Advances in three-dimensional coronary imaging and computational fluid dynamics: is virtual fractional flow reserve more than just a pretty picture?
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Percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) has shown a high success rate in the treatment of coronary artery disease. The decision to perform PCI often relies on the cardiologist’s visual interpretation of coronary lesions during angiography. This has inherent limitations, particularly due to the low resolution and two-dimensional nature of angiography. State-of-the-art modalities such as three-dimensional quantitative coronary angiography, optical coherence tomography and invasive fractional flow reserve (FFR) may improve clinicians’ understanding of both the anatomical and physiological importance of coronary lesions. While invasive FFR is the gold standard technique for assessment of the haemodynamic significance of coronary lesions, recent studies have explored a surrogate for FFR derived solely from three-dimensional reconstruction of the invasive angiogram, and therefore eliminating need for a pressure wire. Utilizing advanced computational fluid dynamics research, this virtual fractional flow reserve (vFFR) has demonstrated reasonable correlation with invasive measurements and remains an intense area of ongoing study. However, at present, several limitations and computational fluid dynamic assumptions may preclude vFFR from widespread clinical use. This review demonstrates the tight integration of advanced three-dimensional imaging techniques and vFFR in assessing coronary artery disease, reviews the advantages and disadvantages of such techniques and attempts to provide a glimpse of how such advances may benefit future clinical decision-making during PCI. 

Coron Artery Dis 2015, 26:e43–e54 Copyright © 2015 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All rights reserved.

Coronary Artery Disease 2015, 26:e43–e54

Keywords: computational fluid dynamics, coronary angiogram, coronary artery stenosis, coronary flow reserve, fractional flow reserve, optical coherence tomography

*Department of Mechanical Engineering, Melbourne School of Engineering, \textsuperscript{b}North West Academic Centre, Melbourne Medical School, IBM Research Collaboratory for Life Sciences-Melbourne, Victoria Life Sciences Computation Initiative, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, \textsuperscript{e}National Heart Research Institute Singapore, National Heart Centre Singapore, Singapore and \textsuperscript{b}Biomedical Instrument Institute, School of Biomedical Engineering, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

Correspondence to Peter Barlis, MD, PhD, North West Academic Centre, Northern Hospital, The University of Melbourne, 185 Cooper Street, Epping, Vic 3076, Australia Tel: +61 3 8405 8554; fax: +61 3 8405 8405; e-mail: pbarlis@unimelb.edu.au

Introduction

Coronary artery disease (CAD) represents a significant health burden with the key pathological process being atherosclerosis. The invasive assessment of CAD relies upon catheter-based coronary angiography, and despite its limitations, it has remained the gold standard since its introduction over 30 years ago [1]. Quantitative coronary angiography (QCA) is based on the automated or semi-automated border detection of the contrast-filled lumen, and has become both the reference standard in research studies and provides objective assessment of diameter stenosis in clinical practice [1]. Angiography, however, provides a two-dimensional (2D) representation of the coronary arteries and lacks sufficient resolution to provide comprehensive lesion-level information. More recently, intravascular imaging has been complemented by optical coherence tomography (OCT), which, because of its superior resolution, provides detailed knowledge of the nature of the atherosclerosis process and also helps guide percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) more accurately than angiography alone [2–4]. In addition, physiological lesion assessment has been enhanced by the use of pressure wires measuring the fractional flow reserve (FFR) to help guide the need for PCI. This review provides an update on the latest developments in three-dimensional (3D) coronary imaging, discusses how such advances can be integrated into the assessment of haemodynamic significance of a lesion, and postulates their future roles in the catheterization laboratory.

Quantitative coronary angiography

Coronary angiography is the gold standard invasive imaging modality to diagnose CAD, and visual estimation of stenosis severity has been the traditional method to guide intervention [5]. This approach has several limitations highlighted in older studies conducted over a decade ago [6,7]. Interobserver and intraobserver assessment of angiographic disease severity varies from 15 to 45% as reported in numerous studies [8–10]. Advances in angiographic data processing have resulted in the ability to computationally reconstruct the coronary artery of interest in 2D or 3D [11] and to quantitatively analyse the...
severity of lesions, a process known as QCA. Nallamothu et al. [12] more recently demonstrated once again that despite technological refinements in angiographic acquisition and processing, visual estimation of the degree of stenosis remains imprecise. In their study of 216 treated lesions, they found the mean difference in per cent diameter stenosis (%DS) between clinical interpretation and QCA to be 8.2 ± 8.4% reflecting higher %DS, on average, by clinical interpretation (P < 0.001). Of all the treated lesions graded as more than 70% by visual interpretation, approximately one-quarter were less than 70% by QCA [12]. These discrepancies may translate to inconsistencies in clinical decision-making in the catheterization laboratory [13]. QCA adds to the objectivity of angiographic evaluation and has been shown to improve the interobserver and intraobserver agreement [14,15]. It is a widely adapted benchmark tool in clinical trials and is recommended in clinical practice.

