## It is important to find and treat the vulnerable plaques

## Myeong-Ki Hong, MD, PhD. Asan Medical Center, Seoul, Korea







Artery

## Plaque Rupture









# Question: Is it important to find and treat the vulnerable plaques ?



???

가





## What is vulnerable plaque?







**Underlying Pathologies of "Culprit" Coronary Lesions in ACS patients Ruptured plaques (70%)** Stenotic (20%) Non-stenotic (50%) Non-ruptured plaques (30%) **Erosion Calcified nodule Others/Unknown** 

Naghavi M. Circulation 2003; 108: 1664-72





## Vulnerable plaque



# Rupture of fibrous cap

#### **Superficial erosion**

Welt & Simon: CCI 2001; 53: 56-63



#### Criteria for defining vulnerable plaque, based on the study of culprit plaque

#### **Major criteria**

- Active inflammation
  - (monocyte/macrophage and sometimes T-cell infiltration)
- Thin cap with large lipid core
- Endothelial denudation with superficial platelet aggregation
- Fissured plaque
- Stenosis > 90%

#### **Minor criteria**

- Superficial calcified nodule
- Glistening yellow
- Intraplaque hemorrhage
- Endothelial dysfunction
- Outward (positive) remodeling

Naghavi M. Circulation 2003; 108: 1664-72



#### **Stable vs. Vulnerable Plaque**

#### **Stable (obstructive)**



- Progressively flow-limiting
- Often causes chest pain
- Detected by X-ray angiography
- Main target of interventional therapies (angioplasty, stents)

#### **Vulnerable (non-obstructive)**



- Minimal effect on blood flow
- First symptom is often sudden death
- No established detection method
- Preventative drug therapies; directed therapies still unproven











#### Thermal Heterogeneity is Detected In Vivo in Human Coronary Atherosclerotic Lesions



Stefanadis et al, Circulation 1999



#### **Plaque Composition In ACS**



Schoenhagen et al. Circulation 2000;101:598-603



## **Types of Vulnerable Plaque**

### 1. Plaque rupture

## 2. Lipid pool-like images

## 3. Thrombus alone without above 2 types





## **Definition of Plaque Rupture**

A cavity that communicated with the lumen with an overlying residual fibrous cap fragment





## Definition of Lipid Pool-like Images

A pooling of lowechogenic material or echolucent material covered with a highechogenic layer





## **Definition of Thrombus**

An intraluminal mass having a layered or lobulated appearance, evidence of blood flow within the mass, and speckling or scintillation





## **Question 1: Is it important to find the vulnerable plaques ?**

## Multiple Vulnerable Plaque





#### **Vulnerable plaque in RCA**



#### **Vulnerable plaque in LAD**







#### **Vulnerable plaque in LCX**



## Severity of coronary artery stenosis before AMI

Critical luminal stenosis due to atheroma growth does not cause most ACS.

Rather, thrombosis of a non-critical stenosis caused by lesion disruption causes the majority of ACS.



Welt & Simon: CCI 2001; 53: 56-63



## **Angioscopic study**



Asakura M. JACC 2001;37: 1284-88



## **IVUS** study

The only three-vessel IVUS study in ACS patients:

An incidence of culprit lesion plaque rupture: 37.5% (9/24);

A

At least one secondary (nonculprit) plaque rupture in 79% (19/24) of the patients



Rioufol G, et al. Circulation. 2002;106:804-808.



## **IVUS** study

#### **80% of ACS patients have > 1 ruptured plaque**





Prospective comparison of coronary plaque rupture between stable angina and acute myocardial infarction: a threevessel IVUS study in 235 patients.

