



## **King's Research Portal**

DOI: 10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.124.014477

Document Version Peer reviewed version

Link to publication record in King's Research Portal

Citation for published version (APA):

Sinha, A., Rahman, H., Demir, O., De Silva, K., Morgan, H., Li Kam Wa, M., Ryan, M., Ezad, S., Al-Khayatt, B., Ellis, H., Chiribiri, A., Webb, A., & Perera, D. (2024). Microvascular Resistance Reserve Predicts Myocardial Ischemia and Response to Therapy in Patients With Angina and Nonobstructive Coronary Arteries. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Interventions*, *17*(9), 866-868. Article e014477. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.124.014477

#### Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

#### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

#### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1	Microvascular resistance reserve predicts myocardial ischemia and response to therapy
2	in patients with angina and nonobstructive coronary arteries
3	Running title: diagnostic and therapeutic thresholds of MRR in ANOCA
4	
5	Aish Sinha <sup>1</sup> MRCP PhD, Haseeb Rahman <sup>1</sup> MRCP PhD, Ozan M Demir <sup>1</sup> MRCP PhD, Kalpa
6	De Silva <sup>2</sup> FRCP PhD, Holly P Morgan <sup>1</sup> MBBS MRCP, Matthew Emile LiKamWa <sup>1</sup> MBBS
7	MRCP, Matthew Ryan <sup>1</sup> MRCP PhD, Saad Ezad <sup>1</sup> MBBS MRCP, Becker Al-Khayatt <sup>1</sup> MBBS
8	MRCP, Howard Ellis <sup>1</sup> BSc, Amedeo Chiribiri <sup>1</sup> MRCP PhD, Andrew J Webb <sup>1,2</sup> MRCP PhD,
9	Divaka Perera <sup>1,2</sup> FRCP MD
10	
11	1. British Heart Foundation Centre of Excellence and National Institute for Health Research
12	Biomedical Research Centre at the School of Cardiovascular Medicine and Sciences, King's
13	College London, London, UK
14	2. Guys' and St. Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, Westminster Bridge Road, London, UK
15	
16	Address for correspondence
17	Professor Divaka Perera, Department of Cardiology, St Thomas' Hospital, London SE1 7EH,
18	UK. Email: divaka.perera@kcl.ac.uk. Tel: +4420 71881048.
19	
20	Keywords
21	Microvascular resistance reserve, coronary flow reserve, coronary physiology, thresholds
22	
23	Subject terms
24	Coronary vessels, angina, coronary artery disease

## 25 Non-standard Abbreviations and Acronyms

- 26 ANOCA: angina with nonobstructive coronary arteries
- 27 CFR: coronary flow reserve
- 28 CMD: coronary microvascular disease
- 29 MRR: microvascular resistance reserve

30

31

32 Coronary microvascular disease (CMD) is associated with an impaired quality of life and heightened risk of adverse cardiovascular outcomes. The hallmark of CMD is a diminished 33 coronary flow reserve<sup>1</sup> (CFR) and CFR<2.5 predicts maladaptive exercise physiology, 34 ischemia on noninvasive assessment and response to anti-ischemic therapy with excellent 35 accuracy<sup>1,2</sup>. However, CFR is affected by the conductance of both the epicardial and 36 microvascular compartments. Microvascular resistance reserve (MRR) is a novel 37 microcirculation-specific coronary physiologic parameter<sup>3,4</sup>; however, the diagnostic and 38 therapeutic thresholds in patients with angina and nonobstructive coronary arteries (ANOCA) 39 40 are yet to be established.

