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This paper examines the evidence for contrast echocardiography, both for improving assessment of left ventricular structure and function compared with unenhanced echocardiography and for the identification of myocardial perfusion. Based on the evidence, recommendations are proposed for the clinical use of contrast echocardiography.
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Introduction

In a significant proportion of patients, echocardiography fails to produce diagnostically useful images despite tissue harmonic imaging.1 The main impediments appear to be obesity and lung disease.2 The problem is even greater in patients referred for stress echocardiography as images are suboptimal in as many as 33% of the patients.3 This results in inaccurate assessment of left ventricular (LV) function, and suboptimal reproducibility especially in the subgroup of patients with poor images, resulting in subsequent referrals for other tests because of uninterpretable images.

These concerns prompted the facilitation of contrast ultrasound imaging that utilizes contrast agents. The present generation of ultrasound contrast agents consist of microbubbles of encapsulated high-molecular-weight gas. Since the ultrasound characteristics of microbubbles are distinct from those of the surrounding blood cells and cardiac tissue, the backscatter that they produce result in intense echocardiographic signals, which are proportional to the blood volume. Thus, the LV cavity is enhanced compared with the surrounding heart muscle (which has relatively lower myocardial blood volume). With the advancement in ultrasound techniques and improved microbubble technology, it is now possible also to assess myocardial microcirculation and hence perfusion.

This paper examines the clinical efficacy and safety of ultrasound contrast agents and proposes evidence-based recommendations and protocols for the use of contrast echocardiography in various clinical scenarios.

Contrast agent

Echogenicity and ultrasound properties are determined by the size, shell, and encapsulated gas characterizing the microbubbles within the various contrast agents. Microbubble ultrasound scatter is proportional to the sixth power of the radius, so the largest bubble capable of passing through the pulmonary microcirculation will have the best acoustic profile.4 The harmonic properties of microbubbles are a function of their non-linear oscillation, which means that they reflect sound not only at the fundamental frequency of the ultrasound source but also at higher harmonics.5 A microbubble’s ultrasonic characteristics also depend on its size, the composition of the outer shell of the bubble, and the encapsulated gas.5 In general, the more elastic the shell, the more easily it will be compressed in an ultrasonic field and the better it will resonate. Conversely, stiffer shells may rupture when subjected to ultrasound.
The microbubbles must be stable enough to resist destruction at normal ultrasound power outputs and so maintain a sufficient concentration in the heart to give a satisfactory image. This is largely a factor of solubility of the gas in blood with high-molecular-weight bubbles being less soluble and so more stable. Characteristics of the three-marketed second-generation contrast agents that use high-molecular-weight gases are listed in Table 1.

### Contrast imaging modalities

As previously mentioned, harmonic imaging utilizes the non-linear scattering properties of ultrasound contrast agents to facilitate their detection within the heart. However, tissue also generates a harmonic signal as ultrasound is propagated through it and a high-quality contrast-enhanced image is one where the distribution of contrast (within the LV cavity and/or myocardium) is clearly seen without the presence of con founding myocardial tissue signals. The mechanical index (MI) is a measure of the power generated by an ultrasound transducer within an acoustic field. Harmonic imaging requires relatively high ultrasound power (high MI) that very quickly destroys (bursts) most commercially available ultrasound contrast agents and therefore is not a suitable imaging modality for continuous, or ‘real-time’ contrast imaging. High MI contrast imaging modalities have been successfully utilized for the detection of myocardial contrast using intermittent or triggered imaging modes where one imaging frame is created every one, two, three, or up to six cardiac cycles. The most common form of high MI imaging modality used in this way is harmonic power Doppler, which works best when utilized with a fragile contrast agent which is quickly destroyed and contains a soluble gas (air or nitrogen). This typically involves a dual-pulse technique where the difference in backscattered signal from two high MI pulses transmitted down each scan line is examined. If contrast micro-bubbles are encountered by the first pulse, they will generate a backscattered signal and also be destroyed. In addition, any tissue targets will also generate a signal. The second pulse will only generate a signal from tissue because all contrast will have been destroyed by the first pulse. The backscattered data from Pulse 1 are subtracted from that derived from Pulse 2, and the difference represents the contrast signal since the tissue signal cancels out. Newer high power techniques also utilize ultraharmonic properties of the microbubble, which improves the detection of the ‘signal’ of the microbubble, from the ‘noise’ of the background tissue, since tissue produces very little ultraharmonic signal.

In order to use real-time imaging of contrast within the LV cavity and/or myocardium, it is necessary to reduce significantly the transmitted ultrasound power (low MI imaging) and this has required more sophisticated, contrast-specific imaging modalities. These modalities have unique features, and have been named according to the developing ultrasound system manufacturer: power pulse inversion, power modulation, and cadence (or coherent) contrast imaging. They essentially work by transmitting multiple pulses down each scan line. Alternate pulses are 180° out of phase with other or vary in magnitude of amplitude by a fixed ratio, or are a combination of both strategies. All these types of modalities rely on the fact that tissue is essentially a linear and relatively predictable ultrasound scatterer, especially at low ultrasound energy levels, whereas contrast microbubbles are not, and are therefore described as being ‘non-linear’. When alternate backscattered signals are received, which are perfectly out of phase or proportionally altered in amplitude, they are processed by the imaging software as being derived from tissue and therefore are filtered out and suppressed. All remaining ‘non-linear’ signals are considered to be derived from contrast microbubbles and are displayed. When using this kind of imaging modality, the image will normally be totally dark prior to contrast administration, confirming effective suppression of tissue data. This type of imaging is very effective for LV endocardial border enhancement, as it demonstrates a sharp demarcation between the contrast-enhanced cavity and the myocardium. With minor modification and increased contrast concentration, it can also effectively detect and display contrast within the myocardium, facilitating the evaluation of myocardial perfusion as described later. It is common to combine this form of low MI contrast imaging with a burst of a few frames of high MI imaging to destroy contrast within the myocardium.
This allows the qualitative and quantitative assessment of contrast replenishment into the myocardium and is also discussed later.

### Efficacy of contrast agents in echocardiography

#### Enhancement of left ventricular endocardial border

In all of the following studies described, all patients had suboptimal images with non-contrast echocardiography before the use of a contrast agent. There have been three controlled studies of SonoVue in echocardiography. A total of 317 patients were treated with doses of SonoVue (between 0.5 and 4.0 mL) or with a comparator drug that was an older microbubble contrast agent or saline. Primary endpoints were assessed by two blinded readers. In all three studies, SonoVue administration resulted in increases in endocardial border delineation (EBD) score and left ventricular opacification (LVO) score relative to baseline images, which were significantly greater than after administration of the comparator or saline ($P < 0.001$). In the two studies in which it was a primary endpoint, duration of useful contrast was 1.7–4 min with SonoVue (2.0 mL) compared with $<15$ s with the highest dose of comparator. For all primary endpoints (LVO and EBD scores, and duration of effect), the maximum effect observed with SonoVue was significantly greater than that achieved with the comparator.

