Alkadhi H, Int J Cardiovasc Res 2021, 10:8

International Journal of Cardiovascular Research

Short Communication A SCITECHNOL JOURNAL

Analyzing a computed tomography Coronary Angiography

Hatem Alkadhi[*]

Department of Diagnosis, Institute of Diagnostic and Interventional Radiology, University Hospital Zurich, Raemistrasse 100, 8091 Zurich, Switzerland.

[*]**Corresponding Author:** Hatem Alkadhi, Department of Diagnosis, Institute of Diagnostic and Interventional Radiology, University Hospital Zurich, Raemistrasse 100, 8091 Zurich, Switzerland. Tel: +41-1-2553662; Email: hc.zsu@ihdakla.metah

Received date: October 04, 2021; **Accepted date:** October 18, 2021; **Published date:** October 25, 2021

Abstract

Computed Tomography Coronary Angiography (CTCA) has become routine clinical practise in many institutions across the world. All previous research on the diagnostic accuracy of CTCA have found that this approach has a strong negative predictive value, indicating that it is capable of excluding relevant coronary artery disease[1,2,3]. CTCA, on the other hand, places great demands not only on technology but also on the CTCA data interpreters. A relevant coronary lesion could be readily missed by an untrained reader, while a non-related stenosis could be underestimated as a substantial lesion, especially in the presence of extensive calcified deposits. Furthermore, artefacts could be confused for genuine lesions, leading to unnecessary false-positive classifications. The stated high negative predictive value of CTCA is one of the method's key benefits, and a patient with a negative scan result will typically not undergo further cardiac diagnostics. It is critical that a CTCA study is accurately read. Any false-positive CTCA results, on the other hand, result in more invasive work-up that could have been avoided if the CTCA interpretation had been correct.

Introduction

CTCA data sets have grown in size as spatial resolution has improved, averaging 1,000 images–5,000 images each examination. As a result, interactively moving up and down a stack of axial slices to perform basic transverse scanning of large data sets is impracticable, favoring a shift toward volume imaging and 3D image display [4]. As a result, the interpreter of a CTCA data set should be aware of the benefits and drawbacks of the various post-processing procedures. Some of these post-processing approaches include a plethora of options that can be tweaked to achieve the best visualization for a given data collection. CTCA interpretation necessitates interactive visual editing and browsing. As a result, the CTCA interpreter can enhance his or her reading by learning to engage with his workstation and knowing the fundamentals of the various post-processing approaches.

Computed tomography (CT) scans are diagnostic imaging tests that produce detailed images of interior organs, bones, soft tissue, and blood arteries. CT scan cross-sectional scans can be reformatted in several planes, and three-dimensional images can be viewed on a computer monitor, reproduced on film, or transferred to electronic devices. Because the images allow your doctor to confirm the presence of a tumor and estimate its size and location, CT scanning is frequently the best tool for detecting many different malignancies. CT scans are quick, painless, noninvasive, and precise. It can disclose internal injuries and bleeding soon enough to save lives in emergency situations.

Coronary Angiography

Computed tomography (CT) has changed diagnostic decision-making since its inception in the 1970s. It has resulted in better surgery, cancer detection and therapy, post-injury and serious trauma care, stroke treatment, and cardiac treatment. CT has numerous advantages over other imaging modalities in that it can be completed in minutes and is widely available, allowing physicians to more confidently confirm or rule out a diagnosis. It has had a significant impact on the field of surgery, reducing the necessity for emergency surgery from 13% to 5% and nearly eliminating numerous exploratory surgical operations. The broad use of CT in clinical practise has been found to reduce the number of patients who need to be admitted to the hospital [5]. CT's continuous technological advancements have contributed to make it a more appealing imaging modality, with improved spatial resolution and shorter scanning periods, resulting in a substantially expanded variety of clinical applications, such as CT colonography, CT angiography, CT urography etc.

Given these benefits, it's no surprise that CT has witnessed a huge increase in use since its introduction. In 2007, it was predicted that 62 million CT scans were performed in the United States each year, compared to roughly 3 million in 1980. The increasing radiation exposure received by patients is one of the key concerns linked with the widespread adoption of CT. CT presently accounts for 75.4% of the effective radiation dosage supplied from all imaging procedures, according to a 2009 research in the United States, whereas X-ray scans account for only 11%. Because of this increased reliance on CT scanning, the cumulative per-capita effective radiation dose received from medical imaging in the United States increased nearly sixfold between 1980 and 2006 (from 0.5 mSv to 3.0 mSv), and medical imaging is now the most common source of radiation exposure to humans other than natural background radiation (it accounted for over 24% of the population's radiation dose in 2009). The use of CT scanning has increased by over 10% each year since the mid-1990s [6].

The fast growth in the use of fluoroscopic and interventional radiologic techniques has also contributed to an increase in the amount of ionising radiation provided by the medical profession. When these guided treatments are combined with the possibility for CT-based screening programmes (e.g., CT colonography, CT lung screening), the use of CT scanning is expected to grow even further in the coming years. The dearth of alternate imaging modalities, especially in smaller centres, exacerbates this dependency on CT scanning.

References

1. Anderson CM, Saloner D, Tsuruda JS (1990) Artifacts in maximum-intensity-projection display of MR angiograms. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 154: 623-629.
2. Fishman EK, Ney DR, Heath DG (2006) Volume rendering versus maximum intensity projection in CT angiography: what works best, when, and why. Radiographics 26: 905-922.

3. Schroeder S, Kopp AF, Baumbach A (2001) Noninvasive detection and evaluation of atherosclerotic coronary plaques with multislice computed tomography. J Am Coll Cardiol 37: 1430-1435.
4. Leschka S, Stinn B, Schmid F, Thomas GF, Simon W, et al. (2009) Dual source CT coronary angiography in severely obese patients: trading off temporal resolution and image noise. Invest Radiol 44: 720-727.
5. Lu B, Dai RP, Jiang SL, Sun X, Budoff MJ, et al. (2001) Effects of window and threshold levels on the accuracy of three-dimensional rendering techniques in coronary artery electron-beam CT angiography. Acad Radiol 8: 754-761.
6. Van Ooijen PMA, Ho KY, Dorgelo J, Oudkerk M (2003) Coronary artery imaging with multidetector CT: visualization issues. Radiographics 23: e16.