Assessing the risk in severe inherited hyperlipidemia

The possible precocious occurrence of a coronary event in patients affected by severe forms of genetically inherited hyperlipidemia such as familial hypercholesterolemia (FH) homozygote (HozFH), double heterozygote “compound” (DhFH), heterozygote (HtzFH), autosomal recessive hypercholesterolemia (ARH), and HyperLp(a) lipidemia [HyperLp(a)], imposes an effective, continuous and personalized therapeutic approach. Pharmacological therapy on its own does not obtain adequate results in HozFH or DhFH, and in approximately 20% of cases affected by HtzFH, perhaps because of a genetically-determined variable response to statins, or intolerance. The natural history of HozFH and DhFH predicts, in the absence of treatment, a fatal event (sudden death and myocardial infarction) in the first or second decade of life. They have xanthomatosis (tuberous and tendineous) and atherosclerosis of coronary arteries and aortic root stenosis. Only 20% of HtzFH reaches the age of 70 years. A precocious, intensive treatment, carried out with rigorous attention to LDL-Cholesterol (LDLC) targets for individuals at high risk such as the above mentioned patients, suggested by international guidelines, enabled LDL-apheresis experts to observe the stabilization and, in some cases, angiographically documented regression of coronary atherosclerotic lesions. The Italian Multicenter Study on LDL-apheresis Working Group (2009) reported differences concerning the diagnostic modality of evaluating the cardiovascular system, both in the assessment of the pre-existing Coronary Artery Disease (CAD), and in the follow up of cardiovascular disease (1,2). While recourse to echocardiography, echodoppler of the carotid and vertebral arteries, standard and stress electrocardiography (ECG) is relatively common. Centers where patients undergo coronary catheterization and other non-invasive cardiovascular techniques result as being only a little less inferior. Moreover, aorto-coronary angiography is prescribed to paediatric patients with some reluctance. This evidence may represent a limit in the prospective evaluation on
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the impact of lipid lowering treatment on the progression and stabilization-regression of pre-existing atherosclerotic lesions. Even the possibility of confirming the effectiveness of LDL-apheresis reported in literature, in preventing the relapse of cardiac events or of obstruction of grafts after aorto-coronary by-pass operations, or of stents introduced during Percutaneous Transluminal Coronary Angioplasty (PTCA), is significantly limited from the lack of programming of diagnostic cardiovascular exams of a serial type. Repetition over time of any general cardiovascular exam is more frequent in highly specialized and clinical research oriented centers. Nevertheless, a precocious diagnosis of subclinical, silent forms is crucial, whether fatal and non fatal cardiovascular events are to be prevented (3, 4). More recently novel imaging techniques, each one with its own strength and drawbacks, have been reported. Supposedly the new diagnostic techniques can help in the evaluation and quantification of atherosclerosis. Particularly when repetition over time, and the evaluation of the impact of existing lipid-lowering tools and emerging new pharmacological approach is necessary. This is not philosophically different from serial investigation of cardiovascular system in subjects affected by arterial hypertension.

Serial cardiovascular diagnostic evaluation in Homozygous Familial Hypercholesterolemia

According to the available body of evidence all patients with HoFH must be submitted to:

Cardiovascular examination and ECG: must be performed before submitting patients to LDL-apheresis, and later at least once a year (follow-up) to highlight patients clinical condition;

Cardiac echocolorDoppler: must be performed before submitting patients to LDL-apheresis, and later every 1-2 years (follow-up). In case of documented lesions - left ventricle insufficiency, aortic supravalvular stenosis, and valvular insufficiency - the examination can be repeated more frequently;

Exercise ECG test: to highlight the possible presence of objective findings suggestive of myocardial ischemia that is not associated with angina or anginal equivalent.

To be performed before submitting patients to LDL-apheresis and later once a year (follow-up). Where indicated it can be substituted with stress myocardial scintigraphy, or pharmacologically stress-induced test, or stress echocardiography;

Investigations are under way to characterize atherosclerotic lesions by imaging, particularly in coronary artery disease, not only including conventional angiography, but also B-mode ultrasound (B-mode US), Intravascular ultrasound (IVUS), CT, and MR imaging.
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Magnetic Resonance and coronary computed tomography