Optison and Albunex were used in two similar multicentre, randomized crossover studies. The test drugs were administered single blind and the image analysis was performed double blind. A total of 203 patients participated with the criteria for inclusion being that at least two of six segments of the LV endocardial border were not well delineated at routine echocardiography. Images were interpreted by a reader who was blinded to the patient’s clinical history and to the identity and dose of the test drug. In comparison with non-contrast ultrasound, Optison significantly increased the length of endocardial border that could be visualized both at end-systole and end-diastole. In addition, Optison significantly improved the ability to delineate qualitatively each of the LV segments, with a lesser effect for the septal segments. As assessed by video densitometry, Optison increased LV opacification in the mid-chamber and apical views.

Four controlled studies were performed with Luminity in a total of 249 patients with two or more non-evaluable segments on non-contrast echocardiography. Outcomes were assessed both by the institutional investigator and by blinded, independent physicians or sonographers who had no clinical information available to them. A primary endpoint in all studies was change in EBD from baseline, and significant improvements in this parameter were seen by a total of 12 of 16 of the blinded readers. In three studies, involving 190 patients in total, LV enhancement was also a primary endpoint. In two of the studies, blinded readers reported enhancement in up to 78% of participants. In the remaining study, the ability of investigators to optimize echocardiographic equipment settings led to even better results with blinded readers reporting 86–98% enhancement. An overview of the studies providing proof of contrast enhancement of endocardial border definition in echocardiography is provided in Table 2.

### Quantitative assessment of left ventricular function

Left ventricular function assessment provides valuable diagnostic and prognostic information in patients with suspected cardiovascular disease. Accurate and reproducible measurement of LV function is imperative for reliability of information. Several studies, as shown in Table 3, have indicated that contrast-enhanced echocardiography improves the evaluation of LV volumes and ejection fraction (LVEF). These findings were most striking in study participants who had two or more adjacent poorly visualized segments.

However, in a larger study consisting of 110 patients, the accuracy of intravenous contrast echocardiography was found to be significantly better than unenhanced tissue harmonic imaging when compared with cardiac magnetic resonance (CMR) imaging irrespective of imaging quality. It is now known based on contrast studies that LV volumes assessed by tissue harmonic imaging were consistently smaller, while those assessed during contrast echocardiography were more comparable with cardiac MRI. This is probably because tissue harmonic imaging does not track the true endocardial surface as well as contrast echocardiography, resulting in tracking noise in the LV cavity that is perceived as the endocardial border. In a multicentre study using SonoVue, LV volumes and LVEF assessed by contrast echocardiography demonstrated the least reader variability compared with unenhanced echocardiography, cine ventriculography, and cardiac MRI. When regional function was

---

### Table 2: Efficacy of contrast agents on various measures of image enhancement in echocardiography (Modified from Bhatia and Senior)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Patients (n)</th>
<th>Contrast agent used vs. comparator or control</th>
<th>Measure of contrast enhancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LVB length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LVO, LVEB score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duration of contrast effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salvage of non-diagnostic echo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side effect profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen et al. 94</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Optison vs. Albunex</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior et al. 95</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>SonoVue</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitzman et al. 96</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Luminity</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen et al. 97</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Optison</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanda et al. 98</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>SonoVue vs. Albunex vs. saline</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rizzo et al. 99</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SonoVue</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upward arrows signify significant improvement and horizontal arrows signify no significant difference in side effects compared with control.

LVB, left ventricular border; LVO, left ventricular opacification; LVEB, left ventricular endocardial border delineation score.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patients (n)</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
<th>Unenhanced imaging mode</th>
<th>Contrast agent</th>
<th>Agreement vs. comparator*</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without contrast</td>
<td>With contrast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundley et al.</td>
<td>CMR</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>EchoGen</td>
<td>0.85 (EF)</td>
<td>0.93 (EF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reilly et al.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Optison</td>
<td>0.92 (EDV)</td>
<td>0.95 (EDV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahar et al.</td>
<td>RNI</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Optison</td>
<td>0.94 (ESV)</td>
<td>0.97 (ESV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu et al.</td>
<td>RNI</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Levovist</td>
<td>0.94 (EF)</td>
<td>0.97 (EF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yong et al.</td>
<td>TEE</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Optison</td>
<td>0.92 (EDV)</td>
<td>0.95 (EDV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malm et al.</td>
<td>CMR</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Luminity</td>
<td>0.92 (ESV)</td>
<td>0.97 (ESV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffmann et al.</td>
<td>CMRb</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Sonovue</td>
<td>0.83 (EF)</td>
<td>0.91 (EF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lim et al.</td>
<td>CMRc</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Sonovue</td>
<td>0.82 (EF)</td>
<td>0.91 (EF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss et al.</td>
<td>TEE</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Luminity</td>
<td>0.82 (EF)</td>
<td>0.91 (EF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean correlation coefficient [95% CI]

- Mean % agreement with gold standard

Figures in bold refer to correlation coefficient. Percentage values refer to mean extent of agreement with standard unless otherwise stipulated.

RNI, radionuclide imaging; TEE, transoesophageal echocardiography; LV, left ventricle; EDV, end-diastolic volume; ESV, end-systolic volume; EF, ejection fraction; RWMA, regional wall motion abnormalities; FI, fundamental imaging; HI, harmonic imaging; CMR, cardiac magnetic resonance imaging.

aNo gold standard: direct comparison between standard, harmonic, and contrast echo. Values refer to percentage of patients in whom EF could be calculated with certainty.

bExpert panel decision as gold standard, but patients also underwent CMR. Values refer to Kappa extent of agreement with expert panel consensus.

cValues refer to percentage of diagnostic stress echocardiograms in difficult-to-image patients within a trial.
evaluated, the assessment by contrast echocardiography demonstrated the highest accuracy compared with cardiac MRI or cineventriculography. Such results have major implications for screening patients before and following them up after chemotherapy, because one needs the most reproducible technique to track changes in LV function so that timely action may be taken. In this scenario, contrast echocardiography is likely to be the non-invasive technique of choice due to its low risk (non-ionizing) and portability.

The ability of contrast echocardiography to assess LV remodelling, a major indicator of prognosis, 7–10 days after acute myocardial infarction (AMI) was evaluated. Compared with cardiac MRI, the study demonstrated that contrast echocardiography was more accurate and reproducible than tissue harmonic imaging alone. Furthermore, contrast echocardiography correctly identified patients with various grades of LVEF. Such findings are clinically important because LVEF after AMI is one of the major determinants not only of outcome but also for decision-making regarding, for example, the implantation of an expensive, but life-saving, device like intracardiac cardioverter defibrillator (ICD).

