Screening for coronary heart disease: Has the time for universal imaging arrived?

ABSTRACT

The Screening for Heart Attack Prevention and Education (SHAPE) Task Force has recommended a strategy of screening for coronary heart disease in which nearly all middle-aged and older adults would undergo an imaging test. However, this approach is not supported by evidence and is not endorsed by professional societies or the US Preventive Services Task Force. Physicians should follow established guidelines such as those of the third Adult Treatment Panel of the National Cholesterol Education Program.

KEY POINTS

Observational studies can overestimate the benefit of screening tests in reducing disease-specific mortality rates, owing to lead-time bias, length-time bias, and overdiagnosis bias.

The Framingham risk score uses clinical variables to give an estimate of a patient’s 10-year risk of coronary events. Imaging tests may have a role in patients at intermediate risk.

Rather than subjecting all adults to a screening test with its expense and potential harms, a better use of resources might be in public health efforts to improve the national diet, promote exercise, and discourage smoking. Resources could also be directed to performance of definitive randomized trials aimed at testing the therapeutic value of screening tests.

A 48-YEAR-OLD MAN is concerned about coronary heart disease because two of his colleagues recently had heart attacks. Yesterday, while driving home from work, he heard an advertisement on the radio for a heart scan, which he understood as being a test that could “save his life.”

He remembers that 2 months ago you did an office evaluation, including lipid blood tests, and you told him that his heart risk was low. Still, rattled by the two heart attacks at his office, he worries that your evaluation may not be enough. “Shouldn’t I get that heart scan I heard about on the radio, doctor?” he asks, and then adds, “Were all those blood tests you did really needed?”

When you evaluated him, his blood pressure was 125/78 mm Hg, his total cholesterol level was 220 mg/dL, and his high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C) level was 40 mg/dL. You noted no history of chest discomfort or shortness of breath, cigarette smoking, diabetes, obesity or other evidence of the metabolic syndrome, or family history of premature coronary disease. You assessed his risk using the Framingham risk score,1 which indicated that his risk of having a major cardiac event within the next 10 years was 5% (FIGURE 1).

Should you order the imaging test as he asks? Should you have done the imaging test first, without assessing his global risk with the Framingham risk score? What is the best evidence-based approach to your patient’s concerns?
A PROPOSAL FOR MORE AGGRESSIVE SCREENING

The issue of when and how to evaluate patients for their risk of cardiovascular disease came to the forefront in July 2006 with the publication of the paper, “From vulnerable plaque to vulnerable patient—part III; executive summary of the Screening for Heart Attack Prevention and Education (SHAPE) Task Force report.” This paper, from a group of prominent authors, recommended aggressive screening with imaging, notably calcium scanning or ultrasound measurement of the carotid arteries.

However, I believe that such an approach, which de-emphasizes the use of traditional cardiovascular risk-assessment techniques, is premature and is not supported by the evidence.

WHAT IS SCREENING, AND WHEN IS IT APPROPRIATE?

Screening is a process by which patients without symptoms undergo testing to determine whether they have a disease. Examples of accepted screening tests are mammography, cervical cytology, and sphygmomanometry. Screening is appropriate for common serious diseases that have a prolonged, asymptomatic phase. By detecting the disease early, physicians and patients can initiate effective treatments that can prevent symptoms, premature life-threatening events, or both.

Screening is appropriate only if early detection and early therapy yield better outcomes than late detection and late therapy. For example, some breast cancers develop so slowly that, if detected at an early stage by mammography, they can be completely eradicated; this would be more difficult should one wait for symptoms. Investigators have shown that screening reduces the rate of deaths due to breast cancer.

Another example of appropriate screening is ultrasound imaging of the abdominal aorta, at least in older men who smoke, in whom routine screening has been shown to detect aneurysms accurately and prevent aneurysm-related deaths.