Myeong-Ki Hong, Cheol Whan Lee, Young-Hak Kim, Seung-Whan Lee, Ki-Hoon Han, Jae-Joong Kim, Seong-Wook Park, and Seung-Jung Park

Asan Medical Center, Seoul, Korea

Circulation 2004; 110: 928-933





## **Definition of Plaque Rupture**

A plaque with cavity that communicated with the lumen with an overlying residual fibrous cap fragment







#### **Incidence of plaque rupture**









## **Question 1: Limitations**

- Practical definition of vulnerable plaques before plaque rupture
- Non-invasive diagnostic tool (MSCT, MR, et al)
- Other simple biochemical markers suggesting vulnerable plaque (CRP, other inflammatory markers)





# **Question 2: Is it important to treat the vulnerable plaques ?**

• Treatment or not: Lack of data about natural history

• If it is treated, what types of treatment modalities? Medical (Which drugs?), PCI, CABG





Long-term Follow-up





#### Angiographic study: multiple complex plaque



Goldstein JA, et al. N Engl J Med. 2000; 343:915–922.





## Angiographic study

One previous study using coronary angiography:

1. 40% of patients with an AMI had multiple complex plaques,

2. These patients had an increased incidence of recurrent ACS, repeat intervention (particularly of non–infarct-related lesions), and CABG in the subsequent year.



Goldstein JA, et al. N Engl J Med. 2000; 343:915-922.



#### Changes of DS in non-culprit complex plaque as detected at first (I) and follow-up (II) coronary angiography



Lee SG et al, Am Heart J 2004;147: 281-286





#### Change in morphology of complex plaques







Evolution of Spontaneous Atherosclerotic Plaque Rupture With Medical Therapy: Long-Term Follow-Up With IVUS (14 patients, 28 ruptured plaques)



*Conclusions*—Nearly 2 years of follow-up found that spontaneous coronary atheromatous plaque rupture without significant stenosis detected on first acute coronary syndrome healed without significant plaque modification in 50% of cases with medical therapy. (Rioufol G, et al. *Circulation*. 2004;110:2875-2880.)



#### Angioscopic Follow-Up Study of Coronary Ruptured Plaques in Non-culprit Lesions

 The study population was 30 patients with 50 ruptured plaque lesions. The mean angioscopic follow-up period was 13<u>+</u> 9 months.

2) The healing rate according to the angioscopic follow-up period (23% at  $\leq$ 12 months vs. 55% at >12 months, p 0.044).

3) The percent DS at the healed plaque increased from baseline to follow-up (12.3% vs. 22.7%, respectively; p 0.0004).

4) The serum CRP level at follow-up was the independent predictor of healing of ruptured plaques

Takano M, Am J Coll Cardiol 2005; 45:652-8



Serial IVUS Findings in Patients with Untreated Ruptured Coronary Plaques: Evidence of Both Plaque Stabilization and Lesion Progression

Myeong-Ki Hong, Cheol Whan Lee, Young-Hak Kim, Bong-Ki Lee, Jae-Joong Kim, Seong-Wook Park, and Seung-Jung Park

Asan Medical Center, Seoul, Korea





## Clinical outcomes (n=28)

|  | Statin<br>(n=14) | Control<br>(n=14) | Ρ     |
|--|------------------|-------------------|-------|
| <b>Complete healing</b>  | 4                | 0                 | 0.049 |
| Incomplete healing   | 0                | 1                 |       |
| No significant changes   | 10               | 10                |       |
| <b>Progression to a focal</b><br><b>stenosis requiring PCI</b> | 0                | 3                 | 0.11  |







#### **Changes of ruptured plaque area**





## **Predilection site of** Vulnerable Plaque-**Clustering of Vulnerable Plaque**





#### **Coronary Artery Spatial Distribution** of AMI Occlusions





The Site of Plaque Rupture in Native Coronary Arteries: a Three-Vessel IVUS Analysis.