The accuracy of contrast echocardiography for assessing LV volumes and LVEF was also demonstrated in critically ill patients in intensive therapy units where accurate assessment of LV function is mandatory for optimal management but often has to be performed under adverse imaging circumstances. In addition, it has been shown that contrast echocardiography improves the interpretation of regional and global LV function in intensive care unit patients. In a further evaluation of similar group of patients, comparing the results with transoesophageal echocardiography, it was concluded that the use of intravenous contrast harmonic echocardiography significantly improved the feasibility and accuracy of estimated LVEF over tissue harmonic imaging.

A randomized study evaluated the use of Luminity for the detection of coronary artery disease (CAD) in 560 patients in whom non-contrast stress echocardiography had given difficult-to-interpretable images. Patients were randomized to receive rest and stress echocardiography either enhanced with Luminity or unenhanced. Investigator confidence was assessed as excellent or good in 95% of the enhanced images compared with only 63% of unenhanced images (P < 0.0001). Of the enhanced images, 95% proved diagnostic compared with 66% of unenhanced images. Three months after the imaging, 36% of patients with unenhanced imaging had required further diagnostic testing compared with only 17% of those with enhanced images.

It has been estimated that the addition of contrast media gives ~37% more diagnostic information and, in patients with a poor acoustic window, 50–90% improvement has been observed. In addition, it has been pointed out that contrast agents enhance decision-making for echocardiographers and clinicians as well as shortening the time to diagnosis. Contrast enhancement may also improve clinical throughput by decreasing the time needed to image difficult-to-image patients.

**Clinical efficacy of stress contrast echocardiography**

That contrast administration improves image quality through improved endocardial border definition during stress echocardiography has been shown in many studies. Image quality is a key factor determining the diagnostic accuracy of stress echocardiography. Contrast has been shown to improve visualization of regional wall motion abnormalities, improve study quality, and increase reader confidence in study interpretation.

Moir et al. demonstrated improved sensitivity and accuracy for the detection of CAD when contrast was administered. Studies have compared the sensitivity and specificity of dobutamine stress echocardiography in patients with good LV visualization at rest with that in patients with poor image quality during native imaging that underwent contrast echocardiography. These investigators found that, in patients with poor image quality, the use of contrast during dobutamine stress echocardiography significantly improved EBD and resulted in a sensitivity and specificity for the detection of CAD comparable with that achieved with the native dobutamine stress in patients with good image quality. In a recent randomized control study by Plana et al. comparing the diagnostic accuracy for the detection of CAD in patients who received contrast vs. those who did not, accuracy of contrast dobutamine stress echocardiography was significantly higher compared with unenhanced stress echocardiography for the detection of CAD.

In another study, stress echocardiography with contrast (30% of patients) resulted in reduced down stream cost compared with Ex-ECG for the detection of CAD in patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of study</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of subjects</th>
<th>Contrast</th>
<th>Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single centre</td>
<td>Dobutamine</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Optison</td>
<td>Dolan et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single centre</td>
<td>Treadmill exercise</td>
<td>100&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Optison</td>
<td>Shimoni et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single centre</td>
<td>Dobutamine</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Optison</td>
<td>Rainbird et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single centre</td>
<td>Diprytidamole</td>
<td>70&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Definity</td>
<td>Moir et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single centre</td>
<td>Dobutamine</td>
<td>1486&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Definity Optison</td>
<td>Tsutsui et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single centre</td>
<td>Dobutamine</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>Levovist</td>
<td>Wake et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single centre</td>
<td>Diprytidamole</td>
<td>120&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Optison</td>
<td>Korosoglou et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single centre</td>
<td>Dobutamine</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Infoson</td>
<td>Ikonomides et al.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Also perfusion.
presenting with troponin negative acute chest pain and enabled more patients to be discharged rapidly from the hospital. A study in the USA estimated that by reducing the need for further investigative procedures, contrast enhancement of sub-optimal images during stress echocardiography would result in a saving of $238 per patient.

Studies have also shown that the inter-observer variability improved significantly following contrast administration for the interpretation of wall motion abnormalities and this is particularly true if the operators are in their learning phase.

**Assessment of cardiac structure**

Contrast echocardiography is now recognized as the technique of choice for establishing or excluding the presence of apical hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, LV thrombus, non-compaction of LV, and life-threatening complications of myocardial infarction, such as myocardial rupture and LV pseudoaneurysm. Contrast opacification facilitates the identification of apical abnormalities. This is because native tissue harmonic echocardiography is unable to overcome the noise, clutter, and reverberation artefacts in the near field as tissue harmonic signals are weak at the nearfield; hence, apical abnormalities can be difficult to visualize.

**Clinical safety of contrast agents in echocardiography**

Contrast echocardiography is safe. In a large retrospective analysis of >18 000 patients, of which one-third received contrast agent in the acute setting, there was no significant difference in mortality in patients who received contrast vs. those who did not. This is because patients who received contrast agents had a higher risk clinical profile, compared with those who did not receive contrast. A European stress echocardiography study included patients receiving Optison, SonoVue, or no contrast, and found that the overall incidence of adverse events was not different between the three groups. Another UK study involving ~4000 patients showed no difference in acute complication rate in patients who received contrast vs. those who did not during stress echocardiography and this is despite the fact that the patients in the contrast group were in the higher risk group. A study in the USA included 963 patients receiving Optison and 523 receiving Lumivity during stress echocardiography and analyzed adverse cardiovascular and pulmonary effects. The incidence of side effects did not differ significantly between the three groups (Optison, Definity, and no contrast). Finally, a recent report of dobutamine myocardial stress echocardiography of over 5000 patients showed no excess of side effects. Side effects have been noted with contrast agents but they are usually mild and transient (Table 1). However, serious allergic reactions have been observed, at a very low incidence (estimated to be ~1:10 000). Table 5 lists mortality observed during usage of competing investigations. Therefore, the evidence shows that contrast echocardiography is very safe in clinical practice. Except for SonoVue, both Optison and Lumivity may be used in acute coronary syndromes (ACS). The contraindication on the use of contrast agents (Definity and Optison) in acute cardiac conditions was recently withdrawn by FDA following mounting evidence of safety and unequivocally favourable risk–benefit profile in the acute setting. It is hoped that EMEA will follow suit, regarding SonoVue which has similar safety profile to Definity and Optison. At present, SonoVue may be used 7 days after ACS. However, in all acute conditions, it is important to monitor vital signs and pulse oximetry for 30 min after contrast administration. The only absolute contraindications for administration of contrast agents are in patients with known or suspected intracardiac cardiac shunting of significant degree, or known hypersensitivity to the agent. Intracoronary administration is also not approved and is considered contraindicated, although it has been done without complications in thousands of patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy undergoing septal ablation.