Current screening strategies for adults at risk of coronary heart disease events who have no symptoms of it are based on scoring algorithms that use only classic risk factors, such as age, sex, diabetes, hypertension, smoking, and cholesterol levels. Assessing these risk factors is reasonable, since randomized trials have shown, for example, that treatment of asymptomatic hypertension and hypercholesterolemia prevents clinical events.

Some investigators believe that the estimates of risk can be sharpened by adding information from screening tests such as coronary calcium scoring, to better identify people at high risk who have advanced atherosclerosis so that drugs such as aspirin or statins can be added to lifestyle interventions to prevent premature death or myocardial infarction.

But is screening for coronary heart disease effective?

HOW DO WE KNOW SCREENING SAVES LIVES?

Determining whether a screening test is effective is difficult. It is not enough to show that the test predicts future events: we need to
prove that a screening strategy, as opposed to a symptom-based approach, reduces the rate of major clinical events.\textsuperscript{11}

**Observational studies are fraught with problems**

Some investigators perform large observational studies, comparing outcomes of people who do or do not undergo screening. If the people who undergo a screening test have a lower death rate, it is tempting to conclude that the screening is effective. However, this observational approach is fraught with problems, including lead-time bias, length-time bias, and overdiagnosis bias.\textsuperscript{12,13} Clinicians need to understand these biases and explain them to their patients.

**Lead-time bias** occurs when physicians diagnose a disease earlier than they would have if they had waited for symptoms to arise, but the natural history is the same.\textsuperscript{12} Imagine a patient with a disease that ultimately will kill him in 2010. With screening we can diagnose the disease this year (2007), but without screening we would have to wait until symptoms occur (say, in 2009). However, if the current treatments are not very effective, it would make no difference whether we diagnose the disease in 2007 or 2009, as the patient is fated to die in 2010. Screening might appear to help, because he lived 3 years after diagnosis rather than 1 year. Yet, in reality, the screening test did nothing except detect the disease earlier.

**Length-time bias** is more difficult to understand.\textsuperscript{12} Imagine two patients who both decide to see their doctor for a screening test next July. The first patient has a rapidly growing tumor, which he does not yet know about. By April, unfortunately, the tumor causes symptoms, and therefore he cancels his July screening test. The second patient has a slowly growing tumor, and therefore he shows up for his July screening test. Since only the patient with the slowly growing tumor underwent screening, the screening strategy appears to improve his outcome, when in fact it is actually the tempo of the disease that determines who gets screened.

**Overdiagnosis bias** is perhaps the most serious screening bias.\textsuperscript{12} In this case, a physician diagnoses a disease that, while real, is unlikely to ever be clinically important. For example, among older men, prostate cancers are common but some never cause clinical symptoms or death. One is simply diagnosing a disease that, had it not been discovered, never would have troubled the patient.

**Only randomized trials can show if screening improves outcomes**

The only way to know definitively whether a screening test improves outcome is by performing a randomized trial. This has been done for a number of diseases, including breast cancer\textsuperscript{3} and abdominal aortic aneurysm.\textsuperscript{7} For example, the recently published Multicentre Aneurysm Screening Study\textsuperscript{14} found that a strategy of inviting older men for an abdominal aortic ultrasound scan safely reduced the rate of death from aortic aneurysms.

Randomized trials of screening are difficult to perform because, to succeed, they require large sample sizes and long periods of follow-up. However, only the randomized trial design makes it possible to eliminate the effects of lead-time bias, length-time bias, and overdiagnosis bias.

**ARE THERE DOWNSIDES TO SCREENING?**

One might think that screening is so logically beneficial that it cannot cause any harm. It
Screening can cause harm, which is not merely theoretical.

makes perfect sense to diagnose a disease early before it causes symptoms or death. How could there possible be any downside to screening?

In fact, screening can cause serious harm, and the harm is not merely theoretical. Consider neuroblastoma, a serious brain cancer of children. Recently, a number of public health groups decided to institute mass screening for neuroblastoma by testing urine samples for metabolites produced by these tumors. What happened? Many more children with neuroblastoma were diagnosed and underwent surgery.