In QCA, coronary stenoses are assessed based on their geometric features. The minimum lumen diameter (MLD), reference vessel diameter and the %DS are some of the commonly used parameters to gauge stenosis severity [16]. Foley et al. [16] challenged the long held popularity of %DS among clinicians and proposed that absolute luminal measurements, especially MLD, should be the preferred parameter. The authors [16] performed quantitative analysis on 110 angiograms obtained immediately after angioplasty and on a repeat angiogram 24 h later. There was no difference in mean MLD or cross-sectional area between the immediate postangioplasty and 24-h postangioplasty period; however, reference vessel diameter increased significantly (presumably secondary to greater vasodilatory effect of the same dose of intracoronary nitrate at 24 h); therefore, %DS was also found to increase significantly [16]. This study highlighted that %DS, a widely utilized parameter, was subject to considerable variation as it relies upon the dimensions of normally appearing reference vessel. Whereas this was an intriguing finding, %DS continues to be used in contemporary research and clinical practice.

**Does three-dimensional quantitative coronary angiography add extra value?**

Whereas angiography provides excellent delineation of the arterial lumen and 2D-QCA adds to the objective assessment of the severity of DS, it is widely known that a 2D imaging profile of a 3D structure inherently carries certain limitations such as inadequate visualization of eccentric plaques, inaccurate estimation of disease severity in D-shaped or elliptical lumens and lack of spatial information as we know that vessels do not always have circular geometries [17]. Whereas some of these problems can be partly overcome by acquisition of multiple projections of coronary vasculature from a range of angles and creating a 3D ‘approximation’ of the diseased segment, 3D-QCA was developed to address some of these limitations. Dviv et al. [18] analysed 38 angiographic images side by side using both 2D-QCA and 3D-QCA and reported a weak correlation for %DS calculation between the two methods (r² = 0.94 for MLD and reference diameter, r² = 0.33 for %DS; P < 0.05). They concluded that the assumption of circular cross-section is the main reason for the weaker correlation in %DS between 2D-QCA and 3D-QCA. Their findings were again confirmed by Bourantas et al. [19], who showed stronger correlation between 3D-QCA and intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) in lumen dimensions (r = 0.8) than 2D assessed %DS (r = 0.34). Ultimately, the greatest advantage of 3D-QCA may be that it offers improved assessment of the absolute lumen dimensions including length, diameter, tortuosity, and optimal views [20,21] and not just %DS.

Whereas QCA is a widely accepted reference technique in scientific research and catheterization laboratories, the fundamental limitations of %DS and loss in MLD cut-off criteria have been well documented [16]. It is important to remember that QCA is an anatomical tool, and %DS and MLD do not always confer physiologic significance of a coronary stenosis.

**Optical coherence tomography**

OCT, by virtue of its exceptionally high resolution (10–15 μm), is far superior to IVUS in delineating the intima–lumen border with excellent reproducibility [4, 22, 23]. This fact generates a plausible hypothesis that OCT could have an expanded role in predicting the functional significance of a given stenosis. Previous IVUS studies have found that minimal lumen area (MLA) less than 4 mm² or less than 3 mm² were useful thresholds to indicate haemodynamically significant lesions when tested against an FFR value of less than 0.75 as reference standard [24,25], whereas a later IVUS study with much larger sample size brought the IVUS-MLA threshold down to 2.4 mm² when tested against an FFR value of 0.80 or less [26].

