




Prevent Cancer Foundation
"Quantitative Imaging Workshop XIV: Lung
Cancer, COPD and Cardiovascular Disease"
October 2-3, 2017 | Hilton McLean Tysons Corner

Are Radiologists Responsible for Everything in the Field of View?

Disclosure: none

Harvey S. Hecht, MD, FACC, FSCCT
Director of Cardiovascular Imaging
Mount Sinai Saint Luke's and Mount Sinai West Medical Centers
Professor of Medicine, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai


Comparative Effects of Passive and Active Smoking



	SHS	Exposure	Active	SHS/Active
Risk of heart disease				
29 study meta-analysis	1.31	Chronic	1.78	40%

1. Risk Prediction

CAC is unequivocally the most powerful predictor of cardiac risk in the asymptomatic primary prevention population and should replace risk factor based analyses (FRS, Procam, ESC).



Prognostic Power of CAC in Asymptomatic Patients

	N	Mean Age (years)	Follow up (years)	Calcium Score Cutoff	Comparator Group for RR Calculat	Relative Risk Ratio
Arad (1)	1,173	53	3.6	CAC>160	CAC< 160	20.2
Park (2)	967	67	6.4	CAC >142.1	CAC <3.7	4.9
Raggi (3)	632	52	2.7	Top Quartile	Lowest Quartile	13
Wong (4)	926	54	3.3	Top Quartile (>270)	First Quartile	8.8
Kondos (5)	5,635	51	3.1	CAC	No CAC	10.5
Greenland (6)	1,312	66	7.0	CAC>300	No CAC	3.9
Shaw (7)	10,377	53	5	CAC ≥400	CAC ≤10	8.4
Arad (8)	5,585	59	4.3	CAC ≥ 100	CAC <100	10.7
Taylor (9)	2000	40-50	3.0	CAC >44	CAC=0	11.8
Vliegenthart (10)	1795	71	3.3	CAC>1000	CAC<100	8.3
				CAC 400-1000	CAC<100	4.6
Budoff (11)	25,503	56	6.8	CAC>400	CAC 0	9.2
Lagoski (12)	3601	45-84	3.75	CAC>0	CAC 0	6.5
Becker (13)	1726	57.7	3.4	CAC>400	CAC 0	6.8 men 7.9 women
Detrano (14)	6814	62.2	3.8	CAC>300	CAC 0	14.1
Erbel (15)	4487	45-75	5	>75 th %	<25 th %	11.1 men 3.2 women

Prognostic Power of CAC in Asymptomatic Patients

	N	Mean Age (years)	Follow up (years)	Calcium Score Cutoff	Comparator Group for RR Calculat	Relative Risk Ratio
Arad (1)	1,173	53	3.6	CAC>160	CAC< 160	20.2
Park (2)	967	67	6.4	CAC >142.1	CAC <3.7	4.9
Raggi (3)	632	52	2.7	Top Quartile	Lowest	13
Wolfe (4)						1.8
Korber (5)						0.5
Greider (6)						0.9
Shah (7)						0.4
Arad (8)						0.7
Taylor (9)						1.8
Vliegenthart (10)	1795	71	3.3	CAC>1000 CAC 400-1000	CAC<100 CAC<100	8.3 4.6
Budoff (11)	25,503	56	6.8	CAC>400	CAC 0	9.2
Lagoski (12)	3601	45-84	3.75	CAC>0	CAC 0	6.5
Becker (13)	1726	57.7	3.4	CAC>400	CAC 0	6.8 men 7.9 women
Detrano (14)	6814	62.2	3.8	CAC>300	CAC 0	14.1
Erbel (15)	4487	45-75	5	>75 th %	<25 th %	11.1 men 3.2 women

In every study, CAC has been superior to and significantly added to the area under the ROC curve for all risk factor based analyses!

