

1 **Comparison of Stress-rest and Stress-LGE analysis strategy in patients undergoing stress**
2 **perfusion cardiovascular magnetic resonance**

3

4 Peter P. Swoboda MBBS, PhD ^a (p.swoboda@leeds.ac.uk), Gareth Matthews MB BChir, PhD ^b
5 (gareth.matthews@uea.ac.uk), Pankaj Garg MD, PhD ^b (p.garg@uea.ac.uk), Sven Plein MD,
6 PhD ^a (s.plein@leeds.ac.uk), John P. Greenwood MB ChB, PhD ^a
7 (j.greenwood@leeds.ac.uk).

8

9 ^a Leeds Institute of Cardiovascular and Metabolic Medicine, University of Leeds, Leeds,
10 United Kingdom

11 ^b Department of Cardiovascular and Metabolic Health, Norwich Medical School, University
12 of East Anglia, Norwich, Norfolk, United Kingdom

13

14 **Corresponding author:** John P. Greenwood MB ChB, PhD, Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular
15 Research Centre and Department of Biomedical Imaging Science, Leeds Institute of
16 Cardiovascular and Metabolic Medicine, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom.

17

18 **Short title:** Stress-rest vs Stress-LGE CMR

19

20 **Abstract word count:** 296

21 **Total word count excluding references and abstract:** 2824

22 **ABSTRACT**

23

24 BACKGROUND

25 Stress perfusion cardiovascular magnetic resonance (CMR) is increasingly used without rest
26 perfusion for the quantification of ischemia burden. However, the optimal method of
27 analysis is uncertain.

28

29 METHODS

30 We identified 666 patients from Clinical Evaluation of MAgnetic Resonance imaging in
31 Coronary heart disease (CE-MARC) with complete stress perfusion, rest perfusion, late
32 gadolinium enhancement (LGE) and quantitative coronary angiography (QCA) data. For
33 each segment of the 16-segment model, perfusion was visually graded during stress and
34 rest imaging, with infarct transmuralities assessed from LGE imaging. In the “Stress-LGE”
35 analysis a segment was defined as ischemic if it had a subendocardial perfusion defect with
36 no infarction. Rest perfusion was not used in this analysis. We compared the diagnostic
37 accuracy of “Stress-LGE” analysis against QCA and the “Stress-rest” method validated in the
38 original CE-MARC analysis. The diagnostic accuracy of the “Stress-LGE” method was
39 evaluated with different thresholds of infarct transmuralities, used to define whether an
40 infarcted segment had peri-infarct ischemia.

41

42 RESULTS

43 The optimal “Stress-LGE” analysis classified all segments with a stress perfusion defect as
44 ischemic unless they had >75% infarct transmuralities (AUC 0.843, sensitivity 75.6%,
45 specificity 93.1%, $P < 0.001$). This analysis method has superior diagnostic accuracy to the

46 “Stress-rest” method (AUC 0.834, sensitivity 73.6%, specificity 93.1%, $P < 0.001$, P-value for
47 difference=0.02). Patients were followed up for median 6.5 years for major adverse
48 cardiovascular events (MACE), with the presence of inducible ischemia by either the “Stress-
49 LGE (>75%)” or “Stress-rest” analysis being similar and strongly predictive (Hazard Ratio
50 2.65, $P < 0.0001$, for both).

51

52 CONCLUSIONS

53 The optimum definition of inducible ischemia was the presence of a stress-induced
54 perfusion defect without transmural infarction. This definition improved the diagnostic
55 accuracy compared to the “Stress-rest” analysis validated in CE-MARC without the need for
56 rest perfusion imaging. The absence of ischemia by either analysis strategy conferred a
57 favorable long-term prognosis.

58 **CLINICAL PERSPECTIVE**

59 *What is new?*

60 Functional ischemia testing, specifically with stress perfusion cardiovascular magnetic
61 resonance (CMR), is an established step in the evaluation of patients with chest pain. This
62 study demonstrates that the rest perfusion imaging can safely be removed from the
63 acquisition and analysis, without compromising imaging diagnostic and prognostic accuracy.
64 For the highest diagnostic accuracy, all segments with stress-induced subendocardial
65 hypoperfusion without transmural infarction should be considered ischemic.

66

67 *What are the clinical implications?*

68 Removal of rest imaging from the stress perfusion CMR examination reduces study duration
69 which could potentially reduce costs, increase throughput, and build capacity to increase
70 access to CMR.

71

72

73 **ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

74

Abbreviation	Meaning
CAD	Coronary Artery Disease
CE-MARC	Clinical Evaluation of MAGnetic Resonance imaging in Coronary heart disease
CMR	Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance
FFR	Fractional Flow Reserve
LGE	Late Gadolinium Enhancement
LVSD	Left Ventricular Systolic Dysfunction
MACE	Major Adverse Cardiac Events
MI	Myocardial Infarction
MPS-SPECT	Myocardial perfusion scintigraphy using single-photon emission computerized tomography
QCA	Quantitative coronary angiography
ROC	Receiver Operator Curve
SCMR	Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance

75

76

77 **INTRODUCTION**

78 Stress perfusion cardiovascular magnetic resonance (CMR) has a Class 1 recommendation in
79 the 2021 AHA/ACC/ASE/CHEST/SAEM/SCCT/SCMR guidelines for the evaluation and
80 diagnosis of chest pain, particularly in those with intermediate-high risk or known
81 obstructive coronary artery disease¹. Conventionally perfusion imaging is performed first
82 during stress with a short acting vasodilator such as adenosine, then again at rest, with
83 segmental hypoperfusion at stress that normalizes at rest being diagnostic for ischemia.