Correlation of OCT-measured luminal parameters and invasive FFR has been tested for intermediate severity coronary stenosis (Table 1). Gonzalo et al. [27] examined 61 stenoses of intermediate angiographic severity from 56 patients. Quantitative OCT-based measurements were evaluated against FFR threshold of 0.80 or less. The authors reported an overall moderate diagnostic efficiency of OCT with optimal cut-off value for MLA being less than 1.95 mm² [27]. Forty-seven of these patients also underwent IVUS and a comparison of results in participants with simultaneous OCT and IVUS evaluation did not show significant difference in diagnostic efficiency. The only exception was in a subgroup of smaller vessels (<3 mm) in which OCT performed better [27].
More recently, Zafar et al. [29] evaluated 41 stenoses from 30 patients with QCA, FFR and OCT. Using an FFR cut-off value of 0.80 or less, the authors concluded that the overall diagnostic efficiency of OCT-derived MLD and MLA to predict haemodynamic significance was moderate [29]. In further subgroup analysis, they also found that the MLA had high diagnostic efficiency in smaller diameter vessels (<3 mm), overall low specificity means that the exact role of OCT in this setting is yet to be established. Ultimately, it may have higher potential in ruling out ischaemia than ruling in.

Invasive fractional flow reserve

Fractional flow reserve-guided percutaneous coronary intervention versus quantitative coronary angiography-guided percutaneous coronary intervention

FFR is the current gold standard to determine haemodynamic significance of intermediate severity coronary stenosis [31–34] as demonstrated by multiple clinical studies [35–39]. In the DEFER trial [36], 181 out of 325 patients who had an FFR value of more than 0.75 were randomly stratified into performed-PCI versus deferred-PCI groups. Over a 5-year follow-up period, the deferred-PCI group had a lower incidence of major adverse cardiac events as compared with the QCA-guided PCI group (3.3 vs. 7.9%; P = 0.21). The DEFER trial not only demonstrated benefit of FFR-guided PCI using a cut-off value 0.75 or less but it also highlighted the discrepancy between FFR and QCA [40].

The Fractional Flow Reserve Versus Angiography for Multivessel Evaluation (FAME) trial [35] was a large, randomized multicentre study evaluating the advantage of FFR-guided PCI over angiography-guided PCI. A total of 1005 patients with more than 50% DS in more than two epicardial coronary arteries were recruited. The FAME trial utilized a higher cut-off FFR value of 0.80 or less to include patients within the uncertainty region (0.75 ≤ FFR ≤ 0.80) as multiple studies have shown that there is an increased risk of ischaemia within these FFR values [41,42]. FFR value of 0.80 or less has since become the clinical cut-off value most often used [43]. Nevertheless, there were substantially fewer decisions to proceed with PCI in the FFR-guided than the angiography-guided groups (1.9 ± 1.3 vs. 2.7 ± 1.2; P < 0.001). There were also fewer occurrences of major adverse cardiac events in FFR-guided PCI patients at 1-year follow-up (13.2 vs. 18.3%; P = 0.02) and at 2-year follow-up (17.9 vs. 22.4%; P = 0.08). The FAME trial not only demonstrated the benefit of FFR-guided PCI but also showed that FFR-guided PCI is more cost-effective [44]. By reducing the number of stents deployed and minimizing revascularization and other adverse clinical events, FFR-guided PCI saved ~$2400/patient at 1-year follow-up [45]. Besides the FAME trial, several other studies involving more than 10,000 patients [37–39] have also reported better clinical outcomes using FFR guidance. These results [35,37–39] have led to class IA and IIA recommendations from the European Society of Cardiology [46] and the American College of Cardiology [47], respectively. One of the potentially major
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Number of patients</th>
<th>Number of stenoses</th>
<th>FFR reference</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>AUC (95% confidence interval for MLA)</th>
<th>OCT MLD cut-off (mm)</th>
<th>OCT MLD cut-off (mm²)</th>
<th>OCT reference lumen area (mm²)</th>
<th>Sensitivity for MLA (%)</th>
<th>Specificity for MLA (%)</th>
<th>Overall diagnostic sensitivity to predict functional stenosis severity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>戈onaldo et al. [27]</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>≤ 0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74 (0.61–0.84)</td>
<td>&lt; 1.34</td>
<td>&lt; 1.95</td>
<td>6.47 ± 2.72</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimo et al. [28]</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>&lt; 0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90 (0.82–0.97)</td>
<td>&lt; 1.35</td>
<td>&lt; 1.91</td>
<td>6.30 ± 1.72</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zafar et al. [29]</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80 (0.64–0.91)</td>
<td>&lt; 1.23</td>
<td>&lt; 1.62</td>
<td>7.35 ± 2.21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUC, area under the curve; FFR, fractional flow reserve; MLA, minimal lumen area; MLD, minimal lumen diameter; OCT, optical coherence tomography.
limitations of FFR, however, is the inability to achieve maximum hyperaemia in patients with diffuse epicardial or microvascular disease, resulting in underestimation of lesion severity [34,45,48].

