Identifying Patients at Low-Risk for Badness: Chest Pain Case Studies

George L. Higgins III, MD, FACEP

Emeritus Professor of Emergency Medicine Maine Medical Center, Portland, ME Director of Rural Education and Emergency Partner BlueWater Health, Brunswick, ME Clinical Professor of Emergency Medicine University of New England College of Osteopathic Medicine Portland, ME

CONTINUING EDUCATION COMPANY

Disclosure

I have no financial interests or relationships to disclose.

CONTINUING EDUCATION COMPANY







CONTINUING EDUCATION COMPANY

George Higgins, MD Identifying Patients at Low-Risk for Badness



Gestalt (experience and mental clarity) has been shown to be as accurate as Clinical Decision Tools for a number of conditions



CONTINUING EDUCATION COMPANY

This Allows Focused Risk Stratification of Patients So That Appropriate Management Plans Can Be Formed



George Higgins, MD Identifying Patients at Low-Risk for Badness

When my Gestalt and CDT Agree, Great!

When They Disagree, I Go with the Choice that Is Less Risky.



Learning Objectives

We will review an evidence-based process that will allow us to risk-stratify patients presenting with chest pain



CONTINUING EDUCATION COMPANY

George Higgins, MD Identifying Patients at Low-Risk for Badness

Why ACS Is a Can't Miss Dx

ACS Is a Killer

- Millions of patients present to us with acute chest pain annually
- STEMI, STEMI Equivalents, and Unstable Angina are all potentially life-threatening
- In-hospital mortality from ACS is less than 5%
- ACS patients misdiagnosed have increased mortality
- The majority of acute care clinicians want a miss rate of <1%

My Short List of <u>CAN'T MISS</u> Chest Discomfort Diagnoses

Acute Coronary Syndrome

Delete Pulmonary Embolus

□ Thoracic Aortic Dissection

Deneumothorax

Myo-pericarditis/Tamponade



Why Not Just Fully Evaluate All Patients Presenting with Chest Pain?











CONTINUING EDUCATION COMPANY

13



Gulati M et al: Circulation 2021

George Higgins, MD Identifying Patients at Low-Risk for Badness

And Many Patients that Concern Us Do Quite Well

Reassuring Study

- #7,266 patients presenting to three ED's with chest discomfort
 - "pain", "tightness","burning", "pressure"
- All admitted or observed

- All had:
 - Non-concerning vital signs and ECGs
 - Normal serial biomarkers
- Only two patients experienced a major cardiac event: 0.03%

Weinstock: JAMA 2015

Can H&P Help Dx ACS?



Although individual elements of the H&P are rarely diagnostic of ACS, all elements taken together produce a pattern that may indeed be concerning.

Let your brain process this when you leave the bedside. Trust your gestalt when this happens.

Can History Help Dx ACS?

	Likelihood Ratio
Pain Radiation to Both Arms	7.1
Pain Similar to Prior Ischemia	2.2
Pain Radiation to Right Arm/Shoulder	4.7
Chest Pain with Exertion	2.4
History of MI	1.5

Remember:

Influential LR+: 5 to 10+ Influential LR-: 0.2 to 0.1-

Hollander: Circulation 2016

17

Can History Help Dx ACS?

	Likelihood Ratio
Pleuritic Chest Pain	0.2
Described as Sharp	0.3
Positional Chest Pain	0.3
Not Associated with Exertion	0.8
Inframammary Location	0.8

Remember: Influential LR+: 5 to 10+ Influential LR-: 0.2 to 0.1-

Hollander: Circulation 2016

Can Physical Help Dx ACS?

	Likelihood Ratio
Diaphoresis	2.0
Hypotension (SBP <80mm Hg)	3.1
Third Heart Sound	3.2
Pulmonary Rales	2.1
Reproduced by Palpation	0.3

Remember: Influential LR+ (5 to 10+) Influential LR (0.2 to 0.1-)

Hollander: Circulation 2016

19

The Other Two Major Players



<image><complex-block><complex-block><complex-block><complex-block><text><text>

The Ideal Clinical Decision Tool for Risk Stratifying Undifferentiated Chest Pain

Validated in real life situations Easy to apply at the bedside Clinically relevant Reliable

Score		Components		Criteria for Low Risk
EDACS-ADP	Age, yrs	18-45	2 points	EDACS <16
	5.,,	46-50	4 points	 No new ischemia
		51-55	6 points	on ECG Nonelevated serial
		56-60	8 points	0-h and 2-h cardiac
		61-65	10 points	troponin
		66-70	12 points	concentrations
		71-75	14 points	
		76-80	16 points	
		81-85	18 points	
		86+	20 points	
	Male			
	Age 18-50+ yrs	(i) Known CAD(ii) ≥3 risk factors	4 points	
	Symptoms	Diaphoresis	3 points	
		Radiates to arm or shoulder	5 points	
		Pain occurred or worse on inspiration	-4 points	
		Pain on palpation	-6 points	