84

85 Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance (SCMR) Standardized Protocols recommend
86 that a minimum of 10 minutes should be left between stress and rest imaging to ensure the
87 hemodynamic effects of adenosine have resolved². A further 5-minute gap between rest
88 perfusion and late gadolinium enhancement (LGE) imaging is advised. Removing rest
89 perfusion imaging from the protocol can therefore save at least 5-7 minutes from the scan,
90 and the standardized protocols advise that this can be done depending on institutional
91 policy and experience.

92

93 The stress-rest ischemia definition has been validated in several studies including Clinical
94 Evaluation of MAgnetic Resonance imaging in Coronary heart disease (CE-MARC), a
95 prospective study of 752 patients who underwent stress perfusion CMR, myocardial
96 perfusion scintigraphy using single-photon emission computed tomography (MPS-SPECT)
97 and invasive coronary angiography³. In this study, ischemia, defined as a myocardial
98 perfusion defect seen during hyperemia but not at rest, was found to have sensitivity of 77%
99 and specificity of 92% compared to quantitative invasive angiography for the detection of
100 significant coronary artery disease (CAD). A major strength of CE-MARC was that all patients

101 underwent both CMR and invasive angiography, and that the CMR data was not used in
102 clinical decision making.

103

104 There has been a recent trend to perform a stress-only protocol in which inducible ischemia
105 is deemed to be present if there is a perfusion defect on stress perfusion imaging but no
106 scar detected on LGE imaging^{2,4,5}. Although removal of rest perfusion from the CMR exam
107 has the potential to shorten the overall study time, its diagnostic accuracy against invasive
108 coronary angiography is not known.

109

110 We hypothesized that when interpreting stress perfusion CMR, “Stress-LGE” analysis has
111 equivalent diagnostic accuracy to the “Stress-rest” analysis that was validated in the original
112 CE-MARC study. We also aimed to identify the optimum threshold of infarct transmuralty at
113 which segments with both infarction and stress-induced subendocardial hypoperfusion
114 should be considered ischemic.

115

116

117

118

119

120 **METHODS**

121 The study design and primary analyses have been published previously^{3,6}. In brief, patients
122 with suspected stable angina were prospectively enrolled if they had at least 1 major
123 cardiovascular risk factor and a cardiologist considered them to require further
124 investigation. By protocol, all patients were scheduled to have CMR and MPS-SPECT in a
125 randomized order, followed by invasive fluoroscopic coronary angiography within 4 weeks,
126 regardless of the treating physician's chosen clinical pathway or prior imaging test results.
127 After invasive angiography, the MPS-SPECT results could be made available on request to
128 enable decision making about revascularization (blinding the treating clinician to this result
129 was deemed unethical); however, CMR results were kept blinded. The study was conducted
130 in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki (2000) and approved by the United Kingdom
131 National Research Ethics Service (05/Q1205/126); all patients provided informed written
132 consent. Extended 5-year follow-up was conducted with approval from the National
133 Research Ethics Service (14/YH/0137) and under Section 251 of the National Health Service
134 Act 2006 (14/CAG/1018). Original data and analysis utilized in the study are available from
135 the corresponding author at reasonable request.

136

137 **CMR acquisition and analysis**

138 CMR was performed on a 1.5T Philips Intera system (Philips, Best, The Netherlands) using a
139 protocol that included stress perfusion (adenosine, 140µg/kg/min for ≥4 minutes), cine
140 imaging, rest perfusion and LGE. CMR coronary imaging was previously shown to have
141 inferior sensitivity and specificity compared to stress perfusion testing, and was therefore
142 not used in this sub-analysis^{3,7-9}. CMR analysis techniques from the original trial, which have

143 previously been described in detail, were used in this analysis⁶. Scans were reported by
144 paired readers with >10 years' experience who were blinded to other tests and recorded by
145 consensus.

146

147 Each segment within the 16-segment model⁶ during perfusion imaging was visually graded
148 at stress and then rest (0 = normal, 1 = equivocal, 2 = subendocardial defect, 3 = transmural
149 defect, 4 = transmural defect and wall thinned). LGE imaging was scored using the same 16-
150 segment model, the presence of any infarction and its pattern described (subendocardial or
151 transmural), and then categorized according to transmurality (0 = normal, 1 = <25%, 2 = 25-
152 50%, 3 = 50-75%, 4 = 75-100%). Manual co-registration was used to localize infarction and
153 ischemia to each of the 16-segments.

