	50.8		49.9	
Mass (g)	87(ED)			
Mass Index (g/m²)	49(ED)			
Dyssynchrony Global TUWT	0.75			



Fent G, Plein S. Function. Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging 2016;9:e004589.

# Indications for SSFP imaging

- "Gold standard" for measurements of LV and RV ejection fraction, volumes, and myocardial mass
  - LVEF for chemotherapy monitoring
  - LVEF for ICD
- LVEF and ventricular volumes can help to determine the timing of valvular surgery
  - LV volume for MVR, AVR. etc
- CMR can answer most anatomical questions
- Numerous applications in congenital heart disease
- All of the above can be answered without radiation or contrast!



### **Tissue characterization**

- Necrosis or scar (irreversible injury/fibrosis and viability)
- Edema (acute, potentially reversible injury)
- Abnormal tissue components (infiltration/storage)
- Pericardial assessment (physiology and tissue assessment)
- Cardiac mass assessment



## Inversion Recovery – Late Gadolinium Enhancement

- Inversion Recovery pulses are used to null the signal from a desired tissue to differentiate surrounding pathology
- A common use of this technique is to null the signal from normal myocardium during delayed enhanced imaging
- The nulled normal myocardium will be dark in contrast to the enhanced abnormal myocardium







Late Gadolinium Enhancement (LGE) = Scar or Fibrosis

## LGE (scar) Assessment



Cummings KW, et al. RadioGraphics 2009;29:89–103.



## Myocardial Infarction



## Acute Coronary Syndrome Complications

#### Thrombus

• LV aneurysm and pseudoaneurysm







## Myocardial Viability



Arai AE. Cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging. Totowa (NJ): Human Press Inc; 2008. p. 351-75.

## CTO MID LAD – worth treating?



Complex RCA Lesion - worth treating?



## Parametric Mapping Native T1, T2, T2\*, and Extracellular Volume Fraction



Messroghli DR, et al. J Cardiovasc Magn Reson 2017;19:75.

## Native T1 and Extracellular Volume (ECV) Mapping

- T1 mapping provides a numerical value for the T1 relaxation of the myocardial tissue
- Native T1 and ECV have traditionally served as a surrogate for myocardial fibrosis; however, T1/ECV have a sensitivity to numerous factors including edema, blood volume, myocyte expansion, ECV expansion secondary to protein infiltration, iron deposition, and intramyocardial lipids.
- T1 mapping has been used to identify abnormalities in various disorders, including myocarditis, cardiac amyloidosis, hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, iron overload states, and Fabry disease

Robinson, A.A. et al. J Am Coll Cardiol Img. 2019;12(11):2332–44.



Robinson, A.A. et al. J Am Coll Cardiol Img. 2019;12(11):2332-44.



#### Messroghli DR, et al. J Cardiovasc Magn Reson 2017;19:75.

## T2 Mapping

- T2 mapping can be used to identify myocardial edema in patients with acute myocardial infarction, myocarditis, stress cardiomyopathy, cardiac sarcoidosis, and cardiac allograft rejection.
- T2 elevation is now included in CMR criteria for myocarditis

Thavendiranathan P, et al. Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging 2012;5:102–110.



## T2\* Mapping

- T2\* mapping calculates the T2\* time of tissue
- T2\* times are useful in the evaluation of myocardial iron content and myocardial hemorrhage
- Myocardial iron overload syndromes
  - Hemochromatosis, Sickle cell disease, & ß-thalassemia
- Assessment of chelation therapy (therapy decision and monitoring)
- Acute myocardial infarction
  - Microvascular injury and hemorrhage



## T2\* Mapping for Iron Overload

- T2\* is measured in the interventricular septum
- T2\* >20 ms no iron overload
- T2\* 10-20 ms mild to moderate iron overload
- T2\* <10 ms severe iron overload



J Cardiovasc Magn Reson. 2015;17:102.

## Iron Overload on T1 Mapping





# Clinical examples of tissue characterization techniques

## Myocardial Infarction with Nonobstructive Coronary Arteries



Small subendocardial infarction



Myocarditis



Stress-induced cardiomyopathy with diffuse edema

## Myocarditis – Lake Louise Criteria



#### Ferreira V.M., et al. JACC 2018;72:3158-3176.

## Myocarditis - Case

- 25-y.o male with dyspnea, chest pain, and palpitations
- Normal ECG
- hs-cTnT 2,000 -> peak 10,000
- Normal TTE
- ICA or Cath? How about Cardiac MRI!




#### Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy (HCM)

- Reliably assess LV morphology, including maximal LV wall thickness
- Determine subtype of HCM
- Further inform risk stratification with assessment of extent of LGE (given the emerging data supporting extensive LGE as a marker of arrhythmic risk and sudden cardiac death



#### Etiology Assessment in HCM



Gati et al. JACC Cardiovasc Imaging. 2018;11(2 Pt 1):247-59

#### LVOT Obstruction – is this HOCM?



#### Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy

- Two broad and distinct subtypes are commonly found: reverse septal curvature and isolated basal septal hypertrophy
- Reverse septal curvature morphology has more LGE, interstitial fibrosis, and genotype positivity



Reverse septal curvature

Isolated basal septal hypertrophy

Neubauer & Kramer et al. "Distinct Subgroups in Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy in the NHLBI HCM Registry." *JACC* vol. 74,19 (2019): 2333-2345.

#### LGE in HCM

- LGE identifies fibrosis/scarring that contributes to risk stratification for HCM
- >15% LGE is significantly related to VT/VF and SCD
- LGE typically occurs in the segments with the greatest hypertrophy



Green JJ, Salerno M, et al. JACC CVI. 2012;5(4):370-7 Chan et al. Circulation. 2014;130:484-495.

#### More Examples of HCM



Apical HCM



Mid-ventricular hypertrophy is identified with SSFP imaging. Apical aneurysm is a common feature associated with midventricular obstruction.

#### HCM vs Athletic Remodeling

- HCM has both cellular hypertrophy and interstitial fibrosis resulting in an increase in ECV
- In athletic hypertrophy, there is predominately myocyte hypertrophy without significant fibrosis resulting in a reduction in the ECV
- Normal ECV values of 25 ± 3% have been reported in healthy individuals





a) ECV map in mid-ventricular obstruction. b) ECV in athletic hypertrophy



Swoboda PP, et al. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2016;67(18):2189-90.

#### Cardiac Sarcoidosis



#### Cardiac Sarcoidosis



#### **Evaluating Cardiac Masses**

#### MR Imaging Tissue Characteristics of Common Cardiac Masses

Cardiac Mass	T1-weighted Imaging*	T2-weighted Imaging*	After Contrast Enhancement (LGE Imaging)
Pseudotumor			
Thrombus	Low (high if recent)	Low (high if recent)	No uptake <sup>†</sup>
Pericardial cyst	Low	High	No uptake
Benign		U	
Myxoma	Isointense	High	Heterogeneous
Lipoma	High <sup>‡</sup>	High <sup>‡</sup>	No uptake
Fibroma	Isointense	Low	Hyperenhancement <sup>§</sup>
Rhabdomyoma	Isointense	Isointense/high	No/minimal uptake
Malignant			
Angiosarcoma	Heterogenous	Heterogeneous	Heterogeneous
Rhabdomyosarcoma	Isointense	Hyperintense	Homogeneous
Undifferentiated sarcoma	Isointense	Hyperintense	Heterogeneous/variable
Lymphoma	Isointense	Isointense	No/minimal uptake
Metastasis	Low	High	Heterogeneous

Note.—Table presents typical characteristics, but all tumors can have atypical appearances owing to altered tissue composition.

\* T1- and T2-weighted imaging signal intensity is given relative to myocardium.

Best seen on EGE images (no uptake) 2 minutes after contrast agent administration (Fig 1).

<sup>‡</sup> Similar to surrounding fat signal intensity and characterized by marked suppression with a fat-saturation prepulse.

<sup>§</sup> However, fibromas are nonenhancing at perfusion imaging because of avascularity.

<sup>1</sup> The exception is metastatic melanoma ,which has a high T1-weighted and a low T2-weighted signal intensity.



Motwani M, et al. MR Imaging of Cardiac Tumors and Masses. Radiology 2013;268:26–43.