**Indications, imaging modality, and contrast administration for left ventricular opacification**

Indications for resting left ventricular opacification contrast echo

In patients with suboptimal images:

1. To enable improved endocardial visualization and assessment of LV structure and function when two or more contiguous segments are NOT seen on non-contrast images
2. To have accurate and repeatable measurements of LV volumes, and ejection fraction by 2D Echo
3. To increase confidence of the interpreting physician in the LV function, structure and volume assessments
4. To confirm or exclude the echocardiographic diagnosis of the following LV structural abnormalities, when non-enhanced images are suboptimal for definitive diagnosis:
   - apical hypertrophic cardiomyopathy
   - ventricular non-compaction
   - apical thrombus
   - ventricular pseudoaneurysm

Indications for use of contrast in stress echocardiography

When two or more endocardial border contiguous segments of LV are not well visualized in order to:

- To obtain diagnostic assessment of segmental wall motion and thickening at rest and stress
- To increase the proportion of diagnostic studies
- To increase reader confidence in interpretation

---

**Table 5** Comparative mortality in selected cardiac procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contrast Echo</td>
<td>1:145 000 (SonoVue), 1:500 000 (Definity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myocardial Scintigraphy</td>
<td>1:10 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise ECG</td>
<td>1:2500 (or AMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary arteriography</td>
<td>1:1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modified from Main et al.
Imaging modalities

High mechanical index imaging

Harmonic imaging has become the standard imaging technique for native (tissue) echocardiography, although it was originally developed to enhance the detection of contrast agents (Table 6). In order to use it optimally for contrast studies, the transmit power must be reduced from an MI > 1.0 to ~0.4–0.6. However, even this power level is still relatively high and can cause destruction of the contrast in the nearfield of the transducer as well as create confounding tissue signals in the myocardium, which impair the delineation of the endocardium.

Low power imaging

For clinical studies, the newer contrast-specific imaging modalities (Pulse inversion Power Modulation and Cadence Pulse Sequencing) are preferable. This low-power (‘Low MI’) contrast-specific imaging technology provides the best LV opacification (homogeneous contrast, excellent endocardial border definition). Because of the low transmit power, less contrast is needed compared with standard real-time harmonic imaging. In addition, myocardial opacification, which allows assessment of perfusion, can be studied simultaneously. Thus, perfusion can be assessed without prolongation of the LVO contrast study and without increasing the amount of contrast agent infused. Scanning with the new low-power contrast-specific imaging modalities for the detection of myocardial perfusion is an ‘off-label’ application, as none of the currently available contrast agents have been approved for this indication. It should be noted, however, that because the real-time Low MI modes transmit multiple pulses down each image scan line, relatively low frame rates may result, which are not optimal for wall motion assessment. This may be usually overcome by narrowing the sector width until the frame rate is at least 25 Hz that is preferable for wall motion assessment during stress echocardiography.

Low MI contrast-specific techniques display the contrast within the cavities of the heart and, because contrast microbubbles are red blood cell tracers, they accurately display the myocardial blood within the intramyocardial vessels. The blood volume within the myocardial vessels comprises only 7% of the myocardium. Therefore, the myocardial opacification is always much less intense than the cavity opacification, providing an excellent contrast for endocardial delineation. The myocardial contrast is also very useful for assessing thickening of the myocardium and myocardial perfusion.

Contrast administration

Infusion method

Infusion of ultrasound contrast agents requires an infusion pump that is not limited by the detection of microbubbles, and which may be intermittently agitated to maintain heterogeneity of distribution of the microbubbles. Agitation can be performed manually by slowly rocking the pump to and fro. A special infusion pump has been developed for SonoVue, which provides constant agitation. The pump can be prepared in a few minutes prior to the study while the patient undresses or during the baseline echo examination. By an alternating rotating action the contrast agent is agitated preventing bubbles separating and floating to the surface. The pump is then kept in a stand-by mode. The pump is started by the sonographer using a remote control and no additional staff is needed. Although the pump provides the possibility of an initial small bolus, a constant infusion of SonoVue 0.8 mL/min from the start is usually satisfactory and need not be changed in the majority of patients. In contrast to a bolus injection, a continuous infusion over a short time provides stable conditions to acquire loops from different scanplanes and provides a steady-state level to quantitatively assess myocardial perfusion. During stress echocardiography, the infusion can be stopped at any time and resumed when needed. Between infusion periods, the contrast agent is gently agitated. The contrast infusion is connected through a three-way-tap or small bore Y connector at the IV cannula, permitting the simultaneous infusion during dobutamine stress echocardiography.

Bolus injection

It is also possible to use slow bolus injections (~0.2 mL) of all agents (Sonovue, Luminit, and Optison) followed by slow 5 mL saline flush over 20 s. However, these are not as controllable or reproducible as infusion.

Myocardial contrast echocardiography

Physiologic basis of myocardial contrast echocardiography

The predominant (90%) component of myocardial blood volume resides within the capillaries. The myocardial signal assessed visually as contrast intensity reflects the concentration of microbubbles within the myocardium. When the entire myocardium is fully saturated during a continuous infusion of microbubbles, the signal intensity denotes the capillary blood volume. Any alteration of signal in such a situation must, therefore, occur predominantly from a change in capillary blood volume. Furthermore, it has
been shown that following destruction, or depletion, of microbubbles in the myocardium during high-power imaging, replenishment of contrast within the myocardium can be observed. The capillary blood velocity is 1 mm/s with an ultrasound beam elevation of 5 mm. Thus, it takes ~5 s for complete replenishment of the myocardium. Any decrease in myocardial blood flow (MBF) prolongs replenishment time in proportion to the reduction in MBF. Myocardial perfusion is defined as tissue blood flow at the capillary level. The two components of tissue blood flow are capillary blood volume and red blood cell velocity. As microbubbles have been shown to be red blood cell flow tracers, the product of peak microbubble intensity (representative of myocardial blood volume) and their rate of appearance (representative of blood velocity) equals MBF. Therefore, myocardial contrast echocardiography (MCE) can detect capillary blood volume and, by virtue of its temporal resolution, can also assess MBF. This imaging technique of “destruction (or depletion) and replenishment” requires the delivery of a series of high-energy ultrasound pulses to destroy (deplete) microbubbles in the myocardium. Ultrasound imaging is then continued either intermittently (during high-power imaging) or continuously (during low-power imaging) to observe contrast intensity and microbubble velocity.

