Specificity of MR angiography as a confirmatory test of carotid artery stenosis.
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Specificity of MR Angiography as a Confirmatory Test of Carotid Artery Stenosis
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PURPOSE: To estimate from available literature the specificity (true-negative rate) of MR angiography for detecting severe carotid artery stenoses when applied as a confirmatory test after screening with duplex Doppler sonography. METHODS: We reviewed the pertinent MR angiographic literature published between 1990 and 1994 and recalculated the specificity of MR angiography after deleting from the database results for normal vessels and for vessels with mild and moderate stenoses, since the study of these vessels is not germane to an exploration of the utility of MR angiography as a confirmatory test. RESULTS: Seventeen articles provided data for our analysis. We divided vessels into four categories on the basis of data supplied within each article. Seven of the articles provided data that could be configured to match the categories used in the North American Symptomatic Carotid Endarterectomy Trial (NASCET). In one study, the criterion of severe stenosis was more than 70% constriction, but the moderate category was limited to stenoses of 50% to 69%. The remaining series defined severe stenoses as more than 80% (four series), more than 75% (two series), or more than 60% (three series) constriction. The stated specificity of MR angiography ranged from 64% to 100%. Before revision, 15 of 17 articles had stated specificity values above 75%. Our recalculated values ranged from 18% to 100%. Only seven of 17 studies would have had MR angiographic specificity of greater than 75%. Nine of 17 articles would have had specificities of less than 60%. For all articles specifically identifying vessels with false-positive findings at sonography, the specificity of MR angiography was 16%. CONCLUSION: To base specificity values for MR angiography as a confirmatory test of carotid artery stenosis on studies that include nondiseased vessels incurs spectrum bias. The actual specificity for MR angiography as a confirmatory test remains unknown, but it is lower than that reported in the literature.

Index terms: Arteries, magnetic resonance; Efficacy studies; Magnetic resonance angiography

Magnetic resonance (MR) angiography has been proposed as an alternative to conventional catheter angiography to confirm the diagnosis of severe carotid artery stenoses as determined by means of duplex Doppler sonography and to guide decisions regarding the need for carotid endarterectomy (1–3). However, these studies included a high proportion of severely stenosed vessels; consequently, they did not convincingly address the ability of MR angiography to show vessels incorrectly identified as severely stenosed at sonography. This function is critical to the role of a confirmatory test. Thus, for a confirmatory test, the standard of measurement is specificity, or the true-negative rate.

Specificities cited for MR angiography approximate 90%, supporting a confirmatory role for MR angiography (1, 4). However, these reported specificity values are based on studies that included contralateral, nondiseased vessels. When MR angiography is used as a confirmatory test for vessels identified as positive for disease by sonography, at issue is the value of MR angiography in correctly showing vessels that were misdiagnosed at sonography. Thus, specificity calculations for MR angiography should be based only on vessels falsely identified as positive at sonography. Contralateral carotid arteries should not be included in specific-
sity calculations when assessing MR angiography as a confirmatory test unless the contralateral vessel also was diagnosed as severely stenosed at sonography. Inclusion of nondiseased, contralateral vessels, easily identified as normal on MR angiograms but not representative of vessels that will be addressed by MR angiography as a confirmatory test, leads to spectrum bias and inappropriately optimistic results (5–8).

In this study, we surveyed the available literature to estimate the specificity of MR angiography when used as a confirmatory test after sonographic examination, with particular attention to possible spectrum bias introduced by inclusion of contralateral, nondiseased vessels.

**Materials and Methods**

**Identification of MR Angiographic Literature.** We searched the Medline database for English-language articles published between 1990 and 1994 by using the index terms carotid artery; carotid artery, stenosis; carotid arteries, MR; and carotid arteries, sonography. Additional articles referenced in the articles identified in Medline were also included. Twenty-eight articles were identified (1–3, 9–28, 30–34), 20 via the Medline search and eight via references found in the other articles.