Summary of CAC Absolute Event Rates from 14,856 Pts in 5 Prospective Studies

CAC	FRS Risk	10 yr event rate
0	very low	1.1-1.7 %
1-100	low	2.3-5.9 %
100-400	intermediate	12.8-16.4 %
>400	high	22.5-28.6 %
>1000	very high	37 %

Reclassification of FRS Risk by CAC Primary Prevention Outcome Studies

Study	% Reclassified	N	Age	Follow up (yrs)
MESA		5878	62.2	5.8
FRS 0-6%	11.6%			
FRS 6-20%	54.4%			
FRS>20%	35.8%			
NRI	25%			
Heinz Nixdorf		4487	45-75	5.0
FRS<10%	15.0%			
FRS 10-20%	65.6%			
FRS>20%	34.2%			
NRI	22.4%			
Rotterdam		2028	69.6	9.2
FRS<10%	12%			
FRS 10-20%	52%			
FRS>20%	34%			
NRI	19%			

Reclassification of FRS Risk by CAC

Primary Prevention Outcome Studies

Study	% Reclassified	N	Age	Follow up (yrs)
MESA		5878	62.2	5.8
FRS 0-6%	11.6%			
FRS 6-20%	54.4%			
FRS >20%				
NRI				
Heinz				
FRS <10%	18.8%			
FRS 10-20%	65.6%			
FRS >20%	34.2%			
NRI				
Rotte				
FRS <10%	12%			
FRS 10-20%	52%			
FRS >20%	34%			
NRI	19%			

RF based prediction in intermediate risk group is worse than a flip of the coin!


RF based prediction in high risk group is wrong in 1/3 of pts

CAC is an independent Stroke Predictor in the General Population: Heinz Nixdorf Recall Study

4180 patients, 45–75 years; 47.1% men,
94.9±19month follow up

	CAC	
	CVA	no CVA
Median	104.8	11.2
Q1;Q3	14.0;482.2	0;106.2
<i>P</i>	<0.001	

	MV HR	<i>p</i>
log10(CAC+1)	1.52	0.001
Age/5y	1.35	<0.001
SBP/10mm	1.25	<0.001
Smoking	1.75	0.025



CAC predicted stroke:
men and women
esp <65 years of age
independent of AF
Low and intermediate FRS

Redefinition of Normal Lipids

There are no “normal cholesterol” values that apply to the individual patients in the population based studies from which they were derived

“normal” : cholesterol values at which level there is *no* subclinical atherosclerosis

“abnormal” : cholesterol values at which level there *is* subclinical atherosclerosis, with the severity of “abnormal” depending on the degree of subclinical atherosclerosis.

Major CAC Progression Studies

First Author (Ref. #)	N	Follow-Up, yrs	Progression			Progression HR
Raggi et al. (58)	813	2.1	Event: 47% No event: 26% p < 0.01			
Raggi et al. (59)	495	3.2	Event: 42% No event: 17% p < 0.0001			>15% vs. <15%: 17.2
Budoff et al. (60)	4,609	3.1				>15% vs. <15%: 2.98 p < 0.0001
Budoff et al. (61)	6,778	7.6	CAC 0 baseline CAC >0 baseline			>5 AU/yr vs. <5 AU/yr: 1.4 >100 AU/yr: 1.2 >300 AU/yr: 3.8 5%-14%/yr: 1.1 14%-29%/yr: 1.6 >30%/yr: 1.5
Wong et al. (62)	5,662	4.9	Third progression tertile Events/1,000 person-yrs DM + MetS: 30.7 MetS w/o DM: 26.4 Neither: 17.7			Third tertile vs. no progression 8.5 4.1
Kiramijyan et al. (63)	296 DM 300 non-DM	4.7	Event-free survival			DM vs. no DM Δ10%-20% vs. <10%: 1.88 Δ21-30% vs. <10%: 2.29 Δ>30% vs. <10%: 6.95
			ΔCAC	DM	No DM	
			<10%	97.9%	100%	
			10%-20%	95.9%	97.2%	
			21%-30%	92.7%	94%	
			>30%	79.6%	90.6%	

Coronary Calcium Progression

- Significant progression indicates worse prognosis irrespective of baseline level
- Absence of progression indicates excellent prognosis irrespective of baseline level
- Increased progression associated with MI despite LDL lowering indicates failure of statin rx to halt plaque formation