**Detection of coronary artery disease**

At rest, normally perfused myocardium demonstrates appearance of contrast within five cardiac cycles during a destruction/replenishment acquisition; after stress, this is reduced to two cardiac cycles, due to increased MBF. A delayed contrast appearance due to reduced blood flow velocity and reduced contrast intensity due to decreased capillary blood volume forms the basis for detection of CAD using MCE. Single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) using radionuclide agents such as $^{99m}$Tc and $^{201}$Tl are now the most widely used myocardial perfusion techniques for assessment of CAD. Concordance between MCE and SPECT has been demonstrated in many studies during rest or stress (Table 7). A meta-analysis of eight studies comparing the sensitivity and specificity of MCE with those of SPECT/dobutamine stress echocardiography for the detection of CAD showed equivalent results. In a recently concluded, first multicentre, international phase III trial comprising of 662 patients and with all images being read off-site by independent readers, MCE was found to be non-inferior to SPECT for the detection of CAD (Figure 1). Similar trial with SonoVue (PHOENIX) is under way. Taken as an aggregate of published studies, the sensitivity and specificity of MCE for the detection of CAD is 83 and 80%, respectively (Table 8). However, it needs to be emphasized that training and expertise are required to achieve such results.

Myocardial contrast echocardiography also provides incremental prognostic value over and above wall motion assessment in patients with stable CAD during dobutamine stress echocardiography. Patients with normal perfusion have a better outcome than patients with normal wall motion, which underscores the value of incorporating MCE in stress echocardiography.

**Detection of acute coronary syndrome**

The current diagnosis of ACS relies on clinical history, electrocardiography, and cardiac markers of necrosis. It has been shown that these parameters alone could detect ~30% of ACS when the patient presents in the emergency department. In a large multicentre study, performance of MCE improved the detection of ACS over and above clinical, ECG, and biochemical markers at the time of presentation with chest pain and was equivalent to SPECT for risk stratification of these patients. However, MCE is the only technique that allows immediate simultaneous assessment at the bedside of wall motion and perfusion and, in this regard, it offers a unique role in the diagnosis

---

**Table 7** Concordance of myocardial contrast echocardiography and single-photon emission computed tomography for detection of significant coronary artery stenosis in patients with suspected coronary artery disease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Patients (n)</th>
<th>Imaging mode</th>
<th>Percentage concordance (kappa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Territory basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Segment basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaul et al. 46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>THI</td>
<td>86 (0.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinle et al. 47</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>HPD</td>
<td>81 (0.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimoni et al. 48</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>76 (0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei et al., 2003 49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>HPD</td>
<td>84 (0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocchi et al. 50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>HPD</td>
<td>84 (0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olszowska et al. 51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>HPD</td>
<td>UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior et al. 52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>IPI</td>
<td>UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xie et al. 53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>RTI</td>
<td>75 (0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korosoglou et al. 54</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>PPI</td>
<td>UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (T)588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall mean [95% CI]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81 [76.4-85.6]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are expressed as concordance and agreement (kappa).

Adapted from Bhatia and Senior.104
of ACS. Studies have also reported high sensitivities with MCE to detect ACS compared with standard echocardiography and SPECT.\textsuperscript{61,62} In a recent study of over 1000 patients, assessment of resting perfusion and function with MCE has been shown to be a powerful predictor of outcome, over and above clinical ECG and troponin assessment of patients presenting to emergency department with suspected CAD.\textsuperscript{63} Patients who demonstrated normal function and perfusion at rest demonstrated excellent outcome.\textsuperscript{64} Moreover, stress MCE may be used to safely assess prognosis in patients with significant cardiac risk factors presenting with chest pain, but a negative 12-h troponin and non-diagnostic ECG. In these patients, a negative stress MCE result predicted an excellent prognosis.\textsuperscript{65}

Detection of myocardial viability

Microvascular integrity is a pre-requisite for the sustenance of myocardial viability in dysfunctional segments.\textsuperscript{66} Peak contrast intensity, a measure of capillary blood volume correlates with microvascular density and capillary area, and is inversely related to the collagen content.\textsuperscript{67} Experimental models have established that contrast defect size assessed 10–15 s after contrast administration, corresponded to infarct size.\textsuperscript{68,69} In humans, contrast defect intensity and degree of reduction of resting MBF after intravenous contrast administration predicted transmural extent of necrosis assessed by late gadolinium CMR imaging.\textsuperscript{70,71} The ability of MCE to predict functional recovery is comparable with that of cardiac MRI.\textsuperscript{70} Because contractile response with dobutamine depends not only on microvascular integrity (hence conservation of contractile protein) but also on MBF reserve, dobutamine stress echocardiography may be less sensitive than techniques that assess microvasculature directly (MCE) for the detection of hibernating myocardium.\textsuperscript{72,73} Therefore, MCE may be particularly useful in further evaluation of myocardial viability in dobutamine non-responsive myocardium.\textsuperscript{73} At least two studies indicated that MCE has superior sensitivity and equivalent specificity compared with dobutamine echocardiography and has equivalent sensitivity and superior specificity compared with SPECT imaging for the detection of hibernating myocardium.\textsuperscript{72,74} Tables 9–11 summarizes the accuracy of MCE for the prediction of myocardial viability. Recent studies have also shown that among all the clinical, ECG, and angiographic parameters of reperfusion after AMI, contrast perfusion is the only independent predictor of reperfusion.\textsuperscript{75–77} With accumulating evidence of its prognostic value for the detection of myocardial viability over and above clinical