#### Pericardial Assessment

- CMR permits direct visualization of the normal pericardium, which measures <2 mm in thickness
- On SSFP imaging, pericardial fluid has a very bright signal in contrast to the dark line of the pericardium
- CMR is ideal for the detection of constrictive pericarditis, pericardial malignancy and congenital absence of the pericardium
- Pericardial enhancement seen after administration of contrast agent is suggestive of an inflammatory process





#### **Pericardial Constriction**





#### Pericardial Constriction



#### **Pericardial Constriction**



#### Velocity Encoding Imaging (Imaging Flowing Blood)

- Velocity encoded gradient echo imaging (VENC), also known as phase contrast imaging, is a technique for quantifying flowing blood
- Measuring the phase shift that occurs as protons in the blood move through a magnetic field, the velocity and direction of the blood can be obtained, and flow quantified
- VENC imaging is used to determine the relative flows in the systemic and pulmonary systems when evaluating:
  - Cardiac shunts
  - Regurgitant flow through a valve
  - Pressure gradients across a stenotic valve (echo is better for this)



#### Velocity Encoding Imaging





#### Cardiac MRI. Available at:

https://introductiontoradiology.net/courses/rad/CardiacMR/index.html

### Qp/Qs Assessment for ASDs and Other Shunts



Cardiac Shunts: ASD, VSD, PDA. Radiology Key 2016.

## Quantification of Aortic and Mitral Regurgitation by CMR

Seth Uretsky. Quantification of Mitral Regurgitation Using MRI. American College of Cardiology. Available at: acc.org





LV EF: 58 % (Normal 52-79%)

Absolute volumes: LV EDV: 202 mL (Normal 70-155 mL) LV ESV: 85 mL (Normal 15-64 mL) LV SV: 117 mL (Normal 47-99 mL) CO: 8.0 L/min (Normal 3.0-6.9 L/min)

Indexed volumes Height 63" (160 cm) Weight 270 lb (122.5 kg)

LV EDV: 92 mL/sq-m (Normal 45-93 mL/sq-m) LV ESV: 38 mL/sq-m (Normal 10-38 mL/sq-m) LV SV: 53 mL/sq-m (Normal 30-59 mL/sq-m) CI: 3.6 L/min/sq-m (Normal 1.9-4.0 mL/sq-m)

#### Aortic Insufficiency Case



Regurgitant fraction = -20%

#### Mitral Regurgitation



L 10.90

#### **Pulmonic Insufficiency**



#### Regurgitant Fraction -53.2 %

#### What does CMR really offer? CMR has a lot to offer!

- 1) Gold standard for the quantitative assessment of cardiac morphology, volume and function
- 2) Tissue characterization

Edema (acute, potentially reversible injury)

Necrosis or scar (irreversible injury and viability)

>Infiltration/storage (abnormal tissue components)

Pericardial assessment (physiology and tissue assessment)

➤Cardiac mass assessment

3) Velocity encoding data (assessing flow through the heart, regurgitant lesions, stenosis, etc.)

#### Coronary CTA (CCTA) in 2022

- Common Indications
- 2021 Chest Pain Guidelines



#### What is a CCTA?

- CCTA is a well-validated and increasingly utilized noninvasive test for the assessment of CAD in appropriately selected patients with suspected acute or chronic coronary syndromes
- In addition to detecting CAD, CCTA is an excellent method to exclude angiographically significant coronary stenoses.









#### Abnormal RCA



#### CCTA reporting CAD-RADS™

- CAD-RADS<sup>™</sup> is an expert consensus document produced by a multi-society, multidisciplinary working group
- Goal of improving communication of CCTA results to referring physicians
- Standardizes the reporting of CCTA
- CAD-RADS<sup>™</sup> can also be used as a decision-making tool





