What is the best test for a patient with classic angina?

**ABSTRACT**

Symptoms that suggest myocardial ischemia raise two questions: does the patient have severe, hemodynamically obstructive coronary artery disease, and is he or she at risk for premature death or an early, major nonfatal cardiac event? Noninvasive cardiac testing may help with the first question in patients with an intermediate risk of coronary artery disease, and with the second question in patients with either an intermediate or a high risk of disease. Although the diagnostic value of noninvasive tests may be overestimated owing to referral bias, these tests are powerful when used for prognostic purposes. In patients with a normal resting electrocardiogram and no prior revascularization, a regular exercise stress test without imaging should suffice. However, no randomized trials have been done to determine if this strategy leads to better outcomes than with empiric therapy.

**ANSWERING TWO QUESTIONS**

Evaluation of patients like this one with symptoms that suggest myocardial ischemia involves trying to answer one or two questions:

- Does he have severe, hemodynamically obstructive coronary artery disease?
- Is he at risk for premature death or an early, major nonfatal cardiac event, such as a large myocardial infarction?

These two questions reflect two entirely different clinical perspectives. The first question addresses diagnosis, the second, prognosis. The first diagnostic question can be thought of as a miniature cross-sectional study: given that one finding is present on a diagnostic test, how likely is it that another finding would be noted on a “gold standard” test? The second prognostic question mirrors a cohort study. Given that this patient has a certain finding on a test now, what is the likelihood that a bad outcome will occur later?

Current guidelines from the American Heart Association and American College of Cardiology suggest that noninvasive cardiac testing may be of use for both diagnostic and prognostic purposes. Testing can help with both diagnosis and prognosis.

---

**58-YEAR-OLD MAN** presents with substernal exertional chest discomfort. This occurs only with moderate to vigorous physical activity and is quickly relieved with rest. He has medically controlled hypertension (his systolic blood pressure is 132 mm Hg); he does not smoke. His total cholesterol concentration is 225 mg/dL and his high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol concentration is 37 mg/dL. A resting electrocardiogram is within normal limits.

To best evaluate his chest discomfort, which test should he undergo:

- A regular exercise test?
- An exercise test with imaging?
- Cardiac catheterization?
- Calcium scanning (electron beam computed tomography [CT])?
- CT coronary angiography?
- None of the above?
lines recommend that testing be performed for diagnostic purposes in patients with chest discomfort and with an intermediate risk of coronary artery disease.2,3 This is in line with classic Bayesian thinking, by which a diagnostic test is most likely to be useful if the pretest likelihood of disease is 50%; that is, if there is true uncertainty.

The guidelines also recommend using tests for risk stratification, or prognosis, in patients with chest discomfort and with either an intermediate or high risk of having coronary artery disease.2,3

**WHAT IS THIS PATIENT’S PRETEST PROBABILITY OF DISEASE?**

Let us now consider the patient in question. We could assess his pretest probability of having disease by considering his age, sex, and symptoms3 or by considering his age, sex, and risk factors.4 If we consider his age, sex, and symptoms, we can use previously published data5 to conclude that he has a high pretest probability (90%) of having coronary artery disease (TABLE 1).

Symptoms can be classified according to how he would answer three questions:

- *Is your discomfort substernal?*
- *Is your discomfort brought on by physical or mental exertion?*
- *Is your discomfort quickly relieved by rest or sublingual nitroglycerin?*

If the answer to all three questions is yes, he has “typical angina.” If he answers yes to two questions, he has “atypical angina,” whereas an affirmative response to fewer than two questions means he has “nonanginal chest pain.” In the case of our patient, there really is no diagnostic mystery: he has typical angina pectoris related to coronary atherosclerosis.

We could also assess his pretest risk of a major coronary event by using a version of the Framingham score (TABLE 2),4 which enables one to calculate a predicted risk of a major cardiac event, given his demographics and risk factors. The version of the Framingham score shown in TABLE 2 is designed for patients without diabetes; other gender-specific versions do include diabetes.6 Another risk scheme, derived in Europe, accounts for regional factors as well as diabetes.7,8

As shown in TABLE 2, our patient’s pretest risk is 15%. That is, during the next 10 years, his chances of having a major cardiac event are approximately 1.5% per year. This would put him into an intermediate risk category.

We are left with the conclusion that he has an intermediate to high risk of significant coronary disease.

**SHOULD WE THINK DIAGNOSTICALLY OR PROGNOSTICALLY?**

As we decide which test to use, we also have to decide which mode of thinking is most appropriate, diagnostic or prognostic.

