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Background

Angiographic based functional lesion evaluation may appear as a cost saving alternative to pressure wire based assessment

Off-line QFR computation has good diagnostic performance and agreement with FFR as reference standard*

In-procedure feasibility and diagnostic performance of QFR is unknown

*Tu et al.; JACC Cardiovasc Interv 2016
Westra et al.; WIFI II, TCT 2016
QFR analysis

QFR is computed from:
• lumen contours in two standard angiographic projections
• contrast flow velocity estimated by frame count during baseline conditions

QFR by Medis Suite, Medis medical imaging. CE-marked. Not approved for clinical use in the US.
QFR analysis

QFR is an estimate of FFR based on:

- fluid dynamic equations
- emulated hyperaemic flow velocity

QFR by Medis Suite, Medis medical imaging. CE-marked. Not approved for clinical use in the US.
Hypothesis

QFR has superior sensitivity and specificity for detection of functional significant lesions in comparison to 2D-QCA with FFR as gold standard
Design

- Investigator initiated study

- Observational
  - Paired acquisition of FFR and computation of QFR
  - Site specific protocol for effective blinding
  - Strict protocol for QFR analysis
  - More than one study vessel pr. patient allowed

- Planned enrolment of 310 patients

- 11 hospitals in Europe and Japan

- Enrolment period: March 2017 to October 2017
# Participating sites

1. **Department of Cardiology, Aarhus University Hospital, Skejby, Denmark**  
   Dr. Niels R. Holm, Jelmer Westra, Omeed Neghabat, Prof. Hans Erik Bøtker, Dr. Evald Høj Christiansen
2. **Cardiovascular Institute, Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Ferrara, Ferrara, Italy**  
   Dr. Gianluca Campo, Dr. Matteo Tebaldi
3. **The Department of Cardiovascular Medicine; Gifu Heart Center, Gifu City, Japan**  
   Dr. Hitoshi Matsuo, Dr. Toru Tanigaki
4. **Department of Cardiology, Medical University of Warsaw, Warszawa, Poland**  
   Dr. Lukasz Koltowski, Dr. Janusz Kochman
5. **Department of Cardiology, Hagaziekenhuis, The Hague, The Netherlands**  
   Dr. Tommy Liu, Dr. Samer Somi
6. **Federico II University of Naples, Naples, Italy**  
   Dr. Luigi Di Serafino, Dr. Giovanni Esposito
7. **Azienda Ospedaliera Sant'Anna e San Sebastiano, Caserta, Italy**  
   Dr. Domenico Di Girolamo, Dr. Guseppe Mercone
8. **Department of Cardiology, Hospital Clinico San Carlos, Madrid, Spain**  
   Prof. Javier Escaned, Dr. Hernán Mejía-Rentería
9. **Department of Cardiology, University Clinic Giessen & Marburg, Giessen, Germany**  
   Prof. Holger Nef
10. **Klinik für Kardiologie und Angiologie, Essen, Germany**  
    Dr. Christoph Naber
11. **Cardiovascular Department, Ospedale dell'Angelo, Mestre-Venezia, Italy**  
    Dr. Marco Barbierato, Dr. Federico Ronco
Study organisation

Study chair: Niels Ramsing Holm, Aarhus University Hospital
Co-chair: Evald Høj Christiansen, Aarhus University Hospital
Co-chair: William Wijns, Lamb institute, Ireland

Steering committee: Study chairs. Site primary investigators

Statistics committee: Morten Madsen, Dep. of Clinical Epidemiology, Aarhus University Hospital

QFR tech committee: Jelmer Westra Aarhus University Hospital

FFR core lab: Ashkan Eftekhari, Institute of Clinical Medicine, Aarhus University

QCA core lab: ClinFact, The Netherlands

Trial database: Jakob Hjort, Institute of Clinical Medicine, Aarhus University

Academic study preparation: Birgitte Krogsgaard Andersen, Aarhus University Hospital

Academic research organization: PCI Research, Aarhus University Hospital
Primary endpoint

Sensitivity and specificity of:

**QFR compared to two-dimensional QCA**

- in assessing functional stenosis relevance

with FFR as reference standard
Sample size

- FAVOR pilot study showed **sensitivity 0.74 and specificity 0.91***

- **Null hypothesis**
  - Specificity (QFR) = Specificity (50% DS 2D-QCA)
  - Sensitivity (QFR) = Sensitivity (50% DS 2D-QCA)

- Beta 0.80, alpha 0.05 and estimated FFR≤0.80 prevalence of 30 %

- 274 patients with paired QFR and FFR were needed

*Tu et al.; JACC Cardiovasc Interv 2016
Secondary endpoints

Diagnostic grey zone estimation

- **QFR** limits to yield 95% sensitivity and specificity with FFR as reference standard

- Feasibility of **QFR** in FFR assessed lesions

- Positive and negative predictive value of **QFR** with FFR as reference standard
Secondary endpoints

Time to FFR vs. time to QFR

- **Time to FFR:** from introduction of pressure wire to final drift check, conforming drift within limits

- **Time to QFR:** from start of image evaluation to completed QFR computation
Methods