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{multi-reader(receiver operating characteristics).pdf}
\caption{Multi-reader receiver operating characteristics. Values for each blinded reader from RAMP-1 and -2 trials. Modality-specific curves were extrapolated to the theoretical minimum and maximum values. AUCs were 0.72 for both PSE and SPECT.}
\end{figure}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Study & Patients undergoing coronary angiography & CAD present & MCE sensitivity & MCE specificity \\
\hline
Chiou et al.\textsuperscript{105} & 132 & 85 & 81 & 77 \\
Cwaig et al.\textsuperscript{106} & 45 & 32 & 87 & 66 \\
Elhendy et al.\textsuperscript{107} & 170 & 127 & 91 & 51 \\
Heinle et al.\textsuperscript{47} & 15 & 12 & 75 & 67 \\
Jeetley et al.\textsuperscript{108} & 123 & 96 & 84 & 56 \\
Karavidas et al.\textsuperscript{109} & 47 & 11 & 91 & 92 \\
Korosoglou et al.\textsuperscript{54} & 89 & 62 & 83 & 72 \\
Lin et al.\textsuperscript{110} & 40 & 25 & 84 & 93 \\
Malm et al.\textsuperscript{111} & 43 & 33 & 77 & 72 \\
Moir et al.\textsuperscript{26} & 90 & 48 & 93 & 65 \\
Olszowska et al.\textsuperscript{51} & 44 & 44 & 97 & 93 \\
Peltier et al.\textsuperscript{53} & 35 & 22 & Qualitative 85 & Qualitative 79 \\
Rocchi et al.\textsuperscript{50} & 12 & 12 & Quantitative 97 & Quantitative 79–82 \\
Senior et al.\textsuperscript{52} & 55 & 12 & 89 & 100 \\
Senior et al.\textsuperscript{85} & 52 & 43 & 86 & 88 \\
Shimoni et al.\textsuperscript{48} & 44 & 22 & 82 & 97 \\
Tsutsui et al.\textsuperscript{93} & 16 & 28 & 75 & 100 \\
Winter et al.\textsuperscript{112} & 36 & 13 & RT imaging 64 & RT imaging 92 \\
Hayat et al.\textsuperscript{86} & 63 & 35 & 81 & 67 \\
Aggeli C et al.\textsuperscript{41} & 532 & 25 & 92 & 95 \\
Total & 1683 & 413 & 92 & 61 \\
\hline
Mean [95\% CI] & 83 [78–88] & 80 [73–87] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Accuracy of myocardial contrast echocardiography for the detection of coronary artery disease}
\end{table}
markers and LVEF, MCE is evolving as a useful bedside technique that may be used as first line investigation for the assessment of myocardial viability.\textsuperscript{77–80} Algorithms for the use of MCE after AMI are shown in Figure 2A and B.\textsuperscript{81}

### Table 9: Accuracy of resting intravenous myocardial contrast echocardiography for the prediction of myocardial viability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Type of imaging</th>
<th>No. of patients (n = 736)</th>
<th>MCE perfusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sbano et al.\textsuperscript{113}</td>
<td>High MI</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior et al.\textsuperscript{73}</td>
<td>High MI</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>62 (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggeli et al.\textsuperscript{114}</td>
<td>High MI</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>88 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills et al.\textsuperscript{115}</td>
<td>Low MI</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>86 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main et al.\textsuperscript{116}</td>
<td>Low MI</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69 (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinburn et al.\textsuperscript{117}</td>
<td>Low MI</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68 (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills et al.\textsuperscript{118}</td>
<td>High MI</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80 (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepper et al.\textsuperscript{119}</td>
<td>High MI</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>94 (87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janardhanan et al.\textsuperscript{70}</td>
<td>Low MI</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>82 (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickman et al.\textsuperscript{120}</td>
<td>Low MI</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greaves et al.\textsuperscript{75}</td>
<td>Low MI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88 (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janardhanan et al.\textsuperscript{121}</td>
<td>Low MI</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main et al.\textsuperscript{122}</td>
<td>Low MI</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77 (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimoni et al.\textsuperscript{74}</td>
<td>High MI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickman et al.\textsuperscript{72}</td>
<td>Low MI</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>87 (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agati et al.\textsuperscript{123}</td>
<td>High MI</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang et al.\textsuperscript{124}</td>
<td>Low MI</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>83 (82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolognese et al.\textsuperscript{76}</td>
<td>High MI</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abe et al.\textsuperscript{125}</td>
<td>High MI</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>98 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kousougliou\textsuperscript{126}</td>
<td>Low MI</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>81 (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85 (70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MCE, myocardial contrast echocardiography.

### Table 10: Interpretation of resting contrast echo studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wall motion</th>
<th>Myocardial contrast</th>
<th>Diagnostic confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abnormal</td>
<td>Abnormal</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abnormal</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Stunning, hibernation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Abnormal</td>
<td>Artefact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11: Interpretation of stress contrast studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wall motion</th>
<th>Myocardial contrast</th>
<th>Diagnostic confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New WMA</td>
<td>Perfusion defect</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New WMA</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>May be artefact, but if in centre of plane cardiomyopathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Perfusion defect</td>
<td>Ischaemia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12: Evidence-based recommendations by EAE on contrast echocardiography

Myocardial contrast echocardiography, like all other techniques, requires training and understanding of the technology. The signature of MCE is the result of interaction between the microbubbles and ultrasound power. Thus, variation in concentration of microbubbles with each administration may influence the contrast intensity. Ultrasound power is not uniform in the field of view and this may

### Assessment of coronary flow reserve by myocardial contrast echocardiography

The first experimental study by Wei et al.\textsuperscript{45} established quantitative evaluation of MBF using MCE. In a subsequent clinical study by the same group, they showed that assessment of MBF during hyperaemia provided an accurate assessment of coronary flow reserve.\textsuperscript{82} This was subsequently replicated by other authors.\textsuperscript{83} Indeed, Vogel et al.\textsuperscript{84} demonstrated that MBF assessed by MCE at rest and during hyperaemia closely correlated with MBF assessed by positron emission tomography. Further studies in various cardiovascular disease conditions showed that coronary flow reserve assessed by MCE can accurately assess both the presence and severity of flow-limiting CAD.\textsuperscript{85–88} This assessment can be performed using both low and high MI imaging techniques. The myocardium is first cleared of microbubbles during high MI imaging and subsequent replenishment is assessed in time (Figure 3). Myocardial blood flow, which is the product of peak contrast intensity and myocardial flow velocity, is obtained. It is obtained in each of the myocardial segments in the apical views (preferably avoiding the basal segments—see below). The MBF obtained in each segment can then be collapsed into the three vascular territories. The process is repeated during stress myocardial imaging preferably vasodilator stress. The ratio of the peak MBF and that of resting flow indicates coronary flow reserve.\textsuperscript{82}

### Limitations of myocardial contrast echocardiography

Myocardial contrast echocardiography, like all other techniques, requires training and understanding of the technology. The signature of MCE is the result of interaction between the microbubbles and ultrasound power. Thus, variation in concentration of microbubbles with each administration may influence the contrast intensity. Ultrasound power is not uniform in the field of view and this may
affect the estimation of myocardial blood volume and velocity. Because ultrasound power is weakest in the far field, contrast intensity may be falsely reduced at the bases of the heart. Similarly, as the power of ultrasound is the strongest in the near-field, and apical destruction of contrast may result in false perfusion defects. However, recent advancement in technology and understanding of microbubble and ultrasound interaction has improved interpretation significantly. In a recently concluded multicentre trial involving 27 centres in USA and Europe, diagnostic images could be obtained in 99% of patients. The reproducibility of multiple MCE readers was non-inferior and similar to that of SPECT readers.56

Protocols for myocardial contrast echocardiography

Exercise stress protocol
The protocols are the same as for native stress echocardiography.89 Recordings are performed at rest according to the protocol for rest echocardiography (Figures 4 and 5).