154

155 In the "Stress-rest" analysis, as used in the original CE-MARC study, ischemia was defined as
156 an increase in score of ≥ 2 in at least one segment between stress and rest imaging. LGE
157 imaging was not used in the diagnosis of ischemia in this analysis. For the "Stress-LGE"
158 analysis, a segment was defined as ischemic if it had a stress perfusion score of ≥ 2 and no
159 infarction (score 0) on corresponding LGE images (Figure 1). Rest perfusion imaging was not
160 used in the diagnosis of ischemia in this analysis. Diagnostic accuracy was assessed by
161 altering the definition of inducible ischemia according to the infarct transmurality (i.e.
162 "Stress-LGE (>25%) "= stress perfusion score ≥ 2 , LGE score ≥ 1 , "Stress-LGE (>50%) "= stress
163 perfusion score ≥ 2 , LGE score ≥ 2 and "Stress-LGE (>75%) "= stress perfusion score ≥ 2 , LGE

164 score ≥ 3). Ischemia burden was defined as the number of segments by each method that
165 met the definition for inducible ischemia.

166

167 **Invasive coronary angiography**

168 Invasive fluoroscopic coronary angiography was analyzed by two experienced cardiologists
169 blinded to the CMR and MPS-SPECT results. Based on the original trial, significant coronary
170 artery disease was defined as $\geq 70\%$ stenosis of a first order coronary artery measuring
171 ≥ 2 mm in diameter or left main stem stenosis $\geq 50\%$ by quantitative coronary angiography
172 (QCA) (QCAPlus, Sanders Data Systems, Palo Alto, California, USA).

173

174 **Follow-up**

175 Annual follow-up for 5 years was planned for all recruited patients. A detailed medical
176 history since randomization was obtained from all hospital and general practitioners'
177 records, then cross-referenced to information obtained by direct telephone contact with
178 each patient. Mortality and cause of death were obtained from the Office for National
179 Statistics via the Health and Social Care Information Centre. Major Adverse Cardiac Events
180 (MACE) was defined as the composite end point of cardiovascular death, myocardial
181 infarction (MI) or acute coronary syndrome, unscheduled coronary revascularization or
182 hospital admission for a cardiovascular cause (stroke/transient ischemic attack, heart failure
183 and arrhythmia), in keeping with previous studies^{10,11}. Unscheduled coronary
184 revascularization was defined as any revascularization that occurred owing to clinical
185 deterioration and excluded procedures that were planned based on the index coronary

186 angiography results. All clinical events were adjudicated by a clinical events committee that
187 was blinded to any of the CMR results.

188

189 **Statistical analysis**

190 Continuous data are presented as mean \pm standard deviation. Diagnostic accuracy of both
191 methods against QCA was assessed by Receiver Operator Curve (ROC) analysis using the
192 method described by Delong¹². Hazard ratios for MACE were calculated by Cox proportional
193 hazards regression.

194

195

196 **RESULTS**

197 We identified 666 patients from CE-MARC with complete CMR stress perfusion, rest
198 perfusion, LGE and QCA data. By QCA analysis, 262 (39.3%) cases were defined as having
199 significant coronary stenosis.

200

201 **Diagnostic accuracy versus angiography**

202 By “Stress-LGE (>0%)” analysis, where all segments with LGE were considered non-ischemic,
203 the area under the curve (AUC) was 0.825 with sensitivity 71.4% and specificity 93.4%. The
204 diagnostic accuracy of “Stress-LGE” analysis could be improved with incremental LGE
205 thresholds: “Stress-LGE (>25%)” AUC 0.835, “Stress-LGE (>50%)” 0.839 and “Stress-LGE
206 (>75%)” AUC 0.843. The diagnostic accuracy of all these definitions was significantly better
207 than “Stress-LGE (>0%)” (Table 1). By “Stress-rest”, as used in the original study, AUC was
208 0.834 with sensitivity 73.6% and specificity 93.1%. The only “Stress-LGE” analysis to have
209 significantly better diagnostic accuracy compared to “Stress-rest” was “Stress-LGE (>75%)”
210 with a difference in AUC of 0.009 (P=0.02). There were no subgroups of patients, including
211 male sex, co-morbidities, prior MI or left ventricular systolic dysfunction (LVSD), where there
212 was any significant difference in the diagnostic accuracy of “Stress-rest” and “Stress-LGE
213 (>75%)” (Table 2).

214

215 **Ischemia Burden**

216 MI was present in 124 (18.6%) patients, where it affected 2.9 ± 2.1 segments. The ischemia
217 burden by “Stress-rest” was 4.3 ± 2.8 segments and increased according to transmural
218 used in the definition of “Stress-LGE”: for “Stress-LGE (>0%)” 3.9 ± 2.6 segments, “Stress-

219 LGE (>25%)” 4.0 ± 2.7 segments, “Stress-LGE (>50%)” 4.3 ± 2.8 and “Stress-LGE (>75%)” 4.5
220 ± 2.6 segments (Table 1).

221

222 **Patient outcomes**

223 Patients were followed up for a median of 6.8 years, during this time 109 (16.4%) patients
224 suffered at least 1 MACE event. The Hazard Ratio for the presence of inducible ischemia by
225 “Stress-rest”, “Stress-LGE (>0%)” and “Stress-LGE (>75%)” were 2.65, 2.48, and 2.65
226 respectively (Table 3 and Figure 2) for MACE events (all significant at P<0.001). The presence
227 of inducible ischemia was still associated with MACE by all definitions after correcting for
228 the presence of LGE and the LVEF (Table 4).