T-M	IACS	
Troponin-only Man Syndromes (T-MACS Bules out acute coronary surdrame	chester Acute Cor 5) Decision Aid ☆	onary
EKG ischemia As determined by treating clinician	No 0	Yes +1
Worsening or crescendo angina	No 0	Yes +1
Pain radiating to right arm or shoulder	No 0	Yes +1
Pain associated with vomiting	No 0	Yes +1
Sweating observed As observed by treating clinician	No 0	Yes +1
Hypotension <u>sBP</u> <100 mmHg on arrival to ED	No 0	Yes +1
<u>hs-cTnT</u> concentration on arrival	Norm: 0 - 0.014	μg/L 🖨

George Higgins, MD Identifying Patients at Low-Risk for Badness

HEART/HEAR Pathway



This is my preferred CDT in patients with undifferentiated chest pain

HEAR History	T score for chest pain pat Highly suspicious Moderately suspicious Slightly suspicious	tients 2 1 0	My HEART Ar
ECG	Significant ST-deviation Non specific repolarisation disturbance / LBTB / PM	2	
	Normal	0	History +
Age	≥ 65 years > 45 and < 65 years	1	E
Risk factors	≤ 45 years ≥ 3 risk factors or history of atherosclerotic disease*	2	- Exam +
	1 or 2 risk factors No risk factors known	1	Observation +
Troponin	≥ 3x normal limit > 1 and < 3x normal limit	2	Experience =
*Dick f	≤ 1X normal limit	Tota	Gestalt

	HEAR	T	
HEAR	Highly suspicious Moderately suspicious	2 1 0	
ECG	Slightly suspicious Significant ST-deviation Non specific repolarisation disturbance / LBTB / PM	1	A highly suspicious
Age	Normal ≥ 65 years	0 2 1	- History =
Risk factors	 ≤ 45 years ≤ 45 years ≥ 3 risk factors or history of 	0	– High Risk
	atheroscierotic disease* 1 or 2 risk factors No risk factors known	1	
Troponin	≥ 3x normal limit > 1 and < 3x normal limit ≤ 1x normal limit	2 1 0	Almost never an
*Risk f	actors for atherosclerotic disea	Total	\Box isolated finding
Hypere Hypere Diabet	cholesterolemia Cigarette smokin rension Positive family hi es Mellitus Obesity	g story	





	HEAR	T	My HFART Art
History	AR I SCORE for chest pain pa	2	
Thotory	Moderately suspicious	1	
	Slightly suspicious	0	
ECG	Significant ST-deviation	2	Significant
	Non specific repolarisation	1	Significant
	disturbance / LBTB / PM		
	Normal	0	ST-deviation=
Age	≥ 65 years	2	
	> 45 and < 65 years	1	TT! 1 D! 1
	≤ 45 years	0	High Risk
Risk facto	brs ≥ 3 risk factors or history of atherosclerotic disease*	2	
	1 or 2 risk factors	1	
	No risk factors known	0	
Troponin	≥ 3x normal limit	2	A 1 I
1922	> 1 and < 3x normal limit	1	Almost never an
	≤ 1x normal limit	0	
	42	Total	icolated finding
*Ri	sk factors for atherosclerotic disea	ise:	isolated finding
Hy Hy Dia	percholesterolemia Cigarette smokin pertension Positive family hi abetes Mellitus Obesity	g story	





I Bakana	i score for chest pain pai				
History	Highly suspicious				
	Noderately suspicious	0			
	Slightly suspicious	0			
ECG	Significant SI-deviation	2			
	Non specific repolarisation disturbance / LBTB / PM				
	Normal				
Age	≥ 65 years				
	> 45 and < 65 years	1			
	≤ 45 years	0			
Risk factors	≥ 3 risk factors or history of atherosclerotic disease*				
	1 or 2 risk factors				
	No risk factors known				
Troponin	≥ 3x normal limit				
	> 1 and < 3x normal limit				
	< 1x normal limit				

