

Comparison of Two Different Strategies of Intravascular Ultrasound Guidance during Percutaneous Coronary Intervention; Routine versus Selective

Sang-Wook Kim, MD

Cardiovascular Center, College of Medicine, Heart Research Institute, Chung-Ang University Hospital, Seoul, Korea

Refer to the page 303-308

Intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) is an invasive imaging tool designed to find the maximum of efficiency with the minimum of labor. It provides important procedural information before and after percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI). The lumen, the arterial wall, and the atherosclerotic process within the vessel can be of extensive use. Expert consensus documents prepared by the American College of Cardiology and the European Society of Cardiology have set the standards for the methodology and terminology used in IVUS imaging.^{1,2)} Recently, optical coherent tomography, a light-based imaging technique, has entered the clinical arena. However, there is little doubt that IVUS continues to play a major role in studies on coronary atherosclerosis and the procedural guidance of coronary intervention.

The importance of IVUS was emphasized again during the drug-eluting stent (DES) era. IVUS is useful in assessing lesion length, severity, and plaque morphology before stent implantation, and to optimize the PCI results such as stent expansion, stent apposition, and lesion coverage; as well as for treating possible complications after stent implantation. The stent underexpansion and residual disease of the reference segment were predictive of stent thrombosis, which can be devastating. It is often underexpanded in the

Correspondence: Sang-Wook Kim, MD, Cardiovascular Center, College of Medicine, Heart Research Institute, Chung-Ang University Hospital, 102 Heukseok-ro, Dongjak-gu, Seoul 156-755, Korea
Tel: 82-2-6299-2871, Fax: 82-2-823-0160
E-mail: swivus@gmail.com

• The author has no financial conflicts of interest.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0>) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

DES-treated lesions that develop thrombosis or restenosis, but underexpansion associated with thrombosis is more severe, diffuse, and proximal in location. The repeated DES stenting of in-stent restenosis showed a high rate of cardiac events, with the rates of repeated restenosis for that treatment about 20% for the treatment of restenosed DES. A large necrotic core area may predict high risks for myocardial necrosis after PCI. All of these valuable results represent the fruits of many years of IVUS studies.³⁻⁷⁾ With clinical outcomes depending on the IVUS-guidance, the benefits of IVUS guidance to reduce both DES thrombosis and the need for repeat revascularization have been published. The treatment strategy of DES was impacted by these IVUS results.^{8,9)}

In this manuscript, Seo et al.¹⁰⁾ sought to explore the strategies of IVUS guidance during PCI. The subjects were divided into two groups: routinely IVUS-guided and selectively IVUS-guided. The timing of IVUS imaging was determined by the judgment of the operator (i.e., pre- or post-stent or both). The authors found that PCI under the strategy of 'selective' IVUS-guidance was comparable to PCI under 'routine' IVUS-guidance. Angiographic and clinical outcomes at 1 year were not different between the two groups.

The result of this study should not be considered conclusive, as there remain critical limitations. First, the study has a retrospective design and was non-randomized with a small sample size. The criteria for the routine use of IVUS were obscure. Although IVUS was used after stent implantation in all groups, however, it is necessary to include the pre-interventional IVUS as inclusion criteria in patients with IVUS-guided PCI. Routine use of IVUS should be defined in cases of IVUS guidance at both the pre- and post-stent implantation phases. Secondly, as the authors described, baseline characteristics including gender, dyslipidemia, and vessel territory were different. It showed a lower number of females, a higher percentage of dyslipidemia, and higher left main coronary artery disease in routine IVUS-guided PCI, sufficient to provoke a bias toward inadequate analysis. Thirdly, pre-interventional lesion characteristics were not

included. Pre-interventional angiographic data and IVUS measurements make the results of this study clear. More importantly, IVUS-guided PCI may be helpful in complex lesions such as left main coronary artery disease, bifurcation lesion, and in patients with diabetes and chronic renal disease, etc. Fourth, the procedural indication of post-balloon dilatation was not defined in this study.

Routine IVUS guiding is not necessary in all of PCI, however, the selective use of IVUS may improve clinical outcomes in real world practice.

References

1. Mintz GS, Nissen SE, Anderson WD, et al. American College of Cardiology Clinical Expert Consensus Document on Standards for Acquisition, Measurement and Reporting of Intravascular Ultrasound Studies (IVUS). A report of the American College of Cardiology Task Force on Clinical Expert Consensus Documents. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2001;37:1478-92.
2. Di Mario C, Gorge G, Peters R, et al. Clinical application and image interpretation in intracoronary ultrasound. Study Group on Intracoronary Imaging of the Working Group of Coronary Circulation and of the Subgroup on Intravascular Ultrasound of the Working Group of Echocardiography of the European Society of Cardiology. *Eur Heart J* 1998; 19:207-29.
3. Okabe T, Mintz GS, Buch AN, et al. Intravascular ultrasound parameters associated with stent thrombosis after drug-eluting stent deployment. *Am J Cardiol* 2007;100:615-20.
4. Liu X, Doi H, Maehara A, et al. A volumetric intravascular ultrasound comparison of early drug-eluting stent thrombosis versus restenosis. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2009;2:428-34.
5. Hong MK, Mintz GS, Lee CW, et al. Intravascular ultrasound predictors of angiographic restenosis after sirolimus-eluting stent implantation. *Eur Heart J* 2006;27:1305-10.
6. Kim SW, Mintz GS, Lee KJ, et al. Repeated stenting of recurrent in-stent restenotic lesions: intravascular ultrasound analysis and clinical outcome. *J Invasive Cardiol* 2007;19:506-9.
7. Hong YJ, Mintz GS, Kim SW, et al. Impact of plaque composition on cardiac troponin elevation after percutaneous coronary intervention: an ultrasound analysis. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging* 2009;2:458-68.
8. Roy P, Steinberg DH, Sushinsky SJ, et al. The potential clinical utility of intravascular ultrasound guidance in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention with drug-eluting stents. *Eur Heart J* 2008; 29:1851-7.
9. Claessen BE, Mehran R, Mintz GS, et al. Impact of intravascular ultrasound imaging on early and late clinical outcomes following percutaneous coronary intervention with drug-eluting stents. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2011;4:974-81.
10. Seo JB, Park KW, Lee HY, et al. Comparison of two different strategies of intravascular ultrasound guidance during percutaneous coronary intervention; routine versus selective. *Korean Circ J* 2013;43:303-8.