#### Myeong-Ki Hong, Cheol Whan Lee, Young-Hak Kim, Ki-Hoon Han, Jae-Joong Kim, Seong-Wook Park, and Seung-Jung Park

#### JAm Coll Cardiol 2005; (in press)











#### Event-free Survival in **RAVEL**:

Death, MI, CABG, Re-PCI



| _                  | Sirolimus | Control |                  | P-value | # events<br>prevented p<br>1,000 patients |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|------------------|---------|---|
| Overall            | 4.1       | 16.6    |                  | 0.0001  | 124                                       |
| Male               | 4.4       | 16.6    | <b></b>          | 0.0001  | 122                                       |
| Female             | 3,4       | 16.5    | ·                | 0.0007  | 130                                       |
| Diabetes           | 6.9       | 22.3    |                  | 0.0006  | 154                                       |
| No Diabetes        | 3.2       | 14.3    |                  | 0.0001  | 111                                       |
| LAD                | 5.1       | 19.8    | F-F              | 0.0001  | 147                                       |
| Non-LAD            | 3.4       | 14.3    |                  | 0.0001  | 109                                       |
| Small Vessel (<2.) | 75) 6.3   | 18.7    |                  | 0.0001  | 125                                       |
| Large Vessel       | 1.9       | 14.8    |                  | 0.0001  | 128                                       |
| Short Lesion       | 3.2       | 16.1    |                  | 0.0001  | 129                                       |
| Long Lesion (>13.  | 5) 5.2    | 17.4    |                  | 0.0001  | 122                                       |
| Overlap            | 4.5       | 17.7    |                  | 0.0003  | 131                                       |
| No Overlap         | 3.9       | 16.1    | Sirolimus better | 0.0001  | 121                                       |

SIRIUS

TLR Events

TAXUS IV

#### **Restenosis Rate**

Di

R١

|                   |               | RR     | TAXUS | Control | Р       |  |
|-------------------|---------------|--------|-------|---------|---------|--|
| l .               | - <b>I</b>    | 0.30   | 7.9   | 26.6    | <0.0001 |  |
| on-diabetic       | - <b>-</b>    | 0.35   | 8.5   | 24.4    | <0.0001 |  |
| abetic, oral meds | - <b></b> -   | 0.19   | 5.8   | 29.7    | 0.003   |  |
| abetic, insulin   | • <b>--</b> • | 0.18   | 7.7   | 42.9    | 0.007   |  |
| ۱D                |               | 0.42   | 11.3  | 26.9    | 0.004   |  |
| on-LAD            | - <b>i</b>    | 0.22   | 5.7   | 26.4    | <0.0001 |  |
| /D ≤2.5 mm        |               | 0.27   | 10.2  | 38.5    | <0.0001 |  |
| /D 2.5-3.0 mm     | - <b></b> -   | 0.24   | 6.7   | 27.8    | 0.0001  |  |
| /D ≥3.0 mm        | - I           | • 0.45 | 6.8   | 15.2    | 0.10    |  |
| n length <10 mm   | - <b></b>     | 0.29   | 5.6   | 18.9    | 0.01    |  |
| n length 10-20 mm | - <b></b>     | 0.28   | 7.2   | 25.8    | <0.0001 |  |
| n length >20 mm   | - <b>I</b>    | 0.36   | 14.9  | 41.5    | 0.004   |  |
|                   | 0 0.5 1       | .0 1.5 |       |         |         |  |

RR 195% CI

#### IVUS analysis (A: comparison)



#### Meta-Analysis Comparing Drug-Eluting Stents With Bare Metal Stents in 10 Randomized trials of 5,066 Patients with 6-12 Months Follow-up.