My HEART Art

Any positive troponin = High Risk

Almost never an isolated finding



HEAR	T score for chest pain pa	tients	
History	Highly suspicious	2	
	Moderately suspicious	1	
0	Slightly suspicious	0	
ECG	Significant ST-deviation	2	High-sensitivity Troponin
	Non specific repolarisation disturbance / LBTB / PM	1	
	Normal	0	Low risk HEART score
Age	≥ 65 years	2	
	> 45 and < 65 years	1	+
	≤ 45 years	0	Negative hs-Troponin
Risk factors	≥ 3 risk factors or history of atherosclerotic disease*	2	at time 0 and 1 hour
	1 or 2 risk factors	1	=
	No risk factors known	0	MACE <<1%
Troponin	≥ 3x normal limit	2	
1.55	> 1 and < 3x normal limit	1	Fewer admissions
	≤ 1x normal limit	0	Less cost
*Risk fa Hypero Hypert	actors for atherosclerotic disea cholesterolemia Cigarette smokin ension Positive family hi	story	 Ljung: Annals of Emergency Medicine 20

HEAR	T score for chest pain pai	tients	
History	Highly suspicious	2	
	Moderately suspicious	1	
/	Slightly suspicious	0	
ECG	Significant ST-deviation	2	High-sensitivity Troponin
	Non specific repolarisation disturbance / LBTB / PM	1	
	Normal	0	Low risk HEART score
Age	≥ 65 years	2	
	> 45 and < 65 years	1	+
	≤ 45 years	0	Negative single hs-Troponin
Risk factors	≥ 3 risk factors or history of atherosclerotic disease*	2	
	1 er 2 risk factors	1	AMI at 1 year:
	No risk factors known	0	Nagativa Pradictiva Valua og 8%
Troponin	≥ 3x normal limit	2	Regarive i redictive value 99.070
10221	> 1 and < 3x normal limit	1	
	≤ 1x normal limit	0	Fewer admissions
		Tetal	I agg oogt
*Dick f	actors for atheros claratic disea	co.	Less cost
KISK I	actors for ameroscierotic disea	se.	

HEART Score Performance

	Likelihood Ratio for MACE
Score 0 to 3	0.2
Low Risk	[95%CI 0.13 to 0.3]
Score 4	0.79
Indeterminate	[95%CI 0.53 to 1.2]
Score 5 to 6	2.4
Intermediate	[95%CI 1.6 to 3.6
Score 7 to 10	13
High	[95%CI 7.0 to 24]

Remember: Influential LR+: 5 to 10+ Influential LR-: 0.2 to 0.1-

Fanaroff: JAMA 2015







Recent Support for HEART

Methods:

- Randomized study
- #282 patients presenting to an ED with chest pain
- HEART vs. usual care
- MACE events over 1 year

Results:

- For #66 low-risk HEART enrolled patients (score 0 to 3):
- MACE rate of 0%
- NPV 100%
 - 95%CI 93% to 100%

Stopyra: Academic Emergency Medicine 2018

Recent Support for HEART

Methods:

- Prospective interrupted time series study
- Chest pain patients presenting to ED

 #30,522 before HEART implementation
 #34,871 after HEART implementation

Results:

- Implementation of HEART resulted in....
 - Less in-patient care
 - Less noninvasive cardiac testing
 - No increase in adverse events

Sharp: Annals of Emergency Medicine 2019

41

Recent Support for HEART

Methods:

- Systematic review
- #25 studies
 - International
 - Conventional vs. highsensitivity troponins
- #25,266 study subjects
 - #9,919 low-risk (score 0-3)

Results:

- MACE at 30 days to 6 weeks for low-risk:
 - 2.1% overall
 - 0.7% North America
 - 0.8% high-sensitivity troponin
 - Sensitivity 0.96
 - NPV 0.99
 - Negative Likelihood Ratio 0.09
- MACE non-low-risk 21.9%

Laureano-Phillips: Annals of Emergency Medicine 2019

Recent Support for HEART

Methods:

- Systematic review
- **#30 studies**
- #44,202 study subjects

Results:

"The HEART score has excellent performance for the prediction of mortality and MI in chest pain patients and should be the primary CDT used for the risk stratification of this patient population."

Fernando: Academic Emergency Medicine 2018

43

	HEART 🤎	What if your practice
HEAF	RT score for chest pain patients	does not provide
History	Highly suspicious 2	does not provide
	Moderately suspicious 1	noint-of-care
	Slightly suspicious 0	point of care
ECG	Significant ST-deviation 2	trononin testing?
	disturbance / LBTB / PM	ti oponni testing.
	Normal 0	
Age	≥ 65 years 2	
	> 45 and < 65 years 1	Von oon use the
Diels fe stern	≤ 45 years 0	rou can use the
RISK TACTORS	atherosclerotic disease*	
	1 or 2 risk factors 1	HEAK SCOKE TO
	No risk factors known 0	
Troponin	≥ 3x no strik t 2	identify patients at very
	> 1 an Ks. 7 mal limit 1	
		low risk for ASC







- 45-day MACE 0.4% (95% CI 0.01% to 1.98%)