So far so good. However, when the investigators calculated the death rate from neuroblastoma, it turned out that screening had little impact. In retrospect, a number of children were diagnosed with neuroblastomas that never would have been clinically important. They were subjected to the anxiety of being diagnosed with what they thought was a serious disease and to the risks and inconveniences of surgery. The screening regimen caused harm, not benefit.

HOW DO WE KNOW WHICH SCREENING TESTS ARE APPROPRIATE?

Screening is appropriate only if high-quality evidence exists that the strategy prevents clinical events. Does mammography prevent breast cancer deaths? Yes. Does abdominal ultrasonography prevent deaths from abdominal aortic aneurysm without causing harm otherwise? For at least some groups of patients, the answer appears to be yes.

While in theory this may be a useful framework, the busy clinical practitioner still wants to know where to find useful advice about screening.

In my opinion, one of the best sources of information on the value of screening comes from the US Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF). This is a group of highly respected experts from the private sector assembled by the US Agency for Health Care Research and Quality (AHRQ). The existence of the USPSTF is mandated by public law section 915, which requires that the USPSTF perform a series of carefully orchestrated systematic evidence reviews and syntheses, using established criteria for assessing quality of evidence and extensive peer review.

Reliable information also comes from nonprofit specialty societies such as the American Heart Association, American College of Cardiology, and American Cancer Society. These organizations have established procedures for acquiring evidence and assessing its quality. Documents written by these organizations undergo extensive peer review. In fact, recently these organizations have gone so far as to publish the names of the peer reviewers along with those of the authors of the recommendations, thereby making it clear that the reviewers also share responsibility.

WHAT SCREENING IS RECOMMENDED FOR CORONARY HEART DISEASE?

Coronary heart disease seems like an obvious candidate for screening. The disease is serious and continues to be the number-one killer in developed societies. Nearly half of patients initially present with a major event, ie, myocardial infarction or sudden death, and coronary atherosclerosis can exist for a long time before it causes symptoms. Lay people are well aware of the phrase “ticking time bomb,” describing a person with a heavy disease burden just waiting for the “big day” to happen.

A number of tests have been shown to detect asymptomatic coronary heart disease or to predict coronary events or premature death. The simple exercise treadmill test can identify people at high risk. More recently, interest has focused on powerful imaging techniques such as electron-beam computed tomography for calcium scoring and carotid intimal medial thickness measurements. A number of high-quality studies have demonstrated that these tests predict risk.

Given that coronary heart disease is common and serious and has a prolonged asymptomatic phase, and given that we have tests that predict risk, wouldn’t it make perfect
sense to recommend routine screening for coronary disease?

Yet, when one consults peer-reviewed guidelines, one finds that this is not the case. The USPSTF, for example, specifically recommends against screening adults who are at low risk for coronary heart disease events and found “insufficient evidence to recommend for or against screening” in adults who are at increased risk.21 Similarly, recent recommendations from the American Heart Association and American College of Cardiology 25,26 recommend that screening tests be considered only for people who are at intermediate risk of disease, not for people thought to be at low risk or at high risk.

One current recommended approach to coronary heart disease screening starts with a clinical evaluation.8 This can be formally quantified by global risk scores, such as those of the Framingham Heart Study or the European Score Group. The Framingham risk score can be easily calculated: the only variables needed are the patient's age, sex, smoking status, total cholesterol level, HDL-C level, systolic blood pressure, and whether he or she is taking medications for hypertension. Another version of the Framingham score also includes diabetes, since this is a strong risk factor for coronary events. One then uses this information to determine whether further testing is necessary.

Among patients at intermediate risk, a number of tests could be considered,8 such as the exercise test, carotid imaging, the ankle-brachial index, and electron-beam computed tomography of the heart.