	Degree of maximal coronary stenosis	Interpretation	Further Cardiac Investigation	Management
CAD-RADS 0	0% (No plaque or stenosis)	Documented absence of CAD <sup>a</sup>	None	<ul> <li>Reassurance. Consider non- atherosclerotic causes of chest pain</li> </ul>
CAD-RADS 1	1—24% - Minimal stenosis or plaque with no stenosis <sup>b</sup>	Minimal non-obstructive CAD	None	<ul> <li>Consider non- atherosclerotic causes of chest pain</li> <li>Consider preventive therapy and risk factor modification</li> </ul>
CAD-RADS 2	25–49% Mild stenosis	Mild non-obstructive CAD	None	<ul> <li>Consider non- atherosclerotic causes of chest pain</li> <li>Consider preventive therapy and risk factor modification, particularly for patients with non- obstructive plaque in multiple segments.</li> </ul>
CAD-RADS 3	50–69% stenosis	Moderate stenosis	Consider functional assessment	<ul> <li>Consider symptom-guided anti-ischemic and preventive pharmacotherapy as well as risk factor modification per guideline-directed care<sup>c</sup></li> <li>Other treatments should be considered per guideline-directed care<sup>c</sup></li> </ul>
CAD-RADS 4	A - 70–99% stenosis or B - Left main >50% or 3- vessel obstructive (≥70%) disease	Severe stenosis	A: Consider ICA <sup>d</sup> or functional assessment B: ICA is recommended	<ul> <li>Consider symptom-guided anti-ischemic and preventive pharmacotherapy as well as risk factor modification per guideline-directed care<sup>c</sup></li> <li>Other treatments (including options of revascularization) should be considered per guideline-directed care<sup>c</sup></li> </ul>
CAD-RADS 5	100% (total occlusion)	Total coronary occlusion	Consider ICA and/or viability assessment	<ul> <li>Consider symptom-guided anti-ischemic and preventive pharmacotherapy as well as risk factors modification per guideline-directed care<sup>c</sup></li> <li>Other treatments (including options of revascularization) should be considered per guideline-directed care<sup>c</sup></li> </ul>
CAD-RADS N	Non-diagnostic study	Obstructive CAD cannot be excluded	Additional or alternative evaluation may be needed	

#### CAD-RADS<sup>™</sup> Examples



#### CAD-RADS<sup>™</sup> Examples







<30 HU

# High Risk Features on CCTA



#### Observational Trials in the ED

Study	N	Scanner	ACS risk	Inclusion criteria	ACS definition	ACS rate	Outcome (follow-up)	CT criterion	SE (%)	SP (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)
Rubinshtein, et al	58	64-CT	Intermediate	Negative troponin; normal ECG	CAG≥50%, positive troponins or positive stress test	34%	MACE (15 months)	Stenosis ≥50%	100	92	87	100
Gallagher, et al	85	64-CT	Low	Negative troponin; normal ECG	AMI, UA + CAG>70%	8%	Cardiac death or ACS (30 days)	Stenosis >50% CS > 400	86	92	50	99
Johnson, et al	109	64-DSCT	All	Negative troponin; non- ischemic ECG	CAG >50%	14%	ICA (6 months)	Stenosis >50% (per segment)	100	99	79	100
Beigel, et al	340	MDCT	Low- intermediate	Negative troponin; non- ischemic ECG	CAG significant stenosis	4.40%	MACE (5 months)	Stenosis >50%	100	97	65	100
ROMICAT	368	64-CT	Low	Negative troponin; non- ischemic ECG	AMI, UA	8.40%	MACE (6 months)	Plaque	100	92	87	100
								Stenosis >50%	77	87	35	98
Dedic, et al	111	64-DSCT	All	TnT ≤0.15 μg/mL	AMI, UA	17%	AMI or revascularizati on (3 months)	Calcium	89	41	24	95
								Any plaque	100	40	26	100
								Stenosis	89	79	47	97

Rubinshtein R, et al. Am. J. Cardiol 2007;99:925–929. Gallagher MJ, et al. Annals of Emergency Medicine 2007;49:125–136. Johnson TRC, et a. Eur Radiol 2008;18:773–780. Beigel R, et al. Am. J. Cardiol. 2009;103:1481–1486. Hoffmann U, et al. JACC 2009;53:1642–1650. Dedic A, et al. International Journal of Cardiology 2013;167:1597–1602.