Moumneh T: European J Emergency Medicine 2021







HEAR Performance for Identifying Jensir Strand St



Let's Meet These Concerned Patients









51



George Higgins, MD Identifying Patients at Low-Risk for Badness



Mr. Smith

BP 164/85 HR 75 O2 Sat RA 95%

Patient clearly experiencing pain with associated diaphoresis

Cardiopulmonary exam normal

Illness Script Chest Pain								
Possible Diagnoses								
		ACS	PE	TAD	РТХ	M/P-itis		
Cues & Clues	Sudden Onset Central Chest Discomfort	2+	2+	2+	2+	2-		
	Radiation to Both Shoulders	2+	1-	1+	1-	0		
	Hypertensive and Diaphoretic	2+	0	1+	2-	1+		









<section-header><section-header>

George Higgins, MD Identifying Patients at Low-Risk for Badness



Ms. Green

BP 142/85 HR 75 O2 Sat RA 98%

Cardiopulmonary exam normal

Reproducible chest wall tenderness to palpation over the upper sternal area that duplicates the patient's discomfort

	Pos	sible l	Diagr	ioses		
		ACS	PE	TAD	РТХ	M/P-itis
Cues & Clues	2 Days of Persistent Pain	2-	1+	1+	1+	2+
	Reproducible Upper Sternal Discomfort	2-	2-	2-	2-	2-
	No Respiratory Symptoms	0	2-	0	2-	0
	Normal Exam	0	0	0	0	2-



George Higgins, MD Identifying Patients at Low-Risk for Badness

Ms. Green Sou quickly eliminate PE by calculating PERC. It's negative. Pulmonary Embolism Rule-Out Criteria Variable Age <50 years</td> Pulse <100 beats per minute</td> Sa02 295% on room air No hemoptysis No exogenous estrogen use No prior venous thromboembolism No surgery or trauma requiring hospitalization within the past 4 weeks No unilateral leg swelling







Ms. Green

You discharge her with Chest Wall Pain Syndrome and recommend timely follow-up with her PCP

Ms. Green

You fully document your medical decision making, including something like....

"Given this patient's symptoms and physical exam findings described above, my pre-test probability for ACS was 10%. Given her HEAR Score of 1 with a likelihood ration of 0.2, the post-test probability is 2%. She also demonstrates features of a much more likely alternative diagnosis, Chest Wall Pain Syndrome. Her normal ECG also makes myopericarditis unlikely. Therefore,"



Mr. Jones

BP 158/90 HR 75 O2 Sat RA 95%

Pain free and in no distress

Cardiopulmonary exam normal

	Illness	Scrij	pt Cł	nest]	Pain	
	Pos	sible 1	Diagn	loses		
		ACS	PE	TAD	РТХ	M/P-itis
Cues & Clues	Known Cardiac Disease	2+	2-	0	2-	2-
	Crescendo Anginal Pattern	2+	2-	2-	2-	1+
	Normal Exam	0	1-	1-	2-	2-









Your Point-of-Care Tool Box



Mr. Jones

You diagnose Unstable Angina and consult with Cardiology for timely transfer to your referral center

You fully document your medical decision making, including your HEAR Score & LR analysis, in the patient's medical record

Ms. Baker

🗆 67 yo woman

□ She has experienced three episodes of "a funny feeling in my chest" over the past week, most recently earlier today, all while at rest

□ She describes the sensation as "fullness" "jumpy", at times "prickly"

□ Episodes last about 5 minutes







□ She has a relationship with a local Cardiologist

"My aortic valve was too tight, making my heart muscle big, so he had to rotaroot it. He says its now doing OK. So, I don't think what's been happening this week has anything to do with that. That's why I came here. I didn't want to bother him."



Illness Script Chest Pain							
	Pos	ssible 1	Diagr	ioses			
		ACS	PE	TAD	РТХ	M/P-itis	
Cues & Clues	Brief Episodes of Atypical Central Chest Discomfort	1+	1+	2-	2-	1+	
	Aortic Stenosis	0	0	1+	0	0	
	No SOB	0	2-	0	2-	0	







Your Point-of-Care Tool Box









Ms. Baker

Although your gestalt and HEAR both suggest she is at low risk, your post-test probability of 10% for ACS exceeds your risk tolerance

You arrange timely transfer to your referral center and appropriately inform her Cardiologist



Key Take-to-Work Points

When your gestalt and the CDT you use are concordant, great!

When they are discordant, I recommend going with the one that predicts more risk for your patient



It is essential to clearly and fully document your medical decision making in the medical record when managing chest pain patients

Your medical record should provide details of the exceptional analysis and decision making you performed

<section-header><section-header><section-header><text>