Inclusion criteria

• Stable angina pectoris
• Evaluation of non-culprit stenosis after acute myocardial infarction

Exclusion criteria

• Myocardial infarction within 72 hours
• Severe asthma or severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease
• Severe heart failure (NYHA≥III)
• S-creatinine>150μmol/L or GFR<45 ml/kg/1.73m²
• Allergy to contrast media or adenosine
• Atrial fibrillation at time of catheterization
Methods

Angiographic inclusion criteria
- Diameter stenosis of 30%-90% by visual estimate
- Reference vessel size > 2.0 mm in stenotic segment by visual estimate

Angiographic exclusion criteria

Lesion specific
- Below 30% and above 90% diameter stenosis by visual estimate
- Reference size of vessel below 2.0 mm by visual estimation
- Aorto-ostial lesions
- Bifurcation stenosis with lesions on both sides of a major shift (>1mm) in reference diameter

Angiographic quality
- Poor image quality precluding contour detection
- Good contrast filling not possible
- Severe overlap of stenosed segments
- Severe tortuosity of target vessel
Results - Flowchart

CAG (n=329)

Eligible for FFR and QFR (n=311)

FFR and QFR performed (n=296)

QCA core-lab analysis (n=273)

Patients in analysis (n=272)

Excluded based on diagnostic angiography
- Lesions <30% or >90% (n=14)

Exclusion criteria fulfilled
- Atrial fibrillation (n=1)
- Myocardial infarction <72 hours (n=1)

Angiographic criteria
- Ostial RCA lesion (n=1)
- Bifurcation lesions with reference stepdown > 1 mm (n=1)

In-procedure QFR not computed
- Overlap (n=1)
- Insufficient image quality (n=4)
- Protocol violation (n=7)
- Technical failure (n=1)

FFR not measured
- Asystoli (n=1)
- Technical failure (n=1)

Excluded by FFR core-lab
- Drift (n=8)
- Dampening (n=15)

Excluded by QCA core-lab
- No vessel reference identified (n=1)
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline characteristics</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>67 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>196 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking (current or past)</td>
<td>156 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m²)</td>
<td>27 ± 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>201 (74 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperlipidemia</td>
<td>186 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>78 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family history of CAD</td>
<td>73 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejection fraction (%)</td>
<td>56±10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous PCI</td>
<td>109 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous CABG</td>
<td>11 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are n(%) and mean ±SD
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical presentation</th>
<th>Values are n(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCS 0</td>
<td>54 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS I</td>
<td>67 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS II</td>
<td>122 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS III</td>
<td>14 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS IV</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary evaluation of NCPL</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (dyspnea, arrhythmia)</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCS: Canadian Cardiovascular Society grading of angina pectoris; NCPL: Non-culprit lesions
Results – FFR distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFR ≤ 0.80</td>
<td>104 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFR: 0.75-0.85</td>
<td>101 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D-QCA % DS</td>
<td>45 ± 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primary endpoint
Primary endpoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QFR</td>
<td>88% (80-93)</td>
<td>88% (83-92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D-QCA</td>
<td>46% (36-55)</td>
<td>77% (70-82)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons by McNemar’s test

Vessels (n=317)

p<0.001
Results – QFR vs. 2D-QCA with FFR as reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>NPV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QFR</td>
<td>78% (85-69)</td>
<td>94% (97-89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D-QCA</td>
<td>48% (38-58)</td>
<td>74% (67-79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PPV: Positive predictive value; NPV: Negative predictive value
Results – QFR vs. 2D-QCA with FFR as reference

QFR Diagnostic accuracy: 88%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUC</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QFR</td>
<td>0.93 (0.90; 0.97)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D-QCA</td>
<td>0.65 (0.58; 0.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vessels (n=317)
## Results – Feasibility

**Per vessel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feasibility</th>
<th>n=373</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Successful QFR computations in attempted cases</strong></td>
<td>361 (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsuccessful QFR (n=12)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>1 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient image quality</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreshortening</td>
<td>2 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical failure</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of vessels where FFR was measured and QFR attempted but excluding 2 cases with ostial RCA lesions and 4 cases with major bifurcation lesions (exclusion criteria)
Results – Time to QFR and FFR

- Time to QFR: 4.8 m (IQR: 3.5-6.0)
- Time to FFR: 7.0 m (IQR: 5.0-10.0)

P = <0.001
Results – Precision

Mean difference QFR-FFR: 0.01 ± 0.06
Results – QFR-FFR hybrid approach

QFR limits to yield specificity and sensitivity >95% with FFR as reference
Results – QFR-FFR hybrid approach

- Assuming that FFR is required in the diagnostic grey-zone of QFR, pressure-wire free assessment is possible in potentially 68% of all lesions while ensuring >95% accuracy
Conclusion

- QFR showed superior sensitivity and specificity for detection of functional significant lesions in comparison with 2D-QCA using FFR as reference standard.

- In-procedure QFR computation was feasible and was computed within the time of standard FFR measurements.

- Randomized trials are required to determine if a QFR-based diagnostic strategy provides non-inferior clinical outcome compared to pressure wire based strategies.