Redefinition of Residual Risk

Old Definition: Occurrence of events despite treatment

New Definition: Disease progression measured by serial CAC
evaluation of subclinical atherosclerosis

Guidelines and Appropriateness Criteria

Coronary Artery Calcium

	Population	Recommendation
2009 USPSTF	NA	C
2010 ACC/AHA Risk Guidelines	10-20% intermediate risk	IIA
	Diabetics >40 yo	IIA
	6-10% low to intermediate risk	IIB
2010 Appropriate Use Criteria	10-20% intermediate risk	Appropriate
	Low risk with family history of premature coronary disease	Appropriate
	High risk	Uncertain
	Low risk	Inappropriate
2012 ESC Risk Guideline	Intermediate risk	IIA
2013 ACC/AHA Cholesterol and Risk Guidelines	Uncertain risk after Pooled Cohort Equations	IIB
2017 SSCT CAC Guidelines	<u>></u> 5.0% Risk by Pooled Cohort Equations	IIA

American College of Radiology Indications

A. Indications for Lung CT Scans

1. Evaluation of abnormalities discovered on chest images.
2. Evaluation of clinically suspected cardiothoracic pathology.
3. Staging and follow-up of lung cancer and other primary thoracic malignancies, and detection and evaluation of metastatic disease.
4. Evaluation of cardiothoracic manifestations of known extrathoracic diseases.
5. Evaluation of known or suspected thoracic cardiovascular abnormalities (congenital or acquired), including aortic stenosis, aortic aneurysms, and dissection.
6. Evaluation of suspected acute or chronic pulmonary emboli.
7. Evaluation of suspected pulmonary arterial hypertension.
8. Evaluation of known or suspected congenital cardiothoracic anomalies.
9. Evaluation and follow-up of pulmonary parenchymal and airway disease.
10. Evaluation of blunt and penetrating trauma.
11. Evaluation of postoperative patients and surgical complications.
12. Performance of CT-guided interventional procedures.
13. Evaluation of the chest wall.
14. Evaluation of pleural disease.
15. Treatment planning for radiation therapy.
16. Evaluation of medical complications in the intensive care unit or other settings.

American College of Radiology Performance Guidelines

B. Performance Guidelines for Lung CT Scans

1. Multirow detector acquisition.
2. Scan rotation time: ≤ 1 sec.
3. Acquired slice thickness: ≤ 2 mm.
4. Limiting spatial resolution: ≥ 8 lp/cm for ≥ 32 -cm display field of view (DFOV) and ≥ 10 lp/cm for < 24 cm DFOV.

Guidelines and Appropriateness Criteri

Low Dose Lung Scan

	Age	Pack Years	Within past
National Comprehensive Cancer Network	50-74	≥ 30 ≥ 20 with additional risk factor	15 years 15 years
American College of Chest Physicians and American Society for Clinical Oncology	55-74	≥ 30	15 years
American Cancer Society	55-74	≥ 30	15 years
American Association for Thoracic Surgery	55-79 50-79	≥ 30 ≥ 20 with 5% 5 year risk	15 years 15 years
American Lung Association	55-74	≥ 30	15 years
United States Preventive Services Task Force	55-79	≥ 30	15 years

Medicare

Medicaid/CHIP

Medicare-Medicaid
Coordination

Private
Insurance

Innovation
Center

Regulations &
Guidance

Research, Statistics,
Data & Systems

Outreach &
Education

OVERVIEW

ADVANCED
SEARCH

INDEXES

REPORTS

DOWNLOADS

 BASKET (0)

[Contextual Help is Off](#) | [Page Help](#)

Radiology imaging center eligibility criteria:

For purposes of Medicare coverage of lung cancer LDCT screening, an eligible LDCT screening facility is one that:

- Has participated in past lung cancer screening trials, such as the National Lung Screening Trial, or an accredited advanced diagnostic imaging center with training and experience in LDCT lung cancer screening;
- Must use LDCTs with an effective radiation dose less than 1.5 mSv, and
- Must collect and submit data to a CMS-approved national registry for each LDCT lung cancer screening performed. The data collected and submitted to a CMS-approved national registry must include, at minimum, all of the following elements:

[Expand All](#) | [Collapse All](#)

Decision Summary

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) proposes that the evidence is sufficient to add a lung cancer screening counseling and shared decision making visit, and for appropriate beneficiaries, screening for lung cancer with low dose computed tomography (LDCT), once per year, as an additional preventive service benefit under the Medicare program only if all of the following criteria are met:

Beneficiary eligibility criteria:

- Age 55-74 years;
- Asymptomatic (no signs or symptoms of lung disease);
- Tobacco smoking history of at least 30 pack-years (one pack-year = smoking one pack per day for one year; 1 pack = 20 cigarettes);
- Current smoker or one who has quit smoking within the last 15 years; and

A Stupid Question

A 60 yo male smoker underwent CAC scanning to determine the need for statin and ASA therapy. There was no coronary calcium but there was a 1 cm nodule suspicious for lung cancer.

Should the nodule be reported?

A 45-year-old male underwent a noncontrast, nongated chest CT for further evaluation of pulmonary symptoms. Extensive CAC was present but not reported and statin therapy was not implemented. One year later he died suddenly from a massive myocardial infarction.



Choose the correct answer(s):

1. Catastrophic and potentially avoidable but within the standard of care because reporting CAC on noncontrast CT scans is not part of radiology guidelines.

2. Catastrophic and potentially avoidable but within the standard of care because there are no randomized controlled trials (RCTs) demonstrating that CAC guided treatment affects outcomes positively.

1. Catastrophic and potentially avoidable but within the standard of care because reporting CAC on noncontrast CT scans is not part of radiology guidelines.

2. Catastrophic and potentially avoidable but within the standard of care because there are no randomized controlled trials (RCTs) demonstrating that CAC guided treatment affects outcomes positively.

3. Catastrophic and potentially avoidable, and CAC should be routinely reported and incorporated into risk assessment and treatment.

1. Catastrophic and potentially avoidable but within the standard of care because reporting CAC on noncontrast CT scans is not part of radiology guidelines.

Are radiologists obligated to report all significant findings in the field of view?

should be routinely reported and incorporated into risk assessment and treatment.

Barriers to Reporting

Additional time and effort, not likely to exceed 5 min, are required of the interpreting radiologist. While this may not seem excessive, when multiplied by the number of scans to be read on a daily basis, additional stress will be added to an already overloaded schedule and will not be readily accepted or reimbursed

Reporting very abnormal results to referring physicians who did not request the information and who may not know how it should be utilized may be daunting and consume additional time.

Referring physicians will be forced to act on, and take responsibility for, results they did not request and may not understand, and they will often need to refer these patients to those physicians capable of implementing the findings into treatment plans.

Barriers to Reporting


The importance of CAC may not be fully appreciated by the radiology community

Absence of reporting guidelines

Expense of workstations capable of CAC analysis.

From the treatment perspective, the outstanding criticism of CAC has been the absence of RCTs demonstrating a positive effect on outcomes by CAC guided treatment, which has prevented its designation as a screening test by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force and its reimbursement by insurance companies. In the absence of such trials can one be faulted for not reporting the CAC results or for not implementing them into patient care?

~95% of lung scan candidates are CAC candidates as well



Combined detection of coronary artery disease and lung cancer

Harvey S. Hecht*, **Claudia Henschke**, **David Yankelevitz**, **Valentin Fuster**,
and **Jagat Narula**

Department of Cardiology, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, One Gustave L. Levy Place, Box 1030, New York 10029, USA

At the present time, it is logical and reasonable that gated CAC scanning be performed on lung scans and that the entire thorax be imaged during CAC scans in those who meet recommendations for both evaluations.

American College of Radiology National Radiology Data Registry- Lung Cancer Screening Registry (ACR NRDR-LCSR)

7A15. *Other clinically significant or potentially significant abnormalities – CT exam result modifier S:

No Yes

If yes, what were the other findings? (Select all that apply.)