However, no randomized trials of coronary heart disease screening have been performed. We simply do not know whether screening prevents premature death or major cardiac events. Therefore, published recommendations are cautious in their approach. For example, whereas the USPSTF is clear that screening should not be done in patients at low risk for disease, all that they say for patients at high risk, is that there is “insufficient evidence to recommend for or against routine screening.”21 A reasonable, conservative practitioner, therefore, might conclude that it would be best not to obtain screening tests so as to avoid potential harm induced by screening.

WHAT DO THE SHAPE GUIDELINES RECOMMEND?

On July 17, 2006, the American Journal of Cardiology published the SHAPE Task Force report,2 which recommended a radically different approach to screening for coronary heart disease (Figure 3).

The proposed SHAPE algorithm calls for some form of imaging test for atherosclerosis in nearly all men between the ages of 45 and 75 years and women between the ages of 55 and 75 years. The only people who would not undergo testing would be those at “very low risk,” ie, whose total cholesterol level is lower than 200 mg/dL and whose blood pressure is lower than 120/80 mm Hg and who do not have diabetes, do not smoke, have no family history of coronary heart disease, and have no elements of the metabolic syndrome.2 Only after the atherosclerosis test result is back would risk factors be considered regarding further tests and regarding an optimal low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) goal.

Whereas the current recommended approach is to perform imaging only in patients deemed to be at intermediate risk, the new SHAPE guidelines would lead to the performance of imaging tests in nearly all middle-aged and older adults.2 SHAPE therefore represents a major paradigm shift in determining cholesterol treatment goals. Whereas current Adult Treatment Panel (ATP III) recommendations focus on global risk assessment based on risk factors,1,27 SHAPE focuses on atherosclerosis imaging, with risk factors playing a supplementary role (Table 1).

Criticisms of the SHAPE guidelines

Almost immediately after publication, the SHAPE guidelines came under sharp criticism.28 It was pointed out, for example, that the document had not been endorsed by any official society and had not undergone an extensive and transparent peer review.28

Furthermore, the supplement in which the article was published was paid for by Pfizer,28 the manufacturer of atorvastatin (Lipitor). Presumably, patients identified as having atherosclerosis would be good candidates for atorvastatin therapy; were the SHAPE guidelines to be widely adopted, sales
The SHAPE Task Force guideline

- **Apparantly healthy population, men > 45 years, women > 55 years**

  **Step 1**
  - Very low riskb (no treatment)
  - All > 75 years receive unconditional treatmentc

  **Atherosclerosis test**
  - Coronary artery calcification score (CACS) or carotid intima-medial thickness (CIMT) and carotid plaque^d

  **Step 2**
  - Negative test:
    - CACS = 0
    - CIMT < 50th percentile
  - Positive test:
    - CACS = 1
    - CIMT ≥ 50th percentile or carotid plaque

  No risk factors^e

  Risk factors

  - CACS < 100 and < 75th percentile
  - CIMT < 1 mm and < 75th percentile and no carotid plaque
  - Ankle-brachial index (ABI) < 0.9 (optional)
  - C-reactive protein (CRP) > 4 mg (optional)

  - CACS 100-399 or > 75th percentile
  - CIMT ≥ 1 mm or > 75th percentile
  - > 90th percentile or CACS ≥ 400
  - > 50% stenotic plaque^f

  **Step 3**
  - Lower risk
    - LDL-C target: < 160 mg/dL
    - Retest interval: 5–10 years
  - Moderate risk
    - LDL-C target: < 130 mg/dL
    - Retest interval: 5–10 years
  - Moderately high risk
    - LDL-C target: < 100 mg/dL (optional)
    - Retest interval: Individualized
  - High risk
    - LDL-C target: < 70 mg/dL (optional)
    - Retest interval: Individualized
  - Very high risk
    - LDL-C target: < 70 mg/dL
    - Retest interval: Individualized