**Definition of Normal and Stenosed Vessels.** Calculations of specificity required that we define a discrete cutpoint between positive and negative sonographic results and MR angiographic results. We focused on a cutpoint between moderate and severe stenosis, because the North American Symptomatic Carotid Endarterectomy Trial (NASCET) showed a definite benefit of carotid endarterectomy for stenosis greater than 70% (40). Because of the diverse definitions of stenosis found among articles, four categories of stenosis were defined: normal vessels and vessels with mild, moderate, and severe stenoses. Seven of the articles (9, 10, 16, 19, 22, 26, 33) provided data that could be configured to match the categories used in NASCET. One article used more than 70% constriction as a definition of severe stenosis, but limited its moderate category to 50% to 69% stenoses (27). The remaining series defined severe stenoses as more than 80% (11, 15, 17, 18), more than 75% (2, 21), or more than 60% (12, 14, 37) constriction. We considered the term severe stenosis to represent a "positive" or diseased vessel; the terms normal vessel or mild or moderate stenosis were considered to represent a "negative" or nondiseased vessel, since such a vessel is not one for which a patient would undergo endarterectomy.

**Recalculation of Specificity Values.** Several authors have suggested the use of MR angiography in lieu of conventional angiography to confirm a positive sonographic result (1–3). Thus, the pertinent measurement is the true-negative rate of MR angiography, not for all vessels but for a population limited to vessels identified as positive for disease at sonography. Published reports of MR angiography include in their population of vessels not only sonographically positive arteries but also contralateral, sonographically negative arteries. Compared with sonographically positive vessels, these contralateral, sonographically negative vessels are identified relatively easily as negative at MR angiography, resulting in overestimation of the specificity of MR angiography.

Fortunately, even though most MR angiography series do not distinguish between ipsilateral, sonographically positive and contralateral, sonographically negative vessels, they do offer data for multiple categories of stenosis (ie, normal, mild, moderate, severe). Any group of vessels that would be highly unlikely to be erroneously identified as positive at sonography could be removed from the MR angiography database. This would allow the removal of some contralateral vessels with resultant partial correction of specificity.

In this regard, we removed vessels in the normal and mild stenosis category from the MR angiography database, since it is highly unlikely that these vessels would be erroneously referred to as positive at sonography performed to confirm the results of MR angiography. We substantiate this view by noting that in pooled data from nine sonography series (5, 10, 15, 16, 29, 35–39), only 18 (2%) of 772 normal vessels and mild stenoses were misclassified at sonography as severe stenoses. Furthermore, Dawson et al (36) noted that, sonographically, vessels were almost never miscategorized by more than a single severity category.

As a result, our revised specificity values are based entirely on the vessels in the moderate stenosis category. Note that even these revised specificity values represent overestimations of confirmatory MR angiographic specificity, because within the moderate stenosis category there are three types of vessel. The first group includes vessels that are overestimated as severe at sonography (false-positive sonographic findings), which are the precise vessels upon which confirmatory MR angiographic specificity values should be based. These would be skewed toward the upper end of the moderate category, since they have already been overestimated at sonography as severe. As such, they represent the most challenging vessels to identify as negative at confirmatory MR angiography (ie, low specificity). The second group includes contralateral moderate stenoses accurately identified as negative by sonography. The third group consists of unexamined moderate stenoses from series that do not state explicitly whether screening sonography was performed. Inadvertent inclusion of these latter two types of moderate stenoses cause overestimation of MR angiographic specificity, since, compared with false-positive sonographic findings, they are relatively easily identified as negative at MR angiography.

**Exclusionary Criteria for Articles.** Two reviewers independently analyzed the methods used in the MR angiographic series reported in the literature. Articles were excluded from further review if (a) the results of MR angiography were not compared with conventional film-
screen or selective digital subtraction angiography (the generally accepted standard) (1, 13); (b) the test results could not be entered into a contingency table, based on degree of stenosis, for determination of specificity (20, 30); (c) the method of measuring stenosis was not specified (13, 28); (d) fewer than 20 patients were included in the study (24, 25, 31); or (e) there was no distinction made between normal vessels and mild and moderate stenoses (making it impossible to apply our assumptions and calculate revised specificity) (3, 23, 32). Discrepancies between the two reviewers regarding inclusion of articles were arbitrated by a third reviewer. The concordance rate between the two primary reviewers for article inclusion was 86% (24 of 28 articles). Eleven of 28 articles were excluded.

Results

Of the articles reviewed, five series enrolled patients on the basis of a positive sonographic result (10, 14, 17, 22, 33); one series enrolled patients after screening with sonography or MR angiography (34); nine series enrolled patients on the basis of availability of both MR angiography and conventional angiography (9, 11, 12, 16, 18, 19, 21, 26, 27); one series enrolled patients prospectively on the basis of anticipated need for carotid endarterectomy (2); and one series enrolled patients who had undergone sonography, conventional angiography, and MR angiography (15). All series included both carotid arteries from each patient in their results.