Effects of coronary flow reserve on fractional flow reserve measurements

Coronary flow reserve (CFR) can either be an invasive or noninvasive flow measurement used to quantify the increase in volumetric flow in coronary arteries during hyperaemia relative to baseline flow [49]. Unlike FFR, which has a universal maximum value of 1, there is theoretically no maximum CFR value. The optimum cut-off value for a haemodynamically significant lesion is also less well-defined in the literature. Published CFR cut-off values range widely from 1.7 to 2.5 for epicardial coronary arteries [50–54], limiting the use of CFR in clinical practice.

According to Young et al. [55] the pressure difference ($\Delta P$) across an epicardial artery is related to the volumetric flow ($Q$) with the following fluid dynamic equation [56,57]:

$$\Delta P = A Q + B Q^2,$$

where $A$ and $B$ are constants that depend on the cross-sectional area of the stenosed and normal artery, the length of the stenosis and the rheology of human blood [55]. As a result, it is instinctive to believe that FFR is correlated to CFR. Di Mario et al. [58] studied 21 patients, reporting $r=0.58$ ($P<0.01$), demonstrating a weak correlation between FFR and invasive CFR. In addition, their study showed that patients with an FFR value of 0.75 or less usually have a CFR value of 2.0 or less. Another trial by Meimoun et al. [59] involving 50 patients reported a similar result ($r=0.59; P<0.01$) with noninvasively measured CFR. This study also raised a fundamental concern over correlating FFR and CFR values when drawing conclusions about myocardial ischaemia. In contrast to the study by Di Mario et al. [58], Meimoun et al. [59] showed that four patients with FFR value of 0.80 or less had a CFR value of more than 2.0 and two patients with FFR value of more than 0.80 showed CFR value of 2.0 or less, representing 12% of the patients in this study. A more recent retrospective cohort study [60] with 438 FFR and invasive CFR measurements showed that even though FFR is correlated to CFR ($r=0.34; P<0.001$), almost 40% of lesions show discordance between FFR and CFR.

Johnson et al. [60] demonstrated that neither invasive nor noninvasive CFR measurement techniques can be attributed to the discordance of FFR and CFR. Nonetheless, there remain numerous questions regarding the use of FFR and CFR in clinical practice. Gould et al. [61] argued that while FFR is the current gold standard to reflect the physiological significance of the lesions, it does not truly reveal ischaemic flow conditions in the same manner as CFR. In contrast, it has been observed that CFR varies with time [62,63]. Despite continuous adenosine infusion, saturation of the vascular smooth muscle receptor ($A_2A$), cAMP precursor exhaustion, or $K_{ATP}$ channel simulation momentarily hyperpolarises vascular smooth muscle, potentially resulting in hyperaemic flow returning back to the baseline before it rises again [64]. Furthermore, because CFR can cover a wide range of values for different patients [65], it is inherently difficult to identify whether maximum hyperaemia has been achieved, an important prerequisite for FFR [60,66].

Table 2 Correlation of quantitative coronary angiography-based virtual fractional flow reserve to invasive fractional flow reserve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Morris et al. [70]</th>
<th>Tu et al. [11]</th>
<th>Papafaklis et al. [71]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of patients</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vessels</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% DS</td>
<td>46.8 ± 7.3</td>
<td>38.8 ± 10.9</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilirubin lesions</td>
<td>1/22 (4.5%)</td>
<td>50/77 (64.9%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Rotational angiography</td>
<td>Conventional angiography</td>
<td>Conventional angiography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary conditions</td>
<td>Generic conditions for the whole cohort</td>
<td>Hyperaemic VFR and mean catheter pressure applied at inlet</td>
<td>Generic conditions, no other patient-specific data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computational time</td>
<td>24 h (pulsatile)</td>
<td>VFR from TIMI frame count; CFR = hyperaemic VFR/baseline VFR</td>
<td>15 min Specified blood flow rates at inlet (1 and 3 ml/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperaemia simulation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFR reference</td>
<td>≤ 0.80</td>
<td>≤ 0.80</td>
<td>≤ 0.82 (vFAI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation ($r$)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic accuracy</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity (%)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV (%)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3D, three-dimensional; %DS, per cent diameter stenosis; CFR, coronary flow reserve; FFR, fractional flow reserve; NPV, negative predictive value; PPV, positive predictive value; TIMI, thrombolysis in myocardial infarction; vFAI, virtual functional assessment index; VFR, volumetric flow rate.
Virtual fractional flow reserve