| TABLE 2 Clinical Outcomes  |             |         |           |           |          |                                   |           |          |                                 |  |  |
|--|-------------|---------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------|---------------------------------|--|--|
|  | Sample size |         | c   .     |           |          | Outcomes With Drug-eluting Stents |           |          | Outcomes With Bare-metal Stents |  |  |
|  |             |         | Follow-up | Death     | AMI      | Thrombosis                        | Death     | AMI      | Thrombosis                      |  |  |
| Trials   | DES         | Control | (mo)      | (cardiac) | (Q wave) | (1st mo)                          | (cardiac) | (Q wave) | (1st mo)                        |  |  |
| TAXUS-I  | 31          | 30      | 12        | O (0)     | 0 (0)    | 0 (O)                             | 0 (0)     | 0 (0)    | 0 (0)                           |  |  |
| TAXUS-II   | 266         | 270     | 12        | O (0)     | 8 (3)    | 3 (1)                             | 2 (1)     | 14 (3)   | 0 (0)                           |  |  |
| TAXUS-IV   | 662         | 652     | 12        | ND (9)    | 23 (5)   | 4 (2)                             | ND (8)    | 31 (2)   | 5 (4)                           |  |  |
| ASPECT   | 117         | 59      | 6         | 1 (ND)    | 3 (0)    | 4 (4)                             | 0 (0)     | 1 (0)    | 0 (0)                           |  |  |
| ELUTES   | 152         | 38      | 12        | 1 (1)     | 2 (0)    | 1 (1)                             | 0 (0)     | 0 (0)    | 1 (1)                           |  |  |
| DELIVER  | 522         | 519     | 9         | 5 (ND)    | 6 (2)    | 2 (ND)                            | 5 (ND)    | 5 (1)    | 0 (0)                           |  |  |
| RAVEL  | 120         | 118     | 12        | 2 (0)     | 4 (2)    | 0 (0)                             | 2 (1)     | 5 (1)    | 0 (0)                           |  |  |
| SIRIUS   | 533         | 525     | 9         | 5 (ND)    | 15 (4)   | 2 (1)                             | 3 (ND)    | 17 (2)   | 4 (1)                           |  |  |
| E-SIRIUS   | 175         | 177     | 9         | 2 (1)     | 8 (2)    | 2 (2)                             | 1 (0)     | 4 (0)    | 0 (0)                           |  |  |
| C-SIRIUS   | 50          | 50      | 9         | o (oj     | 1 (0)    | 1 (1)                             | o (oj     | 2 (0)    | 1 (0)                           |  |  |
| AMI = acute myocardial infarction; DES = drug-eluting stent; ND = no data available. |             |         |           |           |          |                                   |           |          |                                 |  |  |

#### Katritsis DG, Am J Cardiology 2005; 45: 652-8





#### Effectiveness of Sirolimus-Eluting Stent Implantation for Coronary Narrowings <50% in Diameter

Angela Hoye, MB, ChB, Pedro A. Lemos, MD, Chourmouzios A. Arampatzis, MD, Francesco Saia, MD, Kengo Tanabe, MD, Muzaffer Degertekin, MD, Joost Daemen, Pieter C. Smits, MD, PhD, Eugene McFadden, MB, ChB, Sjoerd H. Hofma, MD, Georgios Sianos, MD, PhD, Pim de Feyter, MD, PhD, Willem J. van der Giessen, MD, PhD, Ron T. van Domburg, PhD, and Patrick W. Serruys, MD, PhD

 A consecutive series of 20 patients were treated with sirolimus-eluting stent implantation for 23 angiographically mild de novo lesions (defined as a diameter stenosis <50% by quantitative coronary angiography).

• At a mean follow-up of  $399 \pm 120$  days, the survivalfree of major adverse events was 95%, with no patient requiring target lesion revascularization. Am J Cardiol 2004;94: 112-114













#### After stent





#### Pre

After stent

#### Angioplasty Summit



#### 6-month follow-up

# In the previous era of bare metal stents

The proximal LAD lesion location was a risk factor for restenosis; therefore, strategies were developed to avoid unnecessary intervention.





# In the current era of drug-eluting stents

• The proximal LAD lesion location is no longer associated with a higher rate of restenosis.

• It may be time to evaluate the clinical efficacy of drug-eluting stent implantation in mild to moderate proximal LAD stenosis lesions with potentially vulnerable plaque.



### **Concepts of Provisional DES implantation for vulnerable plaques**

Transformation of the target plaque *from vulnerable plaque to scar tissue* without any increase of sudden death, AMI and restenosis.





#### cardiac death

#### fatal myocardial infarct

#### Statin Drug-eluting stenting Statin?



?



## **Question 2: Limitations**

- Lack of control group
- Too small number of study patients to draw the conclusions
- in previously published data
- Need for randomized study to compare the efficacy between stent vs. statin with larger number of patients.





### Conclusion

## Combination of 1) Need for systemic therapy (statin), and 2) Consideration of local interventional treatment, additionally and very aggressively





# Thanks for your attention