- Aortic aneurysm Coronary arterial calcification, moderate or severe Pulmonary fibrosis
- Mass, please specify, e.g., neck, mediastinum, liver, kidneys: _____
- Other interstitial lung disease, select type if known:
- UIP/IPF
 - ILD, other, please specify: _____
 - ILD, unknown

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](#)

Journal of Cardiovascular Computed Tomography

journal homepage: www.JournalofCardiovascularCT.com



Guidelines

2016 SCCT/STR guidelines for coronary artery calcium scoring of noncontrast noncardiac chest CT scans: A report of the Society of Cardiovascular Computed Tomography and Society of Thoracic Radiology

Harvey S. Hecht ^a, Paul Cronin ^b, Michael J. Blaha ^c, Matthew J. Budoff ^d,
Ella A. Kazerooni ^b, Jagat Narula ^e, David Yankelevitz ^f, Suhny Abbara ^{g,*}

J Thorac Imaging Volume 32, Number 5, September 2017

Site Requirements

ALARA

≥300 CT/year

≥10 detector rows

state and federal requirements and ACR or equivalent technical standards and practice guidelines




Technical Issues

Always 120kVp: database driven



Reconstruction to 2.5-3 mm slices

Iterative reconstruction and lower
mAs to reduce radiation

Gated



Nongated



Coronary Calcium Scores as Function of Patient Age and Gender – Results of National Database


MEN (n=28,250)	EBCT Coronary Calcium Scores in Asymptomatic Patients as a Function of Patient Age at the Time of the Examination						
Percentiles /Age (yrs)	40-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	66-70	70+
10	0	0	0	1	1	3	3
25	0	1	2	5	12	30	69
50	2	3	15	54	117	166	350
75	11	36	110	229	386	538	844
90	69	151	346	588	933	1151	1650
WOMEN (n=14,540)							
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
50	0	0	1	1	3	25	51
75	1	2	6	22	68	148	231
90	4	21	61	127	208	327	698

CAC on Low-Dose Ungated MDCT for Lung Cancer Screening: Concordance Study with Dedicated Cardiac CT

483 pts: 2 scans: gated and low dose ungated
16 slice, 3 mm thickness, 120 kVp

Variability	Nongated	Gated
Interobserver	9.6%	3.6%
Intertechnique		40-43%
Concordance risk group		K=0.89
NPV		98-99%
Median	57	54

Nongated Ordinal CAC Scoring




LM, LAD, LCx, RCA


CAC/artery: none (0), mild (1), moderate (2), marked (3)

CAC score: 0 -12/scan

Nongated Visual Analysis



Normal



Moderate
Calcification



Severe
Calcification

Nongated Agatston Score Prognostic Studies

Study	Duration	Pts/events	Adjusted HR vs 0	95% CI	
Jacobs	20.5 months	958/127	1-100	1.38	0.39, 4.90
		CHD	101-1000	3.04	0.95, 9.73
		events	>1000	7.77	2.44, 24.75
Mets	3 years	1834/145	100mm ³	1.08	1.05, 1.11
		CVD events	500mm ³	1.48	1.27, 1.72
			>1500mm ³	3.22	2.05, 5.07
Chiles	7 years	1442/210	1-100	1.27	0.69, 3.57
		CHD death	101-1000	3.57	2.14, 7.48
			>1000	6.63	3.57, 14.97
Hughes-Austin	>6 years	651/157	Nongated 6 mm		
		All cause	1-100	1.9	1.1, 3.1
		death	101-300	2.3	1.2, 4.3
			>300	2.6	1.4, 4.9
			Gated 3mm		
			1-100	2.1	1.1, 3.8
	101-300	2.9	1.5, 5.7		
	>300	3.2	1.7, 6.0		

Nongated Ordinal Score Prognostic Studies


Study	Duration	Pts/events	Adjusted HR vs 0	95% CI	
Shemesh	6 years	8782/193	CAC 1-3	1.0	0.7, 1.5
		CHD death	CAC 4-12	2.1	1.4, 3.1
Chiles	7 years	1442/210	CAC 1-5	1.72	1.05, 3.34
		CHD death	CAC 6-11	5.11	2.92, 10.94
			CAC 12-30	6.11	3.19, 14.05