Despite the established evidence that FFR has clinical and economic benefits, it remains an underutilized tool in interventional practice. Potential barriers may include the additional procedure time required, need for adenosine administration, as well as additional cost. Studies of noninvasive coronary computed tomographic angiography (CTCA)-based virtual fractional flow reserve (vFFR) in DISCOVER-FLOW [67], DeFACTO [68] and HeartFlowNXT [69] were able to obtain vFFR values within a reasonable amount of time (∼5 h) with good accuracy, specificity and high negative predictive values using sophisticated lump parameter boundary conditions based on averaged populations.

vFFR is a method to determine the ischaemic potential of coronary stenoses from routine coronary angiography through application of computational fluid dynamics (CFD) simulations. vFFR has the potential to avoid the need for costly pressure catheters and the possible risks associated with cannulation of stenoses. There has been a great deal of interest in this field recently and some very promising work (Table 2) has been published in the medical literature.

Morris et al. [70] studied 19 patients with stable CAD in the VIRTU-1 study. They constructed the 3D coronary anatomy off-line using invasive rotational coronary angiography and applied generic boundary conditions in their CFD studies. vFFR was computed in 24 h/case with a high accuracy, sensitivity, specificity of 97, 86 and 100%, respectively, on a study population with relatively simple lesions [70]. Furthermore, the vFFR and invasive FFR were closely correlated (r = 0.84), showing that FFR may be reliably predicted without the need for hyperaemia induction.

Tu et al. [11] assessed the diagnostic performance of vFFR using invasive FFR as the reference standard in 77 vessels from 68 patients by constructing 3D-QCA models from standard angiographic projections taken 25° or more apart. Volumetric flow rates at hyperaemia were calculated from thrombolysis in myocardial infarction frame counts. They reported that vFFR, or the so-called FFRQCA, correlated well with FFR (r = 0.81; P < 0.001) on a study population with homogeneous intermediate lesions. The overall accuracy of FFRQCA for the diagnosis of ischaemia defined by FFR value of 0.80 or less was 88%, with positive and negative predictive values of 82 and 91%, respectively. One of the major advancements in this study was extremely fast computational time with the entire analysis taking less than 10 min. However, 3D reconstructions of the coronary arteries remain an interactive process, and substantial automation should be implemented to enable high-volume use.

Papafaklis et al. [71] recently published the results of 139 vessels (120 patients) with mild and intermediate lesions. By deriving a quadratic equation for the pressure difference (ΔP) across the lesions from the CFD results at blood flow rates (Q) of 1 and 3 ml/s, a ΔP–Q curve was constructed and the corresponding vFFR values were obtained. The area under the vFFR–Q curve [virtual functional assessment index (vFAI)] for Q 4 ml/s or less was calculated and the authors reported that diagnostic accuracy, sensitivity and specificity for the optimal vFAI cut-off point (≤ 0.82) were 88, 90 and 86%, respectively. They also reported a significant correlation between the vFAI and vFFR (r = 0.78; P < 0.0001).

It is important to note that, apart from methodological differences in 3D reconstruction and CFD simulations in these three studies, the distribution of the severity of lesions included in the study population will also affect the diagnostic accuracy of these methods. That is, the inclusion of milder lesions will improve the detection metrics relative to higher degrees of stenosis.

Present computational fluid dynamics methodology and our experience

To examine the feasibility, utility and methodological strengths and weaknesses of vFFR, we studied 10 patients with intermediate angiographic stenoses. All patients had invasive FFR measurement at hyperaemia achieved with intravenous administration of adenosine. Invasive FFR served as the reference standard. The clinical cut-off value of 0.80 or less was used in accordance with established guidelines [41–43]. Patients with angina or non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction were included. Angiograms with minimum overlap or foreshortening of the artery of interest and in which the location of the distal pressure sensor was available were selected. Patients with prior transmural infarcts in the interrogated vessel territory, vessel protected by grafts and those with significant collaterals were excluded as these factors would have confounded the estimation of CFR and hyperaemic equations. Ostial and bifurcation lesions were also excluded for this pilot analysis.