229

230

231

232 **DISCUSSION**

233 In this study we have performed a new exploratory analysis of data from 666 patients from
234 CE-MARC with complete stress perfusion, rest perfusion, LGE and QCA data. The optimum
235 definition of inducible ischemia was “Stress-LGE (>75%)”; the presence of a stress-induced
236 perfusion defect without transmural infarction. This definition had higher diagnostic
237 accuracy than both “Stress-LGE (>0%)” and “Stress-rest”, the latter being validated in the
238 original CE-MARC analysis.

239

240 In patients with MI, use of “Stress-rest” analysis as the threshold for classifying a segment as
241 ischemic increased the ischemia burden compared with the “Stress-LGE (>0%)” definition,
242 likely reflecting the incorrect classification of sub-segmental peri-infarct ischemia as
243 infarction in the latter. Finally, a positive test was associated with adverse outcomes on long
244 term follow up regardless of whether “Stress-rest” or “Stress-LGE” analysis was used. These
245 results support the use of a “Stress-LGE” image analysis without the need for acquisition of
246 rest perfusion imaging.

247

248 **Diagnostic accuracy of imaging protocols**

249 In this study we have shown that removing rest perfusion from the imaging analysis does
250 not adversely impact diagnostic accuracy measured against QCA, and in fact the diagnostic
251 accuracy can be improved when only transmurally infarcted segments are classified as non-
252 ischemic. The sensitivity and specificity were not significantly different between the two
253 analysis methods (“Stress-rest” 73.6% and 93.1% and “Stress-LGE (>75%)” 73.6% and 93.1%
254 respectively). It should be noted that the sensitivity in this analysis was lower than in the

255 main trial where a positive test was defined by multiparametric findings including LGE and
256 wall motion score³.

257

258 The data from CE-MARC is relatively unique in that all patients had both QCA and stress
259 perfusion CMR. It is therefore ideal to validate the diagnostic accuracy of “Stress-only”
260 imaging. Previous studies have examined the utility of “Stress-only” protocols. Rijlaarsdam-
261 Hermsen et al. reported CMR findings from 642 consecutive patients with chest pain and a
262 non-zero coronary artery calcium score⁴. They reported that “Stress-only” adenosine CMR
263 was associated with a 91% sensitivity and a 99% specificity for the identification of coronary
264 artery disease and showed incremental diagnostic benefit to coronary artery calcium scoring
265 alone. However, invasive angiography was not mandated and was only performed if the
266 stress-CMR was positive, introducing a major selection bias to the data. Additionally, a
267 previous sub-study of CE-MARC, comparing quantitative myocardial perfusion assessments
268 to visual analysis, found no benefit to inclusion of the rest perfusion data to the analysis for
269 the detection of significant CAD¹³.

270

271 **Refining diagnostic accuracy stress-only imaging**

272 Only 18.6% of patients in this study had MI by LGE imaging but the classification of infarcted
273 segments made a large difference to both diagnostic accuracy and ischemia burden. We
274 have shown that for the highest diagnostic accuracy in segments with both infarct and stress
275 perfusion defects, only segments with transmural infarction should be classified as infarct,
276 whereas all segments with sub-endocardial infarction and stress perfusion defects should be
277 classified as ischemic. The fact that this definition of “Stress-LGE” imaging outperforms
278 “Stress-rest” imaging likely reflects the higher spatial resolution of LGE imaging compared to

279 rest perfusion imaging, and therefore the more accurate delineation of peri-infarct
280 ischemia.

281 In the analysis we have only reported our findings segmentally. With advances in perfusion
282 and LGE imaging, there are opportunities to improve the in-plane spatial resolution and
283 increase the number of slices acquired in stress imaging. These advances will allow
284 differentiation of infarct and peri-infarct ischemia on a subsegmental level from a “Stress-
285 only” scan leading to further improvements in diagnostic accuracy.

286

287 Villa et al. examined the impact of reporter experience on diagnostic accuracy. The main
288 determinant of diagnostic accuracy was level of training. Rest-perfusion imaging did not
289 improve diagnostic accuracy, although it did contribute to higher confidence in the results,
290 particularly with the addition of quantitative perfusion maps which are particularly helpful
291 in the exclusion of balanced ischemia¹⁴. Inclusion of rest-perfusion imaging could also still
292 have a role when stress-perfusion imaging is affected by artefact, although this is equally
293 likely to persist in rest-imaging.

294

295 **Prognostic importance of a positive test**

296 In this analysis of CE-MARC the presence of inducible ischemia by either “Stress-rest” or
297 “Stress-LGE (>75%)” was associated with MACE over median 6.8 years follow up (hazard
298 ratios for both 2.65). There is limited data from other studies on the prognostic potential of
299 “Stress-only” imaging but there are several studies which have shown the prognostic
300 importance of inducible ischemia detected on “Stress-rest” CMR¹⁵⁻¹⁷.

301

302 SPINS (Stress CMR Perfusion Imaging in the United States) is a large multicenter
303 retrospective registry of patients undergoing stress perfusion CMR for the evaluation of
304 chest pain. SPINS included data from 2349 patients followed up for median of 5.4 years¹⁸.
305 The protocol did not mandate rest-perfusion imaging (although this was standard practice
306 during the period of recruitment from 2008-2013). In SPINS the presence of inducible
307 ischemia was associated with increased risk of MACE (3.30; 95% CI: 2.67–4.08, <0.0001)
308 which is comparable to the findings of our study.