Nongated Visual Score Prognostic Studies

Study	Duration	Pts/events	Adjusted HR vs 0	95% CI	
Chiles	7 years	1447/210	mild	2.09	1.3, 4.16
		CHD death	moderate	3.86	2.02, 8.20
			heavy	6.9	3.73, 15.67

Development and progression of Coronary Artery Calcification in Long-term Smokers – Adverse Effects of Continued Smoking

1265 smokers, 50-70y, median 57; 45% women, >20 pack years, median 34
No CAD, 4 y volumetric nongated MDCT f/u
3 groups: ex, light (1-17/d), heavy (>17/d)



Coronary Artery Calcium Scoring Techniques


Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages
EKG gated Agatston scoring	Huge database Standard of care 1000's of articles Guidelines Computer analysis	Software required EKG gating required
Nongated Agatston scoring	No EKG gating required Computer analysis Good correlation with gated	Software required Fewer articles Less reproducible No database
Nongated Ordinal scoring	No software required	No database Few articles Manual analysis Less reproducible
Visual assessment	No software required Quickest analysis	No database 1 article Eyeball analysis Less reproducible

Coronary Artery Calcium Scoring Techniques

Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages
EKG gated	Huge database	Software required
Agatston scoring	Standard of care 1000's of articles Guidelines	EKG gating required

The decision to report CAC, rather than the analysis method, is the most critical issue!

	with gated	No database
Nongated Ordinal scoring	No software required	No database Few articles Manual analysis Less reproducible
Visual assessment	No software required Quickest analysis	No database 1 article Eyeball analysis Less reproducible



Guidelines

2016 SCCT/STR guidelines for coronary artery calcium scoring of noncontrast noncardiac chest CT scans: A report of the Society of Cardiovascular Computed Tomography and Society of Thoracic Radiology



Harvey S. Hecht ^a, Paul Cronin ^b, Michael J. Blaha ^c, Matthew J. Budoff ^d,
Ella A. Kazerooni ^b, Jagat Narula ^e, David Yankelevitz ^f, Suhny Abbara ^{g,*}

Table 5

CAC reporting recommendations^a.

Reporting

Class I. CAC should be evaluated and reported on all noncontrast chest CT examinations

Class IIb. It may be reasonable to evaluate and report thoracic aortic calcification on all noncontrast chest CT examinations

Scoring methodology

Class I. CAC should be estimated as none, mild, moderate or severe

Class IIa. It is reasonable to perform ordinal assessment of CAC on all noncontrast chest CT examinations

Class IIb. It may be reasonable to perform Agatston CAC scoring on all noncontrast chest CT examinations

Table 6

Coronary artery calcium score reports for noncontrast CT examinations.

Total:	Percentile:	LM:	LAD:	LCx:	RCA:
A. Coronary Artery Calcium Gated and Nongated Agatston score					
Score	Risk				
0	very low				
1–99	mildly increased				
100–299	moderately increased				
≥300	moderate to severely increased				
Total:	LM:	LAD:	LCx:	RCA:	
B. Coronary Artery Calcium Ordinal Score (0–12)					
Score	Risk				
0	very low				
1–3	mild to moderately increased				
4–12	moderate to severely increased				
C. Coronary Artery Calcium Ordinal Score (0–30):					
Score	Risk				
0	very low				
1–5	mildly increased				
6–11	moderately increased				
12–30	moderate to severely increased				
D. Coronary Artery Calcium Visual Score:					
Score	Risk				
None	very low				
Mild	mildly increased				
Moderate	moderately increased				
Severe	moderate to severely increased				



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](#)

Journal of Cardiovascular Computed Tomography

journal homepage: www.JournalofCardiovascularCT.com



Guidelines

Clinical indications for coronary artery calcium scoring in asymptomatic patients: Expert consensus statement from the Society of Cardiovascular Computed Tomography



Harvey Hecht, MD, FSCCT^{a,*}, Michael J. Blaha, MD, MPH^b, Daniel S. Berman, MD, FSCCT^c,
Khurram Nasir, MD, MPH, FSCCT^d, Matthew Budoff, MD, FSCCT^e,
Jonathon Leipsic, MD, FSCCT^f, Ron Blankstein, MD, FSCCT^g, Jagat Narula, MD, PhD^a,
John Rumberger, MD, FSCCT^h, Leslee J. Shaw, PhD, FSCCTⁱ

Table 1

SCCT CAC expert consensus recommendations.