Figure 1 shows the overview of the vFFR analyses using CFD methodology. We used QAngioXA 3D research edition 1.0 (Medis Special BV, Leiden, the Netherlands) to construct 3D models of coronary arteries from two angiographic projections acquired 25° or more apart. We selected eight left anterior descending arteries (LADs) and two right coronary arteries (RCAs). 3D models of coronary arteries were converted into STL files. We generated computational domains using ICEM-CFD (ANSYS Inc., Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, USA) from the 3D models of the coronary arteries. Each computational domain consists of ~1.3 million tetrahedral cells. The haemodynamics (i.e., blood velocity and pressure) in these coronary arteries were computed by directly solving the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations using a finite-volume solver OpenFOAM (OpenCFD Ltd, ESI group, Bracknell, UK). Time-dependent parabolic velocity profiles with mean baseline and hyperaemic velocity
at 40 and 60 cm/s, respectively, were prescribed at the inlet to mimic pulsatile blood flow behaviour over a cardiac cycle. Generic waveforms [72] for the LAD and RCA were used. The lumen wall was considered rigid and no-slip. A three-element Windkessel model with nonspecific vasculature resistance was used at the distal ends of the coronary arteries.

To ensure fast turnaround time, CFD simulations were performed using high-performance supercomputers at the Victorian Life Sciences Computational Initiative (Fig. 1). Each CFD study utilized 128 IBM Blue Gene/Q CPUs at 1.6 GHz. In-silico aortic pressure (Pa) was taken at the proximal end of the computational domain, whereas distal pressure (Pd) was monitored at the same location where the actual invasive FFR was taken during angiography. vFFR was calculated from the time-averaged values of Pa and Pd over one cardiac cycle. Results were presented using MATLAB and Statistic Toolbox Release 2014b (MathWorks Inc., Natick, Massachusetts, USA) and Tecplot 360 2013R1 (Tecplot Inc., Bellevue, Wisconsin, USA). The diagnostic performance of vFFR was assessed against the invasive FFR results. Figure 2 shows a representation of the vFFR analyses in RCA and LAD at simulated maximum hyperaemia. Blood pressure levels along these arteries are reported. The comparisons of each individual FFR and vFFR for all 10 cases are reported in Table 3. Our initial results reflect the inherent difficulties in vFFR methodology and highlight several issues facing the application of vFFR in the clinical setting. These variations in numerical setup have been shown to significantly alter the accuracy and speed of vFFR calculations and are discussed below.

**One-for-all boundary conditions**

One of the major limitations of the present CFD models is the use of generic boundary conditions. Similar to the CFD studies VIRTU-1 [70] and Papaefalakis et al. [71], the present study incorporated generic flow velocities for both baseline (40 cm/s) and hyperaemia (60 cm/s) analyses. Depending on the proximal end diameter of the 3D model, this may result in a large variation in mean blood flow (ml/min) into the considered artery, therefore occasionally producing an unrealistic pressure difference and incorrect vFFR. In addition, specifying flow into the artery may neglect the effect of microcirculatory coronary flow [71]. The effect of generic boundary conditions was also reflected in our vFFR analyses in which three of the vFFR results were substantially lower than the invasive FFR results. These three cases suggest that this generic flow velocity (60 cm/s) cannot be applied to every patient. However, it remains unclear which lesion characteristics and in which individuals tailored-specific boundary conditions will be necessary. Other CFD studies such as DISCOVER-FLOW [67], DeFACTO [68] and HeartFlowNXT [69] trials used lump parameter boundary conditions to mimic the distal vascular tree resistance. These lump parameter boundary conditions may have overestimated the hyperaemic flow conditions [73].
Segmented length of the three-dimensional models of coronary artery and pressure sensor location in computational fluid dynamics analyses

Additional factors that influence Pd are the segmented length of the 3D models of coronary arteries and the exact pressure sensor location, as the difference between proximal and distal pressure is a function of the distance between the two points (and other variables) according to Poiseuille’s law. In addition, the two-step decrease in blood pressure level as illustrated in Fig. 2b elucidates the influence of the pressure sensor location on the vFFR analyses, especially in vessels in which serial lesions cannot be visually detected on angiography. Nevertheless, there is no universal agreement on the segmented length of 3D models, pressure sensor location and vFFR analyses. Further investigation is necessary to completely understand their roles in the vFFR analyses.