#### Indications for CCTA (Most Common)

- CCTA be used as an initial test in patients with stable symptoms suggestive of ischemic chest pain who do not have known CAD
- 2. CCTA can be used as an alternative to invasive coronary angiography in patients with nondiagnostic or equivocal stress test results and persistent symptoms in whom a diagnosis of CAD is uncertain
- 3. Evaluate for coronary anomalies or other anatomic considerations (more common in pediatrics)

#### Indications for CCTA (Intermittently Used)

- As the initial test in patients without known CAD who present with possible ACS when troponin testing and the clinical evaluation cannot exclude ACS
- Or when the cause for troponin elevation is uncertain or strongly felt to be non-ACS in origin
- BUT, CCTA should not be performed in patients with ongoing chest pain who may have ACS - CT suites are not generally equipped to manage unstable patients
- Used to simultaneously evaluate the aorta and pulmonary arteries (triple rule out study)
- Evaluation of bypass grafts

#### Indications for CCTA (Rarely Used)

- Evaluation of coronary stent patency
- Alternative to stress testing or ICA in patients without known CAD with NSTEMI and low-risk presentation (no heart failure or unstable symptoms), and there is a desire to avoid invasive coronary angiography

## 2021 AHA/ACC/ASE/CHEST/SAEM/ SCCT/SCMR Guideline for the Evaluation and Diagnosis of Chest Pain

A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Joint Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines



# Choosing the right test – CCTA or stress testing?

	Favors use of CCTA	Favors use of stress imaging
Goal	<ul> <li>Rule out obstructive CAD</li> <li>Detect nonobstructive CAD</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Ischemia-guided management</li> </ul>
Availability and expertise	<ul> <li>High-quality imaging and expert interpretation routinely available</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>High-quality imaging and expert interpretation routinely available</li> </ul>
Likelihood of obstructive CAD	• Age <65 y	• Age ≥65 y
Prior test results	<ul> <li>Prior functional study inconclusive</li> </ul>	Prior CCTA inconclusive
Other compelling indications	<ul> <li>Anomalous coronary arteries</li> <li>Require evaluation of aorta or pulmonary arteries</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Suspect scar (especially if PET or stress CMR available)</li> <li>Suspect coronary microvascular dysfunction (when PET or CMR available)</li> </ul>

#### Choosing the right test within stress testing

Stress testing information					
	ETT	Stress echocardiography	SPECT MPI	PET MPI	Stress CMR MPI
Patient capable of exercise	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
Pharmacologic stress indicated		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Quantitative flow				~	~
LV dysfunction/scar		~	$\checkmark$	~	~

#### Anatomic vs. Functional Imaging





**Invasive Coronary Angiography** 

ССТА

#### Anatomic vs. Functional Imaging







#### What is CT-FFR?

- Application of computational fluid dynamics to calculate coronary fluid pressure, velocity, and flow
- Noninvasive assessment of the physiologic significance of stenosis – is the lesion hemodynamically significant or not?
- Utilizes routine CCTA images
- Does not require additional medications
- Performed as a separate and incremental analysis of the CCTA

Nørgaard BL, et al. JACC. 2014;63:1145–1155. Chinnaiyan KM, et al. J Am Coll Cardiol Img 2020;13:452–461.





Gulati M, et al. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2021;78:e187–e285.

#### Recommendations for Intermediate-High Risk Patients With Stable Chest Pain and No Known CAD

COR	LOE	RECOMMENDATIONS				
		Index Diagnostic Testing				
	Anatomic Testing					
1	A	1. For intermediate-high risk patients with stable chest pain and no known CAD, CCTA is effective for diagnosis of CAD, for risk stratification, and for guiding treatment decisions (1-12).				
		Stress Testing				
1	B-R	<ol> <li>For intermediate-high risk patients with stable chest pain and no known CAD, stress imaging (stress echocardiography, PET/SPECT MPI or CMR) is effective for diagnosis of myocardial ischemia and for estimating risk of MACE (8,13-35).</li> </ol>				
2a	B-R	3. For intermediate-high risk patients with stable chest pain and no known CAD for whom rest/stress nu- clear MPI is selected, PET is reasonable in preference to SPECT, if available to improve diagnostic ac- curacy and decrease the rate of nondiagnostic test results (36-39).				
2a	B-R	<ol> <li>For intermediate-high risk patients with stable chest pain and no known CAD with an interpretable ECG and ability to achieve maximal levels of exercise (≥5 METs), exercise electrocardiography is reasonable (8,13,15,40-45).</li> </ol>				
2b	B-NR	<ol> <li>In intermediate-high risk patients with stable chest pain selected for stress MPI using SPECT, the use of attenuation correction or prone imaging may be reasonable to decrease the rate of false-positive findings (46-51).</li> </ol>				



Gulati M, et al. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2021;78:e187–e285.

## Thank You!

#### Christopher.Hanson@sparrow.org