1. It is appropriate to perform CAC testing in the context of shared decision making for asymptomatic individuals without clinical ASCVD who are 40–75 years of age in the 5–20% 10-year ASCVD risk group and selectively in the <5% ASCVD group, such as those with a family history of premature coronary artery disease.
2. In patients for whom the development or progression of CAC would support intensification or alteration in preventive management, it may be appropriate to consider repeat CAC scanning at an interval of 5 years for patients with 0 CAC and a 3–5-year interval for patients with >0 CAC.
3. As an alternative to filtered back projection and 120 kVp acquisition, iterative and model based reconstruction and 100 kVp acquisition may be utilized with caution after site-based or literature-based validation for each scanner vendor, with documented <10% difference in mean CAC scores and risk group classification compared to filtered back projection and 120 kVp studies.
4. Consistent with a prior guideline from the SCCT/STR, CAC scoring of noncontrast chest CT scans is appropriate in all lung cancer screening patients and patients greater than 40 years of age without established ASCVD. The presence of CAC should be noted in the report of all NCCT studies.
5. ~~The presence of BAC on mammography should be discussed with the patient and detailed in the final report. Shared decision making regarding dedicated CAC scanning may be considered for patients with BAC.~~
6. It may be appropriate to include CAC scanning in CCTA protocols in symptomatic patients without established CAD undergoing CTA, and in high risk asymptomatic individuals for whom the CCTA appropriateness criterion is uncertain, as well as in asymptomatic patients referred for preoperative evaluation prior to major surgery.
7. It is appropriate to incorporate CAC scanning in SPECT and PET MPI protocols in patients who are free of known clinical coronary artery disease.

Table 3

CAC score determined risk classifications and treatment recommendations in the 5–20% ASCVD risk group.

Score	Risk	Treatment Recommendation
0	very low	statin not recommended ^a
1–99	mildly increased	moderate intensity statin if < 75th%; moderate to high intensity if > 75th%
100–299	moderately increased	moderate to high intensity statin + ASA 81mg
>300	moderate to severely increased	high intensity statin + ASA 81mg

Coronary Artery Calcium Score Reports for Noncontrast CT Scans

Coronary Artery Calcium Visual Score

Total:

LM:

LAD:

LCx:

RCA:

Score

Risk

None

very low

healthy lifestyle

Mild

mildly
increased

healthy lifestyle
consider moderate statin especially if >75th%

Moderate

moderately
increased

healthy lifestyle
moderate to very intensive statin + statin

Severe

moderate to
severely increased

healthy lifestyle
very intensive statin
ASA

Shared Decision Making

The new SCCT CAC guidelines have recommended the inclusion of CAC in the statin SDM to ensure patients awareness of the potential effect it may have on the initiation of statin treatment.

Should CAC be included in the lung cancer screening shared decision making session, with a discussion of its benefits and harms, and should the patient be offered the option of declining CAC analysis and reporting?

Since CAC is not the primary indication for the scan, has not been specifically mandated for SDM inclusion and may further complicate an already complicated discussion, it appears reasonable to treat it like any “other clinically significant or potentially significant abnormalities” to be recorded in the ACR NRDR-LCSR, rather than to include it in the SDM.