41

We assessed the diagnostic accuracy of MRR at predicting abnormal exercise physiology, 42 43 inducible ischemia and response to anti-ischemic therapy in patients with ANOCA. We have previously published the inclusion criteria and study protocols<sup>1,2</sup> but in brief, we recruited 44 patients with ANOCA who underwent simultaneous measurement of intracoronary pressure 45 and Doppler flow velocity at rest and during hyperemia. The first cohort (n=85) underwent 46 stress perfusion cardiac magnetic resonance (CMR) imaging and invasive coronary physiology 47 assessment during supine bicycle exercise. Maladaptive exercise physiology was defined as 48 impaired coronary perfusion efficiency during exercise, and myocardial ischemia was defined 49 50 as endocardial-to-epicardial perfusion ratio <1.0 during hyperemia on CMR<sup>1</sup>. The second cohort (n=87) underwent blinded coronary physiology assessment and were randomized into a 51 crossover anti-ischemic therapy trial; response to therapy was defined as  $\geq 60$  seconds 52 increment in exercise time from baseline<sup>2</sup>. This study was approved by the National Health 53 54 Service Research Ethics Committee (references 20/LO/1294 and 17/LO/0203) and written informed consent was obtained from all patients prior to enrolment. The data that support the 55 findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. 56

- 57
- 58 MRR was derived as  $(CFR/FFR) \times (Pa_{rest}/Pa_{hyper})$
- 59 *CFR: ratio of average peak velocity at hyperemia and rest*
- 60 FFR: ratio of distal coronary pressure to aortic pressure during hyperemia
- 61 *Parest/Pahyper: ratio of aortic pressure during rest and hyperemia*
- 62

Binary logistic regression was performed to test if MRR was associated with exercise
physiology, inducible ischemia and response to anti-ischemic therapy using univariable
analysis and reported as odds ratio (95% CI). The Youden's index in receiver operating
characteristic curves was used to identify the optimal MRR threshold. The accuracy of optimal
CFR and MRR thresholds was calculated as [(true positives + true negatives) ÷ (true positives
+ true negatives + false positives + false negatives)] x 100.

69

70 Of the 85 patients enrolled in the first cohort (age 57±10, females 78%), 45 had a CFR<2.5 and 40 had a CFR≥2.5. FFR was 0.92±0.05 and MRR was 3.0±0.9. MRR was independently 71 associated with maladaptive exercise physiology (odds ratio (95% CI) 0.85 (0.78, 0.93), 72 p<0.01) and ischemia on CMR (odds ratio (95% CI) 0.94 (0.88, 1.00), p=0.04) (per 0.1 unit 73 increase in MRR). The optimal MRR threshold was 3.0 to predict maladaptive exercise 74 physiology (sensitivity 75% (95% CI 60%, 86%) and specificity 95% (95% CI 77%, 100%)) 75 and 3.2 to predict ischemia on CMR (sensitivity 83% (95% CI 70%, 93%) and specificity 56% 76 (95% CI 35%, 76%)). CFR was numerically better than MRR at predicting maladaptive 77 exercise physiology (AUC 0.90 (95% CI 0.82, 0.98) vs 0.86 (95% CI 0.77, 0.94), p=0.07), with 78 79 diagnostic accuracies of 86% (95% CI 75%, 93%) and 80% (95% CI 68%, 88%) of the CFR<2.5 and MRR<3.0 thresholds, respectively. CFR and MRR predicted ischemia on CMR 80 with similar accuracy (AUC 0.70 (95% CI 0.56, 0.84) vs 0.70 (95% CI 0.57, 0.84), p=0.85), 81

with diagnostic accuracies of 70% (95% CI 57%, 80%) and 71% (95% CI 59%, 82%) of the
CFR<2.5 and MRR<3.2 thresholds, respectively (Figure 1).</li>

84

Of the 87 patients enrolled in the second cohort (age 61±8, females 62%), 57 had a CFR<2.5 85 and 30 had a CFR≥2.5. FFR was 0.92±0.05 and MRR was 2.7±0.7. MRR was independently 86 associated with a response to anti-ischemic therapy (odds ratio (95% CI) 0.93 (0.87, 1.00), 87 p=0.04) (per 0.1 unit increase in MRR). The optimal MRR threshold to predict a response was 88 2.9 (sensitivity 77% (95% CI 61%, 89%) and specificity 50% (95% CI 33%, 67%)). CFR was 89 numerically better at predicting response to anti-ischemic therapy than MRR (AUC 0.68 (95% 90 CI 0.56, 0.81) vs 0.62 (95% CI 0.50, 0.75), p=0.07), with diagnostic accuracies of 68% (95% 91 92 CI 57%, 78%) and 64% (95% CI 52%, 75%) of the CFR<2.5 and MRR<2.9 thresholds, 93 respectively (Figure 1).