Spatial resolutions and geometrical assumptions on three-dimensional reconstruction of coronary arteries using coronary computed tomographic angiography and coronary angiography

The numerical accuracy, sensitivity and specificity of vFFR is also greatly affected by the limited spatial resolution of CTCA and coronary angiography [74]. In fact, whereas CTCA-based vFFR provides an innovative noninvasive FFR diagnosis technique, the anatomical variation of the coronary arteries should not be ignored when there is a substantial separation period between CTCA and invasive FFR [75]. Time-varying anatomical changes may alter the correlation between invasive FFR and CTCA-based vFFR. The disparity of results between the DISCOVERY-FLOW and DeFACTO trials was also shown to be closely related to the small variation in image processing protocol and was addressed in HeartFlowNXT [69]. Although coronary angiography may provide a better spatial resolution than CTCA [70], coronary arteries are often assumed to have circular/elliptical cross-section contour during reconstruction. The effects of artificially smoothing the coronary arteries on vFFR remain unclear [76]. Ultimately, the accuracy of

Table 3 Invasive and virtual fractional flow reserve values in 10 cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>%DS</th>
<th>Invasive FFR</th>
<th>vFFR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>LAD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>RCA</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>RCA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>LAD</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>LAD</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>LAD</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>LAD</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>LAD</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>LAD</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>LAD</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

%DS, per cent diameter stenosis; FFR, fractional flow reserve; LAD, left anterior descending artery; RCA, right coronary artery; vFFR, virtual fractional flow reserve.
any CFD-based method relies on the resolution of the source image.

**Lengthy computational fluid dynamics studies**

The final hurdle to the utilization of vFFR as an online tool in daily clinical use is the enormous time and computational resources that are required to carry out a single vFFR study. On average, our vFFR CFD studies need a total of 26 h, from imaging processing to data analysis, on a single case. Generally speaking, pulsatile flow CFD studies of coronary arteries will require 5–24 h analysing time on a super computer [70,73]. This is a substantial amount of time before clinicians can make any decision as compared with an invasive FFR procedure. This long computational time can be significantly reduced by partially solving the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations. More specifically, by neglecting the time-derivative term ($\partial u/\partial t$) in the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations, a converged flow solution and data analysis can be obtained with 10 min of time using 16 Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPUs E5645 at 2.40 GHz. Similar FFR analysis time for steady flow simulations was also reported by Tu et al. [11] and Papafaklis et al. [71]. Figure 3 presents a comparison between steady flow simulations and pulsatile flow simulations (CFD run time 10 min vs. 25 h). In brief, vFFR can be predicted reasonably well with steady flow simulations. However, steady flow simulation is unable to predict the time-to-time variation of the pressure difference during a cardiac cycle (see inset in Fig. 3b). A pulsatile flow simulation can potentially provide improved information to clinicians such as instantaneous wave-free ratio [77], turbulent flow and variations in wall shear stress [78] that not only help determine the haemodynamic significance of a lesion but also potentially predict the long-term effect of the lesion on coronary flow in the artery. Finally, the presence of turbulent flow can substantially alter distal pressure, which is not considered with steady flow simulations. The impact of turbulent flow on vFFR results cannot be underestimated as stenoses often lead to highly turbulent flow [79].

**Future of virtual fractional flow reserve**

The concept of vFFR, whether derived from CTCA or invasive angiography, is inherently attractive for several reasons. First, CTCA-derived vFFR is able to non-invasively identify physiologically significant stenoses with excellent accuracy, specificity, and high negative predictive value [65–67]. Second, whereas still invasive, angiography-based vFFR obviates the need for hyperaemia induction, expensive pressure wire catheters, and reduces the risk of procedural complications associated with invasive FFR [31,32,74]. These observations suggest a complementary, rather than competing, role for both methodologies in the clinical management of CAD.