309

310 The landscape of coronary intervention for stable angina has changed significantly over the
311 last two decades, with the role for PCI as the initial strategy diminishing. The ISCHEMIA
312 trial²¹ showed no additional benefit to PCI in the context of demonstrable ischemia and that
313 a more conservative medical strategy could be safely employed. CE-MARC 2¹⁰ showed that
314 stress CMR was less likely to result in invasive angiography than the contemporaneous NICE
315 guidelines with no difference in MACE rates. MR-INFORM²³ showed that stress CMR guided
316 care resulted in lower rates of PCI than fractional flow reserve (FFR) guided care, with
317 similar rates of MACE. Stress CMR therefore has strong evidence for a role as a gatekeeper
318 test for invasive angiography, and we advocate based on the data presented here this can
319 safely be done without rest perfusion.

320

321 **Clinical benefits of a Stress-LGE imaging protocol**

322 There are several benefits of a “Stress-LGE” imaging strategy. CMR scan time could
323 potentially be significantly reduced if rest perfusion imaging is not acquired, particularly if
324 other rapid image acquisition techniques are used^{25,26}, therefore widening access,
325 decreasing cost, and reducing waiting times. Alternatively, the saved time could be used to

326 acquire flow or mapping sequences, that have greater prognostic relevance than rest-
327 perfusion. Given that stress CMR is recommended in both US chest pain¹ and ESC chronic
328 coronary syndrome²⁷ guidelines, increased demand and streamlined protocols will likely
329 increase capacity and availability. There is also the option to repeat stress imaging without
330 concerns about total contrast dose if the first stress imaging is non-diagnostic. Finally, a
331 “Stress-LGE” strategy is ideal for Regadenoson which, preferably because of its long half-life,
332 requires left ventricular volumes and rest-imaging to be acquired before its
333 administration²⁸. For the purposes of streamlining, LV volumes can be acquired after
334 regadenoson stress, making the scan even shorter (but acknowledging that LVEF may be
335 slightly increased)²⁸.

336

337 **Study Limitations**

338 In addition to the previously reported limitations of CE-MARC^{3,13}, in this analysis we have
339 performed the separate “Stress-rest” and “Stress-LGE” analyses from a single scan. We have
340 used the original segmental analysis of CE-MARC for this study where the scan was reported
341 in its entirety. It is possible therefore that unconscious bias may have affected the
342 segmental reporting, although this may be offset by the consensus methodology used.
343 Perfusion and LGE imaging were not matched for slice location although all 16 segments
344 were covered by both imaging techniques. QCA was used as the reference standard in CE-
345 MARC rather than FFR, as this was standard practice at the time of data acquisition during
346 CE-MARC which predated the major FFR trials. The proportion of patients in this analysis
347 with evidence of prior MI on LGE imaging was relatively small at 19%, which might limit
348 statistical power.

349

350

351

352 **Conclusions**

353 The optimum definition of inducible ischemia was the presence of a stress-induced
354 perfusion defect without transmural infarction. This definition improved the diagnostic
355 accuracy compared to the “Stress-rest” analysis validated in CE-MARC without the need for
356 rest-perfusion imaging. AHA/ACC/ASE/CHEST/SAEM/SCCT/SCMR chest pain guidelines
357 recommend stress perfusion CMR in patients with stable chest pain¹, and these results are
358 reassuring that the absence of ischemia by either analysis strategy confers favorable long-
359 term prognosis.

360

361

362 **SOURCES OF FUNDING**

363 This work was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Leeds Clinical
364 Research Facility. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of
365 the National Health Service, NIHR, or the Department of Health. Dr Swoboda is funded by
366 the British Heart Foundation (FS/CRA/22/23034). Dr Matthews is funded by the NIHR. Dr
367 Garg is funded by the Wellcome Trust. Prof Plein is supported by a British Heart Foundation
368 Chair (CH/16/2/32089).