Lung Cancer Screening Eligibility in the Community: CV Risk Factors, CAC, and CV Events

3000 asymptomatic FHS Offspring Cohort 55-77 ; 11.4 y f/u

CMS (1) 55 to 77 years, (2) current or recent (≤ 15 years) former smoker (3) ≥ 30 pack-year

980 CAC			
CAC	Eligible	Ineligible	
	13.6%	86.4%	
>0	90.2%	78.0%	0.01
>300	39.1%	27%	0.045

Cardiovascular prevention should be considered as part of the consultation for lung Ca screening.


	Eligible n=596 (20%)	Ineligible n=2404 (80%)	HR	p
ASCVD	12.6%	8.0%	1.79	<0.001
nonfatal MI	7.9%	4.2%	1.42	<0.001
nonfatal CVA	3.4%	3.1%	1.35	0.24
CVD death	2.5%	1.8%	1.52	0.17
Statin eligible	78.9%			
10y risk	11.4%	9.6%		
Lung cancer	7.2%	1.0%	9.01	<0.001
dx only	2.0%	0.5%	5.28	<0.001
death	5.2%	0.5%	12.1	<0.001

Thoracic Aortic Aneurysm


By SAMMY SALTZMAN CBS NEWS December 14, 2010

Richard Holbrooke Dies of Aortic Tear: What's That?

If John had been screened for the aneurysm prior to the aortic tear, he might be alive today



Thoracic Aortic Aneurysm



Thoracic Aortic Aneurysm

Aortic aneurysms were the primary cause of 10,597 deaths and a contributing cause in more than 17,215 deaths in the United States in 2009: 25% are thoracic

About two-thirds of people who have an aortic dissection are male.

The USPSTF recommends that men 65–75 years who have ever smoked should get an ultrasound screening for AAA, even if they have no symptoms.

There is no screening for thoracic aortic aneurysm!

EDITORIAL COMMENT


“See No Evil”*

Harvey S. Hecht, MD



Screening for lung cancer, which always contains the CAC data without extra radiation or cost of acquisition, should be positioned as not just a scan for lung cancer but as an opportunity to detect the early stages of CAD. Moreover, because the aorta is always in the field of view, it would be reasonable to include the detection of **thoracic aneurysms** as well: a “**triple rule out**” of a different kind.

WE NY




Even though we are one of the best in the country at lung cancer surgery and putting in stents and performing coronary artery bypass surgery and, we are working hard to make sure you never need them.

A PICTURE

IS WORTH

A THOUSAND LIVES



If you have risk factors for lung cancer, heart disease, aortic aneurysm or COPD, for \$150 and 3 seconds of your time our noninvasive combined lung and coronary calcium heart scans (with the minimal radiation of a mammogram), can determine your risk of lung cancer, heart attack, aneurysm, and COPD and help you take the steps needed to avoid visiting our surgical suites and cath labs.

Call 212 241-3000 to schedule your appointment from 7 AM to 8 PM



New York's foremost center for lung and heart care. Staffed with world- renowned lung and heart specialists, we're the first to bring world class combined lung and heart scanning to the world's greatest city.

Screening Randomized Controlled Trials

Disease	RCT
Lung cancer	yes
CAC for CAD	no
Thoracic aneurysm	no

Irrelevant: the information has already been acquired

EDITORIAL COMMENT

“See No Evil”*

Harvey S. Hecht, MD



“This approach transforms the problems of dealing with everything in the field of view into an unparalleled opportunity to save lives. As a responsible medical community, we cannot “see no evil” (ignore the CAC), “speak no evil” (not report the results), and “hear no evil” (not listen to and act on the results).”

It's in the Field of View!
Coronary Artery Analysis on Chest Computed Tomographic
Angiography

Harvey S. Hecht, MD, FACC, FSCCT^a

Jagat Narula, MD, PhD^a

Jonathon Leipsic, MD, FSCCT^b

Conclusions

In the midst of the cardiovascular disease epidemic, providing critical coronary artery information from chest CTA performed for evaluation of AD, AA and PE without additional risk or cost, in combination with improving the quality of the CTA, should become the standard of care. The barriers of insufficient number of trained physicians for image analysis, requirement for “24/7” interpretation, inadequate compensation and possible inappropriate use of the coronary test results must be resolved by the radiology and medical communities.