Among modern technology, MRI and coro CT offer anatomic images and very detailed functions which are intuitive for cardiologists. They are precise images which are easily obtained within a reasonable timeframe and with little or no exposure to radiation and with modest use of contrasts. MRI is capable of great well-defined anatomical images of the heart which are superior to the echocardiogram and which provides information as to the texture of the structure itself (Fig. 1). With certain pharmacological tests it is even possible to obtain functional images which alert to the presence of myocardial ischaemia or contractile reserves. The coro CT instead represents the emerging method of primary prevention. It permits a coronary visualization that, if obtained at an acceptable cardiac frequency (<70/min), provides good quality and definition. It is excellent at negative predictors while less talented at positive prediction due to difficulty in defining surfaces of plaques when calcification or coronary stents are present. It is, however, excellent at highlighting and evaluating arterial or venous bypasses (Fig. 2a, b). The taking in of raw data and its successive analyzing allow for the multidisciplinary orthogonal reconstruction of curves and, in a sense, enable a qualitative and quantitative interpretation of the lesions. The information gained from the coro CT is multiple: the first consists in a simple calculation of the amount of coronary calcium present. This calculation correlates in a satisfactory manner to the coronary lesions (Fig. 3). The absence of calcium excludes any coronary artery disease with great precision (9). An anatomical image which proves the presence of coronary lesions allows for greater risk satisfac-
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...tion and renders more precise the definition of the extent of the stenosis (9). This definition is not affected by the statin therapy, seemingly (10). Recently studies have appeared demonstrating a great correlation between survival and presence or absence of coronary artery disease with subcritical and critical lesions. The methodology is even able to discriminate between patients with only a single chamber involved with respect to multiple chambers. The more advanced technology allows for excellent visualization of the coronary branches with reduced radiation exposure as compared with the past (between 1.5-3.0 mSv compared with 1.0 mSv of a chest X-ray and 10-20 mSv of a scintigraphy). In our opinion the new frontier of diagnosis with coro CT is represented by the evaluation of non-calcified plaques (Fig. 4) (11). The criticism directed at the determination of coronary calcium, in fact, consisted in the fact that it is an indicator of the extent of coronary plaques but not of how dangerous they...
might be. In a famous discussion of this very argument, Narula confirmed that "the necessity of identifying vulnerable plaques represents one of the most anticipated and important events in the war against heart disease" (12). In recent years in fact coronary plaques have begun to be analyzed distinguishing between the calcified lesions and the fibro-adipose lesions which as a known fact represent those of greater risk (13). The presence of coronary calcium and the absence of soft plaques as well as the presence of a remodeling indicator of <1 allow for the distinction between plaques on stable surfaces from those characteristic of acute coronary syndromes (14). This fact is of great interest because it would allow for the identification of vulnerable plaques and also allow for the evaluation of therapy in stabilizing such plaques. With this increase in knowledge new ways of predicting risk have
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Emerged among which is the actual amount of plaque. This expresses the cumulative extension of the plaques in a predetermined vascular path or in all areas analyzed and plays an important role in predicting a survival free of events or the appearance of cardiovascular events (15,16). McPherson confirmed this fact and identified factors of plaque which justify the increasing danger such as 1) the amount of plaque, 2) the softened fibrous cap, 3) an elevated amount of lipid core, and 4) a larger amount of calcium (17). Revisiting an acclaimed editorial by Braunwald one can conclude that one fourth of the population consists of people at low risk (<0.5%/year) and within this group the average risk is modest; the issue is quite different if a larger group of population is taken into account (18). This of course cannot be ignored. At this point we cannot face the expense/cost ratio of preventive treatment in the identification of those patients who will eventually face a coronary event. For them a new diagnostic method is necessary. Then there is the moderate risk group (0.5-2%/year), another approximate 40% of the population. For this group further diagnostic measures must be taken such as the ABI (ankle-brachial index) and high sensitivity C protein to determine those at higher risk (19). Those whose test is positive to any of the above mentioned tests, should be placed into the high risk group (2-15%/year) and subjected to more refined evaluation. The high risk group represents approximately 15% of the population and only they are studied with imaging techniques among which is the highly acclaimed coro CT. The highest risk group (>15%/year), those who have lesions when analyzed by coro CT, need to be evaluated by more invasive means such as coronary angiography and finally MRI to evaluate the need for revascularization and, in any case, to determine the best treatment strategy.

Conclusion

The determination of risk factors as suggested by Framingham is a cornerstone in cardiac risk evaluation. In moderate to high-risk patients it is advisable to use other methodologies that better allow individualization of higher risk patients. In light of this, MRI and especially coro CT with its ability to point out the extent of the plaques is taking an ever-increasing role in primary prevention of coronary heart disease, and in secondary prevention of its ischemic complications. The methods used in atherosclerosis imaging, have its own advantages and disadvantages. Notwithstanding significant efforts are aimed at improving the existing techniques diagnostic capability. Coro CT is highly effective when used by well-trained technicians. On the other hand, when used by unskilled technicians it presents a health hazard to the patient as well as an increased healthcare cost. This methodology which in itself is very helpful in identifying the presence of coronary heart disease cannot for now be compared with coronary angiography which documents and quantifies the severity of every single stenosis. However, improving promising technologies and intensive investigations are on the way. The final challenge will be not only aimed at assessing cardiovascular system safety and effectively by means of novel imaging techniques, but also to offer the clinicians a reliable and accurate diagnostic opportunity to evaluate the impact of usual medical care and upcoming pharmacological and non pharmacological novel therapeutic approaches on existing atherosclerotic lesions and to follow up them serially, meanwhile preventing the development of new plaques in the native arteries.
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