369

370 **DISCLOSURES**

371 None

372

373 **REFERENCES**

374

- 375 1. Gulati M, Levy PD, Mukherjee D, Amsterdam E, Bhatt DL, Birtcher KK, Blankstein R, Boyd
376 J, Bullock-Palmer RP, Conejo T, et al. 2021 AHA/ACC/AASE/CHEST/SAEM/SCCT/SCMR
377 Guideline for the Evaluation and Diagnosis of Chest Pain: A Report of the American
378 College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Joint Committee on Clinical Practice
379 Guidelines. *Circulation*. 2021;144:e368–e454.
- 380 2. Kramer CM, Barkhausen J, Bucciarelli-Ducci C, Flamm SD, Kim RJ, Nagel E. Standardized
381 cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging (CMR) protocols: 2020 update. *Journal of*
382 *Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance*. 2020;22:17.
- 383 3. Greenwood JP, Maredia N, Younger JF, Brown JM, Nixon J, Everett CC, Bijsterveld P,
384 Ridgway JP, Radjenovic A, Dickinson CJ, et al. Cardiovascular magnetic resonance and
385 single-photon emission computed tomography for diagnosis of coronary heart disease
386 (CE-MARC): a prospective trial. *Lancet*. 2012;379:453–460.
- 387 4. Rijlaarsdam-Hermsen D, Lo-Kioeng-Shioe M, van Domburg RT, Deckers JW, Kuijpers D,
388 van Dijkman PRM. Stress-Only Adenosine CMR Improves Diagnostic Yield in Stable
389 Symptomatic Patients With Coronary Artery Calcium. *JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging*.
390 2020;13:1152–1160.
- 391 5. Nagel E, Chandrashekar Y. Stress-Only CMR. *JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging*.
392 2020;13:1296–1298.
- 393 6. Greenwood JP, Maredia N, Radjenovic A, Brown JM, Nixon J, Farrin AJ, Dickinson C,
394 Younger JF, Ridgway JP, Sculpher M, et al. Clinical evaluation of magnetic resonance
395 imaging in coronary heart disease: the CE-MARC study. *Trials*. 2009;10:62.
- 396 7. Kato S, Kitagawa K, Ishida N, Ishida M, Nagata M, Ichikawa Y, Katahira K, Matsumoto Y,
397 Seo K, Ochiai R, et al. Assessment of Coronary Artery Disease Using Magnetic Resonance
398 Coronary Angiography. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2010;56:983–991.
- 399 8. Schwitler J, Wacker CM, van Rossum AC, Lombardi M, Al-Saadi N, Ahlstrom H, Dill T,
400 Larsson HBW, Flamm SD, Marquardt M, et al. MR-IMPACT: comparison of perfusion-
401 cardiac magnetic resonance with single-photon emission computed tomography for the
402 detection of coronary artery disease in a multicentre, multivendor, randomized trial. *Eur*
403 *Heart J*. 2008;29:480–489.
- 404 9. Ripley DP, Motwani M, Brown JM, Nixon J, Everett CC, Bijsterveld P, Maredia N, Plein S,
405 Greenwood JP. Individual component analysis of the multi-parametric cardiovascular
406 magnetic resonance protocol in the CE-MARC trial. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson*.
407 2015;17:59.
- 408 10. Greenwood JP, Ripley DP, Berry C, McCann GP, Plein S, Bucciarelli-Ducci C,
409 Dall'Armellina E, Prasad A, Bijsterveld P, Foley JR, et al. Effect of Care Guided by
410 Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance, Myocardial Perfusion Scintigraphy, or NICE
411 Guidelines on Subsequent Unnecessary Angiography Rates: The CE-MARC 2 Randomized
412 Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2016;316:1051–1060.

- 413 11. Chowdhary A, Jex N, Thirunavukarasu S, MacCannell A, Haywood N, Almutairi A,
414 Athithan L, Jain M, Craven T, Das A, et al. Prospective Longitudinal Characterization of
415 the Relationship between Diabetes and Cardiac Structural and Functional Changes.
416 *Cardiol Res Pract.* 2022;2022:6401180.
- 417 12. DeLong ER, DeLong DM, Clarke-Pearson DL. Comparing the areas under two or more
418 correlated receiver operating characteristic curves: a nonparametric approach.
419 *Biometrics.* 1988;44:837–845.
- 420 13. Biglands JD, Ibraheem M, Magee DR, Radjenovic A, Plein S, Greenwood JP. Quantitative
421 Myocardial Perfusion Imaging Versus Visual Analysis in Diagnosing Myocardial Ischemia:
422 A CE-MARC Substudy. *JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging.* 2018;11:711–718.
- 423 14. Villa ADM, Corsinovi L, Ntalas I, Milidonis X, Scannell C, Di Giovine G, Child N, Ferreira C,
424 Nazir MS, Karady J, et al. Importance of operator training and rest perfusion on the
425 diagnostic accuracy of stress perfusion cardiovascular magnetic resonance. *J Cardiovasc*
426 *Magn Reson.* 2018;20:74.
- 427 15. Lipinski MJ, McVey CM, Berger JS, Kramer CM, Salerno M. Prognostic value of stress
428 cardiac magnetic resonance imaging in patients with known or suspected coronary
429 artery disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2013;62:826–
430 838.
- 431 16. Antiochos P, Ge Y, Steel K, Chen Y-Y, Bingham S, Abdullah S, Mikolich JR, Arai AE,
432 Bandettini WP, Patel AR, et al. Evaluation of Stress Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Imaging
433 in Risk Reclassification of Patients With Suspected Coronary Artery Disease. *JAMA*
434 *Cardiology.* 2020;5:1401–1409.
- 435 17. Hamon M, Fau G, Née G, Ehtisham J, Morello R, Hamon M. Meta-analysis of the
436 diagnostic performance of stress perfusion cardiovascular magnetic resonance for
437 detection of coronary artery disease. *Journal of Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance.*
438 2010;12:29.
- 439 18. Kwong RY, Ge Y, Steel K, Bingham S, Abdullah S, Fujikura K, Wang W, Pandya A, Chen Y-
440 Y, Mikolich JR, et al. Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Stress Perfusion Imaging for
441 Evaluation of Patients With Chest Pain. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology.*
442 2019;74:1741–1755.
- 443 19. Boden WE, O'Rourke RA, Teo KK, Hartigan PM, Maron DJ, Kostuk WJ, Knudtson M, Dada
444 M, Casperson P, Harris CL, et al. Optimal Medical Therapy with or without PCI for Stable
445 Coronary Disease. *New England Journal of Medicine.* 2007;356:1503–1516.
- 446 20. A Randomized Trial of Therapies for Type 2 Diabetes and Coronary Artery Disease. *New*
447 *England Journal of Medicine.* 2009;360:2503–2515.
- 448 21. Maron DJ, Hochman JS, Reynolds HR, Bangalore S, O'Brien SM, Boden WE, Chaitman BR,
449 Senior R, López-Sendón J, Alexander KP, et al. Initial Invasive or Conservative Strategy
450 for Stable Coronary Disease. *New England Journal of Medicine.* 2020;382:1395–1407.