Figure 2  (A) Schematic diagram for the proposed role of myocardial contrast echocardiography in assessment of patients in the acute phase of STEMI. (B) Schematic diagram for the proposed role of myocardial contrast echocardiography in assessment of patients with recent STEMI following reperfusion Hayat and Senior.81

Hayat and Senior81
Further image acquisition is performed immediately after treadmill exercise, upright or supine bicycle ergometry. Because ischaemia-induced wall motion abnormalities may resolve quickly, post-treadmill exercise imaging should be accomplished within 60–90 s of termination of exercise. Therefore, it is necessary to inject the bolus (if only wall motion is assessed) or start the infusion (ideal for assessing perfusion) of contrast before the patient terminates the exercise. After application of the contrast agent, the patient should be asked to continue the exercise for at least 20 s, before laying down for image acquisition.

Dobutamine stress echocardiography
The protocol for native dobutamine stress echocardiography is described elsewhere except apical views are acquired first (Figure 6).89 Resting image settings should be optimized and resting contrast echocardiogram views should be obtained according to the criteria described previously. The same views are acquired at an intermediate stage (70% of the maximum age predicted heart rate) and at peak stress (85% of the maximum age predicted heart rate). Contrast can be administered as a bolus or as an infusion, as described previously. If the SonoVue-infusion pump or Luminity drip is used, infusion is needed only while acquiring the images. Prior to acquisition of the peak stress loops, the contrast infusion is started and the dobutamine infusion is stopped. Within 30 s, there is sufficient contrast enhancement and the peak contrast images are acquired in the apical views (and parasternal views if of sufficient quality). Image acquisition at stress is not different from acquisition at rest except when using triggered imaging. A 1:1 trigger interval should be used at peak stress whereas at rest 1:4 is useful. Adjustment of the time delay of the trigger may be necessary at peak stress to allow for the increased heart rate.

Vasodilator stress
Vasodilator stress is the best stress modality for perfusion imaging
An amount of 0.56 mg/kg of dipyridamole (half-life 30 min) is administered intravenously over 4 min; contrast echocardiograms are acquired at rest (before infusion) and 2 min after completion of infusion. The same infusion line is used to administer the contrast agent and the vasodilator. Alternatively, an infusion of adenosine 140 μg/kg/min (half-life 4–10 s) can be used. The contrast echocardiograms are acquired prior to infusion and again during the infusion at 3 min. Usually, all the three apical views + available parasternal views can be acquired within the subsequent 3 min, resulting in a total adenosine infusion time of 6 min (Figure 7). For both vasodilators, a three-way tap or small bore Y connector is useful to connect the vasodilator infusion lines and contrast infusion pump.

Myocardial contrast echocardiography for myocardial viability
Rest contrast images are acquired as described previously. However, when real-time imaging protocol is used, it is important to acquire at least 15 sc cycle post-flash for optimal assessment. It has been shown that both the presence of homogenous contrast uptake and, alternatively, the absence of contrast uptake are very accurate indicators of the presence or absence of myocardial viability, respectively. It is, however, important to exclude apical and basal artefacts before concluding that there is absent contrast uptake. High MI imaging should also include imaging up to 15 s intermittent image acquisition. The transmit focus should be moved towards the apex to confirm an apical perfusion defect when suspected. A thin and scarred (bright) myocardium of <5 mm in size indicates non-viable tissue and it is unnecessary to assess perfusion in these segments.

Analyses
Lefrt ventricular function and regional wall motion
Visual analysis of LV function is performed in all patients according to EAE/ASE guidelines for non-contrast imaging.89 Myocardial contrast and, particularly, the enhancement of the epicardial vessels helps in judging wall thickening as well as inward motion of the myocardium. Contrast images are ideal for measuring LV volumes and LVEF. The post-flash (destruction) images provide the best evidence-based recommendations by EAE on contrast echocardiography 205
contrast between myocardium and the LV cavity. Manual tracing on still frames to obtain LV volumes and ejection fraction is easy and quick. Therefore, in every contrast study, these measurements should be obtained. The tools for automatic assessment of LV borders (such as colour kinesis), as well as 3D echocardiographic volumetric assessments with contrast are currently being investigated in clinical trials and may be useful clinical tools in the future.\textsuperscript{90,91}

Myocardial perfusion

Although there is growing evidence of the usefulness of quantitative analysis,\textsuperscript{92} myocardial contrast signals are currently judged using visual assessment.

Normal myocardial perfusion is displayed by homogeneous contrast enhancement at rest 5 s after flash (Low MI imaging) or high MI imaging and a quick replenishment at stress (within 2 s).

**Figure 4** Protocol for myocardial contrast echocardiography. Protocol 1.

2.2 Protocol 1 (low power, real-time) — steps

1: standard 2D (tissue harmonic) imaging to adjust scanplanes.

2: activate preset \textit{Contrast preset 1 (low power, real-time)}.

3: adjust \textit{focus} (mitral valve level) and \textit{gain} to achieve some mild background noise (on some scanners, it is only one gain control, whereas on other there different controls for time gain compensation and lateral gain). adjust sector width to obtain frame rate >25 Hz.

4: inject contrast bolus (0.3 ml Optison, 03 mL Luminy or 0.3 ml SonoVue) or infuse contrast agent 0.6–0.9 mL/min Sonovue or 1 drop/s Luminy.

5A: Image acquisition for \textit{bolus injection} (digital loops preferable, back-up on tape)

- usually it takes at least 30 s after the injection of contrast to opacify the LV before acquiring images check whether LV and myocardial opacification is adequate and that no attenuation is present
- 4CV, 2CV, 3CV (SAX and LAX may be omitted as they cause attenuation)
- 1 beat loops in each view.

5B: Image acquisition for \textit{contrast infusion} (digital loops preferable, back up on tape):

- usually it takes at least 30 s after start of infusion to opacify the LV before acquiring images check whether LV and myocardial opacification is adequate and reduce infusion rate if attenuation is present
- 4CV, 2CV, 3CV (SAX and LAX may be omitted to save contrast agent)
- 1 beat loops in each view flash replenishment technique when infusing contrast
  (15 beat loop, high power flash after 2 cardiac cycles )

The setting of the flash has to be adjusted during rest, the flash should clear the contrast from the myocardium with visible destruction (=reduction in intensity in the LV cavity), start with 7 frames duration and MI 0.9

Triggered low power imaging: use 1:1 trigger, trigger point at endsystole, flash replenishment technique like for real-time imaging and record additional single beat loops in real-time to record wall motion

---

\textsuperscript{90}R. Senior et al. 206
Perfusion defect by myocardial contrast echocardiography

A visually evident contrast defect is considered present when there is a relative decrease in contrast enhancement in one region compared with other adjacent regions that have the same or worse imaging conditions. The diagnostic confidence of an observed perfusion defect increases when two contiguous segments fail to exhibit contrast enhancement. A contrast defect is usually seen first in the subendocardium and does not extend over the full thickness of the myocardium. The specificity for the detection of a perfusion defect is decreased in the absence of at least some contrast signal in the epicardium; full thickness defects in which both endocardium and epicardium are absent are more likely to fail to exhibit contrast enhancement.