94

Our study demonstrates, for the first time, that MRR predicts maladaptive exercise physiology, 95 inducible ischemia and response to anti-ischemic therapy in patients with ANOCA. 96 Notwithstanding the fact that MRR is a continuous variable, the diagnostic and therapeutic 97 98 thresholds we have found could be adopted in clinical practice and future research studies. These thresholds are very similar to that which was recently reported as predictive of adverse 99 outcomes in allcomers with ischemic heart disease (including epicardial and/or microvascular 100 101 disease)<sup>5</sup>. MRR was not superior to CFR in patients with ANOCA but, as MRR is proportional to CFR and inversely proportional to FFR, the most impactful utility of MRR may be in patients 102 with concomitant epicardial and microvascular disease<sup>4</sup>. MRR is a metric that relies on 103 measurement of coronary flow as well as pressure; whilst we used Doppler to estimate flow in 104 our study, continuous intracoronary thermodilution may be an attractive alternative technique, 105

106 especially as it has less inter-operator variability and can be performed without107 pharmacological hyperemia.

108

### 109 Acknowledgements

110 The authors offer appreciation to all study investigators, clinical site staff, and study111 participants.

112

### **Sources of funding**

114 The trial was funded by grants from the Medical Research Council (MR/T029390/1) and

115 British Heart Foundation (FS/16/49/32320).

116

#### 117 **Conflict of interest**

118 None of the authors have any conflict of interest or relationships with industry that could have

119 influenced this manuscript.

120

121

### 122 **References**

123	1.	Rahman H, Ryan M, Lumley M, Modi B, McConkey H, Ellis H, Scannell C, Clapp B,
124		Marber M, Webb A et al. Coronary Microvascular Dysfunction Is Associated With
125		Myocardial Ischemia and Abnormal Coronary Perfusion During Exercise. Circulation.
126		2019;140:1805–1816.
127	2.	Sinha A, Rahman H, Douiri A, Demir OM, De Silva K, Clapp B, Webb I, Gulati A, Pinho
128		P, Dutta U et al. ChaMP-CMD: A Phenotype-Blinded, Randomized Controlled, Cross-
129		Over Trial. Circulation. 2024;149:36-47.
130	3.	De Bruyne B, Pijls NHJ, Gallinoro E, Candreva A, Fournier S, Keulards DCJ, Sonck J,
131		van't Veer M, Barbato E, Bartunek J et al. Microvascular Resistance Reserve
132		for Assessment of Coronary Microvascular Function. J Am Coll Cardiol.
133		2021;78:1541–1549.
134	4.	Mahendiran T, Bertolone D, Viscusi M, Gallinoro E, Keulards D, Collet C, Sonck J,
135		Wilgenhof A, Pijls NHJ, De Bruyne B. The Influence Of Epicardial Resistance On
136		Microvascular Resistance Reserve. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2024; doi:
137		10.1016/j.jacc.2024.05.004.
138	5.	Boerhout CKM, Lee JM, de Waard GA, Mejia-Renteria H, Lee SH, Jung J-H, Hoshino
139		M, Echavarria-Pinto M, Meuwissen M, Matsuo H et al. Microvascular resistance

reserve: diagnostic and prognostic performance in the ILIAS registry. *Eur Heart J*.
2023;44:2862–2869.

142

143

# 144 Figure legend

145	Figure 1. Receiver operating characteristic curves comparing the ability of coronary flow
146	reserve and microvascular resistance reserve at predicting maladaptive exercise physiology,
147	ischemia and response to therapy.
148	AUC: area under the curve; CFR: coronary flow reserve; CMR: cardiac magnetic resonance;

149 MRR: microvascular resistance reserve