- 451 22. Al-Lamee R, Thompson D, Dehbi H-M, Sen S, Tang K, Davies J, Keeble T, Mielewczik M,
452 Kaprielian R, Malik IS, et al. Percutaneous coronary intervention in stable angina
453 (ORBITA): a double-blind, randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*. 2018;391:31–40.
- 454 23. Nagel E, Greenwood JP, McCann GP, Bettencourt N, Shah AM, Hussain ST, Perera D,
455 Plein S, Bucciarelli-Ducci C, Paul M, et al. Magnetic Resonance Perfusion or Fractional
456 Flow Reserve in Coronary Disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;380:2418–2428.
- 457 24. Pontone G, Andreini D, Guaricci AI, Rota C, Guglielmo M, Mushtaq S, Baggiano A,
458 Beltrama V, Fusini L, Solbiati A, et al. The STRATEGY Study (Stress Cardiac Magnetic
459 Resonance Versus Computed Tomography Coronary Angiography for the Management
460 of Symptomatic Revascularized Patients): Resources and Outcomes Impact. *Circ
461 Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2016;9:e005171.
- 462 25. Ibrahim E-SH, Frank L, Baruah D, Arpinar VE, Nencka AS, Koch KM, Muftuler LT, Unal O,
463 Stojanovska J, Rubenstein JC, et al. Value CMR: Towards a Comprehensive, Rapid, Cost-
464 Effective Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance Imaging. *Int J Biomed Imaging*.
465 2021;2021:8851958.
- 466 26. Raman SV, Markl M, Patel AR, Bryant J, Allen BD, Plein S, Seiberlich N. 30-minute CMR
467 for common clinical indications: a Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance white
468 paper. *Journal of Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance*. 2022;24:13.
- 469 27. Knuuti J, Wijns W, Saraste A, Capodanno D, Barbato E, Funck-Brentano C, Prescott E,
470 Storey RF, Deaton C, Cuisset T, et al. 2019 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and
471 management of chronic coronary syndromes. *Eur Heart J*. 2020;41:407–477.
- 472 28. Thomas DM, Minor MR, Aden JK, Lisanti CJ, Steel KE. Effects of adenosine and
473 regadenoson on hemodynamics measured using cardiovascular magnetic resonance
474 imaging. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson*. 2017;19:96.
- 475

476

Table 1. Comparison of stress-LGE analysis methods according to the threshold at which a segment with infarction on LGE can be described as ischaemic. Any segment in the “Stress-LGE (>0%)” analysis with LGE was classified as infarcted and could therefore not be classified as ischemic. In the “Stress-LGE (>75%)” analysis only segments with >75% infarct transmuralities were classified as infarcted and segments with 0-75% infarction could be classified as ischaemic if there was inducible ischemia present on stress perfusion imaging. Comparisons in AUC between “Stress-LGE (>25%)”, “Stress-LGE (>50%)” and “Stress-LGE (>75%)” were non-significant.

	“Stress-rest”	“Stress-LGE (>0%)”	“Stress-LGE (>25%)”	“Stress-LGE (>50%)”	“Stress-LGE (>75%)”
<i>AUC</i>	0.834 (0.803-0.861)	0.825 (0.794-0.853)	0.835 (0.804-0.862)	0.839 (0.809-0.866)	0.843 (0.813-0.87)
<i>P-value</i>	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
<i>Sensitivity (%)</i>	73.6 (37.9 - 78.9)	71.4 (65.5-76.8)	73.7 (67.9-78.9)	74.8 (69.1-79.9)	75.6 (69.9-80.7)
<i>Specificity (%)</i>	93.1 (90.1 - 95.3)	93.4 (90.7-95.8)	93.3 (90.4-95.5)	93.1 (90.1-95.3)	93.1 (90.1-95.3)
<i>Positive predictive value (%)</i>	87.3 (83.8 - 90.1)	87.8 (83.1-91.3)	87.7 (83.1-91.2)	87.5 (82.9-91.0)	87.6 (83.1-91.1)
<i>Negative predictive value (%)</i>	84.5 (81.6-87.0)	83.4 (80.6-85.9)	84.5 (81.7-87.0)	85.1 (82.2-87.5)	85.5 (82.6-87.9)
<i>Ischaemia burden (segments)</i>	4.3 ± 2.8	3.9 ± 2.6	4.0 ± 2.7	4.3 ± 2.8	4.5 ± 2.6
<i>P value vs “Stress-rest”</i>	-	0.15	0.76	0.08	0.02
<i>P value vs “Stress – LGE (>0%)”</i>			0.03	0.01	0.004

Table 2. Diagnostic accuracy of “Stress-rest” and “Stress-LGE” strategies in subgroups of patients from CE-MARC. SE indicates the Standard Error.