  Follow existing guidelines

  Angiography

  Yes
  No

| No history of angina, heart attack, stroke, or peripheral arterial disease |
| Must not have any of the following: total cholesterol level > 200 mg/dL (5.18 mmol/L), blood pressure > 120/80 mm Hg, diabetes mellitus, smoking, family history of coronary heart disease, or the metabolic syndrome |
| Population age > 75 years is considered at high risk and must receive therapy without testing for atherosclerosis |
| Pending the development of standard practice guidelines |
| No high cholesterol, high blood pressure, diabetes, smoking, family history of coronary heart disease, or the metabolic syndrome |
| For stroke prevention, follow existing guidelines |

**FIGURE 3.** The Screening for Heart Attack Prevention and Education (SHAPE) guideline. Nearly all adults (men ages 45–75, women ages 55–75) undergo atherosclerosis screening with calcium scanning or carotid intima-media thickness imaging. Only after these test results are known are coronary risk factors considered to determine a goal LDL cholesterol level. Patients deemed at very high risk are referred for myocardial ischemia testing followed by coronary angiography.

of atorvastatin and other statins might dramatically increase. Moreover, a number of SHAPE authors had major personal conflicts of interest. Not only were some of them financially connected to companies that make statins, but others directly received financial benefit from imaging centers that they owned.28 And these screening tests are being marketed directly to consumers, a practice that poses several ethical problems, not the least of which is that some doctors stand to benefit financially from performing these imaging procedures29 and from follow-up testing or procedures that result from abnormal findings. The authors’ failure to disclose potential conflicts of interest is in contrast with the current practice of cardiovascular professional societies, which, in their practice guideline statements, add detailed tables of the authors’ and reviewers’ disclosures.10

■ WHAT’S WRONG WITH THE SHAPE GUIDELINES?

In my opinion, the major problems with the SHAPE guidelines are that they are not evidence-based and that they have not undergone extensive, objective, and transparent peer review.

Although we have a plethora of tests for diagnosing asymptomatic coronary disease and predicting coronary events, the unfortunate reality is that no randomized trials to demonstrate their clinical efficacy have been performed.19,21 If we really want to know whether atherosclerosis imaging prevents heart attacks, we need to follow the lead of investigators in the fields of cancer3 and aortic aneurysm,7 who have performed large-scale, randomized trials. There is reason to think that atherosclerosis screening may not be valuable. We already aggressively treat hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, and diabetes. Randomized trials have demonstrated that aggressive treatment of these conditions can prevent premature coronary events.1,5

When it comes to the disease of atherosclerosis per se, as opposed to just the risk factors for atherosclerosis, we should require no lower standard. The potential harms of coronary disease screening have, in my view, not been adequately considered. Although statins are prob-

---

**TABLE 1**

**Differences between the ATP-III and SHAPE guidelines regarding determination of LDL-cholesterol goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATP-III GUIDELINESa</th>
<th>SHAPE GUIDELINESb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligible population</strong></td>
<td>Adults age 20 years and older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Fasting lipid profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Coronary risk equivalentsd Global risk score (Framingham risk score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Atherosclerosis imaging</strong></td>
<td>Not applicablee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThe third report of the National Cholesterol Education Program Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in Adults1,27
bThe Screening for Heart Attack Prevention and Education Task Force report2
cExcept for people at “very low risk,” meaning total cholesterol less than 200 mg/dL, blood pressure lower than 120/80 mm Hg, no diabetes, no smoking, no family history of coronary heart disease, and no elements of the metabolic syndrome
dClinical coronary heart disease, symptomatic carotid artery disease, peripheral arterial disease, abdominal aortic aneurysm. These markers identify people at high risk with LDL-cholesterol goals < 100 mg/dL or, for people at very high risk, < 70 mg/dL.2
eAccording to some, imaging may be of value in people at intermediate risk.8
Screening helps individuals, but may have little impact on society as a whole.
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