2.3 Protocol 2 (high power, triggered imaging) — steps

1. standard 2D (tissue harmonic) imaging to adjust scanplanes
2. activate preset Contrast preset 2 (high power, triggered imaging) second harmonic ultraharmonic, pulse inversion or harmonic power Doppler (Angio)
3. adjust focus (mitral valve level) and gain to achieve some mild background noise (on some scanners it is only one gain control on other there different controls for time gain compensation and lateral gain)
4. adjust trigger (=select the R wave delay for frame acquisition)
   double trigger (consecutive imaging and destruction frame):
   helps to control whether wall motion artefacts are present
   and the contrast agent has been completely destroyed by the imaging frame
   trigger point: end-systolic trigger work, avoid upsloping part of T wave!
   trigger interval: every fourth cardiac cycle for visual analysis
5. infuse contrast agent (0.9 mL/min SonoVue or 1 drop/s Luminyx)

For triggered imaging infusion of contrast is recommended

8. Image acquisition for contrast infusion (digital loops preferable, back up on tape):
   usually it takes at least 30 s to opacify the myocardium
   before acquiring images check whether LV and myocardial opacification is
   adequate in 4CV (decrease infusion speed in case of attenuation, increase
   infusion speed if a normally/hypokinetic contracting mid or apical segment is not
   opacified)
   4CV, 2CV, 3CV (SAX and LAX may be omitted to avoid attenuation)

**Figure 5** Protocol for myocardial contrast echocardiography. Protocol 2.

![Contrast and Dobutamine Protocol](image)

*Atropine (0.3 mg, maximum 1.2 mg) is given, if there is no adequate increase in heart rate

**Figure 6** Dobutamine stress contrast protocol.

Perfusion defect by myocardial contrast echocardiography

A visually evident contrast defect is considered present when there is a relative decrease in contrast enhancement in one region compared with other adjacent regions that
be due to artefact such as attenuation or rib shadowing. Basal lateral and anterior walls quite often cannot be assessed because of these limitations. However, there is usually enough adequate information in other segments in the LAD or RCX perfusion territories to permit the assessment of adequacy of perfusion by coronary artery territory.

Fixed vs. reversible perfusion defect
Fixed perfusion defects are visible at rest and stress. Reversible defects are best seen early after the flash (during the first 2 cardiac cycles using real-time imaging) or with low trigger rate (1:1 using high power triggered imaging). Reversible defects suggestive of CAD are characterized by delayed subendocardial replenishment and subendocardial hypoenhancement. With longer replenishment time (low MI imaging) or increased trigger intervals (high MI imaging), reversible defects often decrease in size or fill in.

When assessing for potential perfusion defects, it is crucial to avoid either oversaturation with contrast, or alternatively, inadequate concentration of contrast. Subtle subendocardial defects may be obscured by excess contrast. These may be revealed by a reduction in contrast infusion rate or further bubble destruction with additional intermittent high power frames. On the other hand, inadequate contrast concentration will obviate the detection of normally perfused and relatively underperfused regions.

Integrating wall motion findings and judgment of perfusion
During rest echocardiography (Table 10)
This may be particularly useful when the assessment of LV wall motion is difficult or dubious at rest. Probably, the most important situation where perfusion imaging makes a difference is in akinetic areas (Table 7). Before one tries to assess myocardial contrast enhancement, it is important to look at myocardial thickness that often can be seen very well during infusion of contrast. When analysing loops obtained with real-time imaging, judgement of wall motion and myocardial perfusion is often combined. A subendocardial perfusion defect makes a wall motion abnormality much clearer and vice versa. Thus, assessment of myocardial contrast often helps by increasing the diagnostic confidence of dubious wall motion analysis. In a resting study, a perfusion defect can be due to ischaemia with a flow limiting coronary stenosis at rest, a scar, or an artefact. Artefacts are most likely to occur in the basal lateral and anterior walls and can easily be detected by the typical criteria of attenuation and shadowing, in the presence of normal myocardial wall thickening. Other discrepant findings between wall motion and myocardial contrast enhancement occur with stunning and hibernation. Both conditions can be suspected when reduced wall motion and good contrast enhancement are found in a resting perfusion study.

During stress echocardiography (Table 11)
Concordant findings in wall motion and perfusion increase our confidence when assessing a dubious wall motion abnormality. For instance, when asked for the significance of an angiographically determined coronary stenosis, normal wall motion and perfusion in the territory supplied by this vessel should negate the need for coronary intervention. Combined assessment of wall motion and perfusion can also help to increase the diagnostic confidence of abnormal findings. A new wall motion abnormality accompanied by a perfusion defect suggests flow-limiting CAD. A new wall motion abnormality without a corresponding perfusion defect may suggest cardiomyopathy.

Training and accreditation
Both physicians and cardiac sonographers must have acquired basic echocardiography training and preferably accredited in echocardiography before using contrast agents. Those planning to use contrast agents during stress echocardiography must be accredited or at least must have undergone equivalent training in stress echocardiography. Beyond these trainings in rest and stress echocardiography, the use of contrast agents requires a level of experience and performance, initially under guidance or supervision. Physicians, sonographers, and nurses alike should be competent in the administration of contrast agents, should be aware of the indications and contraindications, and should be able to manage adverse events. It is encouraged that personnel involved in contrast use should attend courses, etc. to learn and familiarize themselves with the use of contrast, performance, and interpretation of contrast-enhanced images. This is particularly important if the echo team is contemplating using contrast for assessment of perfusion also. The echo team should seek guidance from the local echocardiography society of institutional director to determine ways to set up myocardial perfusion programme. It cannot be emphasized more that experience with contrast agent for LVO is a prerequisite for moving on to assess perfusion and function with contrast agents.

Conclusions
Contrast echocardiography significantly improves the image quality during rest and stress echocardiography and at the same time provides additional information on myocardial perfusion. Contrast echocardiography reduces the need for additional, costly, and more hazardous tests and, importantly, spares the patient further invasive investigations. Thus, contrast echocardiography provides a safe and comprehensive assessment of cardiac structure, function, perfusion, and coronary flow reserve at the bedside.
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