	“Stress-rest strategy”			“Stress-LGE (>75%) strategy”		P-value
	N	AUC (95% CI)	SE	AUC (95% CI)	SE	
All patients	666	0.83 (0.80-0.86)	0.02	0.84 (0.81-0.88)	0.02	0.15
Male	410	0.83 (0.79-0.86)	0.02	0.84 (0.80-0.87)	0.02	0.25
Hypertension	339	0.82 (0.78-0.86)	0.02	0.83 (0.78-0.87)	0.02	0.52
Diabetes	84	0.75 (0.65-0.84)	0.05	0.77 (0.69-0.85)	0.05	0.66
Current smoker	120	0.89 (0.81-0.94)	0.03	0.89 (0.82-0.94)	0.03	0.75
Obesity (BMI>30)	263	0.84 (0.79-0.88)	0.02	0.84 (0.79-0.89)	0.02	0.66
Prior ACS	55	0.8 (0.67-0.89)	0.06	0.78 (0.64-0.88)	0.06	0.66
LVEF <50%	93	0.91 (0.83-0.96)	0.03	0.91 (0.83-0.96)	0.03	0.95
LV Hypertrophy (LVMI>60g/m ²)	73	0.88 (0.78-0.94)	0.04	0.89 (0.79-0.95)	0.04	0.64
Any MI on LGE	124	0.83 (0.75-0.89)	0.05	0.86 (0.78-0.91)	0.04	0.47

Table 3. Univariable Cox regression of “Stress-rest” and “Stress-LGE” strategies compared to other CMR findings for the prediction of MACE. Beta is the coefficient of the model, SE the Standard Error, and HR the Hazard Ratio.

Covariate	Beta	SE	HR (95% CI)	P-value
Any ischemia by “Stress-rest”	0.98	0.19	2.65 (1.82-3.87)	<0.001
Any ischemia by “Stress-LGE (>0%)”	0.91	0.019	2.48 (1.71-3.61)	<0.001
Any ischemia by “Stress-LGE (>75%)”	0.97	0.19	2.65 (1.82-3.86)	<0.001
Ischemia burden by “Stress-rest”	0.11	0.03	1.11 (1.05-1.12)	<0.001
Ischemia burden by “Stress-LGE (>0%)”	0.11	0.03	1.12 (1.5-1.19)	0.0004
Ischemia burden by “Stress-LGE (>75%)”	0.10	0.03	1.10 (1.05-1.16)	<0.001
Any infarction by LGE	0.99	0.20	2.69 (1.82-3.98)	<0.001
Infarction burden	0.15	0.05	1.16 (1.06-1.27)	0.002
LVEF	-0.19	0.01	0.98 (0.96-1.01)	0.98

Table 4. Multivariable Cox regression of “Stress-rest” and “Stress-LGE” strategies corrected for LVEF and any infarction by LGE. Beta is the coefficient of the model, SE the Standard Error, and HR the Hazard Ratio.

Covariate	Beta	SE	HR (95% CI)	P-value
Any ischemia by “Stress-rest”	0.71	0.23	2.04 (1.31-3.12)	0.002
Any ischemia by “Stress-LGE (>0%)”	0.65	0.22	1.92 (1.24-2.96)	0.003
Any ischemia by “Stress-LGE (>75%)”	0.73	0.23	2.07 (1.31-3.26)	0.002
Ischemia burden by “Stress-rest”	0.05	0.04	1.05 (0.98-1.12)	0.17
Ischemia burden by “Stress-LGE (>0%)”	0.06	0.03	1.06 (0.99-1.14)	0.09
Ischemia burden by “Stress-LGE (>75%)”	0.04	0.03	1.04 (0.97-1.11)	0.25

Figure 1. Workflow for “Stress-LGE” and “Stress-Rest” analysis. Arrow denotes number of minutes duration of the scan.






Figure 2. Cumulative MACE according to whether ischaemia is present by “Stress-LGE (>75%)” or “Stress-rest” definitions. P-value by log-rank <0.001 for both.



Central Illustration. Summary of “Stress-LGE” reanalysis of the CE-MARC study and its main findings.




CE-MARC study: Retrospective re-analysis of 666 patients

Significant coronary stenosis by QCA in 262 (39.3%)

"Stress-LGE" Analysis

"Stress-rest" Analysis



Optimal threshold

>0%

>25%

>50%

>75%

LGE transmurality



Incrementally increasing diagnostic performance (improved AUC and sensitivity, similar specificity)

**AUC: 0.843
Sensitivity: 75.6%
Specificity: 93.1%**

**AUC: 0.834
Sensitivity: 73.6%
Specificity: 93.1%**


"Stress-LGE >75%" superior accuracy vs "Stress-rest" (Δ AUC 0.009, P=0.02)

Same positive test MACE rate: HR 2.65, P<0.001 for both "Stress-rest" and "Stress-LGE >75%"




Analysis Method	Localizers	Stress perfusion	3D whole heart	Rest perfusion	LV volumes	LGE imaging
“Stress-LGE”		✓	Not used in this analysis			✓
“Stress-rest”		✓		✓		






“Stress-LGE (>75%)”



Number at risk

—	440	426	414	403	376	224	39	0
—	226	212	197	181	166	88	24	0

“Stress-rest”



Number at risk

—	445	431	419	408	380	227	39	0
—	221	207	192	176	162	85	24	0