*Diagnostic value of noninvasive tests is overestimated*

The diagnostic value of nearly all noninvasive tests is overestimated in the literature because of failure to take into account referral bias.9–12 This occurs when the performance of a gold standard test is at least in part affected by the result of the diagnostic test being studied.

As physicians believe that the noninvasive test is likely to be correct, patients with an abnormal test result are more likely to be referred for the gold standard, coronary angiography. This bias, by which patients undergoing coronary angiography are much more likely to have an abnormal diagnostic test result than the population at large, is also known as workup bias and results in substantial inflation in sensitivity and deflation in specificity.11 Indeed, the true sensitivity of stress testing, stress echocardiography, and stress nuclear imaging is actually quite poor, at levels of 67% or less.9–12

---

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptoms</th>
<th>Probability (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definite angina</td>
<td>68 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible angina</td>
<td>30 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonspecific chest pain</td>
<td>6 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Redberg RF, Shaw LJ. Diagnosis of Coronary Artery Disease in Women. Prog Cardiovasc Dis 2003; 46:239-258.*

---
Another problem is that the gold standard test itself is problematic, as coronary angiography is only a picture of the whole of the artery but tells us nothing about the disease in the arterial wall, which is where the real problem is.13

Noninvasive tests are good for risk stratification
On the other hand, noninvasive tests are powerful when used for prognostic purposes.

Extensive data show that stress testing or stress testing with imaging is a powerful risk stratifier in patients with symptoms that make one suspect coronary disease.14–19

There are few data on the value of calcium scanning for predicting risk in patients with symptoms, although some literature suggests that it has some value in patients without symptoms.20 CT coronary angiography is an exciting and relatively new technology,21 but no long-term prognostic data are available. Cardiac catheterization provides information about coronary anatomy, but it has been shown to actually be inferior to functional testing for predicting outcomes.13,22

Exercise Testing vs Empiric Therapy
This then leaves us with three choices: a regular exercise test, an exercise test with imaging, or empiric medical therapy.

The guidelines are quite clear that among patients with normal resting electrocardiograms and no prior revascularization, a regular exercise test should suffice; this is true for both men and women.2,3 Indeed, data from Cleveland Clinic and elsewhere have shown that in such patients, additional imaging is unlikely to provide additional prognostically valuable information.19 Thus, if this patient had a stress test indicating low risk as assessed by functional capacity,14,23 heart rate dynamics,17,18,24,25 and ventricular ectopy,15 he is likely to still be at low risk even if his imaging study is abnormal.19

This leaves us with two options, namely, obtaining a regular exercise test without imaging or just proceeding with empiric medical therapy. While current guidelines clearly suggest that risk stratification is appropriate as opposed to empiric medical therapy,2,3 it is important to note that there has been no randomized trial showing that such a strategy improves outcome. The currently accepted paradigm is that risk stratification identifies the patients who are most likely to benefit from aggressive therapy26 and, conversely, identifies patients who are most likely to be best managed conservatively.

The final answer then is to refer this patient for a regular exercise test without imaging, although it must be acknowledged that the definitive randomized trial showing that pursuing this strategy improves outcomes has yet to be done and may never be done.

What to do with the results?
What to do with the results of the exercise test will be covered in greater detail in a future article, but I will address it briefly here.

The exercise test should primarily be interpreted on the basis of the findings that have clear prognostic value, ie, functional capacity,14,23 heart rate responses during25 and after17,18 exercise, and ventricular ectopy.15 The ST segment is a relatively minor predictor of risk.27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The patient’s Framingham risk score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cholesterol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-density lipoprotein cholesterol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systolic blood pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On medication for high blood pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk score*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The risk score shown was derived on the basis of an equation. Other National Cholesterol Education Program materials, such as Adult Treatment Panel III (ATP III) print products, use a point-based system to calculate a risk score that approximates the equation-based one. See http://hp2010.nhlbihin.net/atpiii/calculator.asp?usertype=prof.

To interpret the risk score and for specific information about coronary heart disease risk assessment as part of detection, evaluation, and treatment of high blood cholesterol, see ATP III Executive Summary4 and ATP III At-a-Glance.
If this patient has a low-risk result on a stress test, then medical therapy with aspirin, a statin, and antihypertensive medications would be appropriate. If this patient has a high-risk stress test, it might be reasonable to proceed with coronary angiography.

If the results indicate intermediate risk, then a subsequent stress test with imaging would make sense, and if a large area of ischemia were found, then coronary angiography should follow.
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