---

**Fig. 3**

Virtual fractional flow reserve (vFFR) on case 0 with per cent diameter stenosis = 55 and invasive fractional flow reserve (FFR) = 0.80, vFFR = 0.79. Blood pressure levels across the stenosis are represented by the colour contours of mmHg. Distal pressure ($P_d$) was measured at the pressure sensor location identified from coronary angiography during invasive FFR (red arrows). Aortic pressure ($P_a$) was obtained at the proximal end of the artery. (a) Steady blood flow velocity and (b) pulsatile blood flow velocity. For pulsatile computational fluid dynamics study, the blood pressure levels are presented at the time-instant when the instantaneous blood flow velocity is the same as the steady blood flow velocity. That is, instantaneous blood flow velocity at 0.6 m/s. BPM, beats per min; HR, heart rate.
(see Fig. 4). The high sensitivity and negative predictive value of CTCA-derived vFFR may be useful in effectively ruling out physiologically significant lesions, thereby reducing the number of unnecessary referrals for invasive coronary angiography. Alternatively, in patients appropriately referred for invasive coronary angiography, vFFR may then be used instead of invasive FFR to further reduce procedural risk and cost.

Despite its daunting potential, the clinical application of vFFR remains elusive in its current state. In order to bridge the gap between vFFR and invasive FFR, two major challenges need to be addressed. The first challenge is an improvement to the overall workflow, both in terms of the execution time of the Navier–Stokes solver and the background skill-set required to perform a simulation. The second challenge is to improve patient specificity of the results both in terms of the geometric detail of the model and the imposition of boundary conditions.

To address the first major challenge a departure from standard Navier–Stokes solvers to specially tuned one-dimensional or 2D axisymmetric models, or Lattice Boltzmann methods may be required. With the former approach, a reduced order one-dimensional or 2D axisymmetric model would considerably reduce the size of the computational domain (and hence the amount of computation required to obtain a solution), but may still be able to capture the physics of the flow with sufficient accuracy to estimate the pressure difference. An additional benefit of such an approach would be the simplified mesh generation process, which would be orders of magnitude faster and could potentially be completely
automated, thereby removing the need for an engineer skilled in this field. With a Lattice Boltzmann method, again, the mesh generation procedure is simplified to the point of being trivial and the implicit parallelizability of the method means that 2D or 3D flow fields can be computed significantly faster on generic CPU-based supercomputing platforms or using graphics processing units [80].

Second, refinement in medical imaging data will also improve the accuracy, sensitivity and specificity of vFFR. Tight integration of coronary angiography and OCT (e.g. with coregistration) can lead to more accurate patient-specific coronary artery reconstructions [76], increased accuracy of vFFR simulations due to its high-fidelity and resolution, thereby providing better insight into the alteration of haemodynamics in the presence of stenoses.

In terms of addressing the issue of generic boundary conditions, use of the thrombolysis in myocardial infarction frame count to determine a patient-specific input for volumetric flow rate may be extended in an even more sophisticated manner to dynamically tune the boundary conditions. By solving an additional transport equation (describing the motion of the dye) with the standard Navier–Stokes equations, a synthetically generated concentration field could be generated. In this case, the observed and computed concentration fields could be used to pose vFFR as an optimization problem, dynamically tuning the boundary conditions until a misfit function describing the discrepancy between the observed and computed motion of the dye is minimized.

Ultimately, for this technology to be incorporated into routine clinical practice, medical image data processing and CFD simulations need to be automated [69] and simplified [81] such that patient-specific vFFR values can be obtained in an actionable time-frame. An automated process resulting in fast and highly accurate online vFFR would provide interventional cardiologists the optimum strategies for treatment of CAD, benefiting more patients and potentially cutting healthcare costs.

Conclusion

Anatomic and physiologic assessments of coronary stenoses remain the foundation of clinical cardiology. The standard techniques of 2D coronary angiography and invasive FFR measurements have rapidly given way to more advanced methodologies incorporating 3D quantitative angiography, coronary computed tomographic angiography, OCT and CFD simulations in calculating virtually derived FFR. In its current state, vFFR correlates moderately well and has many potential benefits over invasive FFR; however, several critical issues continue to hinder its wider clinical application. Higher image resolution and accuracy of 3D coronary artery models, more robust understanding and treatment of numerical boundary conditions, enhanced computational time, and more streamlined workflows will help bring vFFR into mainstream clinical practice.
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