A summary contingency table is presented in the Table, which details the performance of MR angiography, where the standard of reference is considered to be conventional (catheter) angiography. Figure 1 shows the relative specificities of the various studies, both before and after revision. The stated specificity of MR angiography ranged from 64% to 100%. Before revision, 15 of 17 articles had stated specificity values above 75%. After eliminating normal and mildly stenotic vessels to estimate the actual specificity of MR angiography as a confirmatory test, the specificity ranged from 18% to 100%. The value of 100% was derived from a study detailing eight moderate stenoses. Following revision, seven of 17 studies had MR angiographic specificities of greater than 75% when MR angiography was used as a confirmatory test, and only four of these studies had specificities greater than 80%. Nine of 17 articles had specificities of less than 60%.

The mean specificity for MR angiography including all negative vessels (86.9% ± 10.6%)
was significantly higher than the mean revised specificity (62.2% ± 24.5%) \( (P < .0001) \).

**Discussion**

This study addresses the expected specificity for MR angiography as a confirmatory test for a positive sonographic examination based on a review of available literature. Our results suggest that the specificity of MR angiography is relatively poor for a population of vessels screened as positive for disease by sonography, calling into question the practice of recommending carotid endarterectomy on the basis of concordant positive findings at sonography and MR angiography.

Other investigators have estimated the specificity of confirmatory MR angiography to be as high as 90% (1, 4). The studies reporting these specificities included both carotid arteries from each patient in their calculations, whether the vessels had been diagnosed as diseased or not. Contralateral vessels determined to be negative at sonography have a spectrum of findings that makes them easy to identify as negative by the confirmatory MR angiogram, thus falsely improving apparent specificity. Moreover, the confirmatory MR angiogram is obtained to assure that vessels diagnosed at sonography as positive are actually severely stenosed. An MR angiographic result for a contralateral vessel that had been diagnosed as normal by sonography has little clinical relevance.

Some of the studies included in our analysis, especially those that enrolled patients on the basis of availability of both MR angiography and conventional angiography, may not have intended to address the use of MR angiography as a confirmatory test. The goals of their research were different from ours. We do not imply that those authors erred when including both vessels in specificity calculations. However, these studies are being cited inappropriately as supportive of a confirmatory role for MR angiography.

The ideal method for calculating specificity of MR angiography as a secondary test would have been to focus on false-positive sonographic results. This computation was impossible for most of the articles we reviewed. Only three of the 17 articles offered data regarding MR angiographic findings specifically for false-positive sonographic results. Mittl et al (16) reported seven false-positive vessels by sonography, all of which were also overestimated at MR angiography. Riles et al (15) reported 11 false-positive vessels by sonography, all of which were also overestimated on MR angiography. Mattle et al (32) reported three false-positive vessels by sonography that were correctly identified as negative at MR angiography. Thus, in support of our analysis of the larger population of vessels we reviewed, of 21 definite false-positive sonographic cases reported in the literature, MR angiographic findings led to overestimation of 18 vessels as severely stenosed (specificity, 16%).

It might be argued that we inappropriately included some studies in our analysis, since studies enrolling patients on the basis of avail-
ability of MR angiography and conventional angio-
graphy did not necessarily include patients who had been examined with sonography. How-
ever, false-positive sonographic findings repre-
sent the most challenging vessels for investiga-
tors to identify as negative by MR angiography,
since these stenoses have already been overes-
timated at sonography. Unexamined moderate steno-
ses would be more likely than false-positive sonographic findings to be correctly diag-
nosed as negative at MR angiography. As such, inclusion of any unexamined moderate steno-
ses would have falsely elevated our revised specificity values.

Calculation of specificity required the definition of a discrete cutpoint, above which test results were considered positive and below which test results were considered negative. This practice is not easily applied to carotid atherosclerosis, since there is a continuum of possible stenoses. Our methods are based on NASCET results reported to date, which are limited to severe stenoses. Until NASCET data regarding moderate stenoses are available, the distinction between moderate and severe steno-
ses remains critical.

One of the basic assumptions in this analysis was that conventional angiography represents the standard of reference. This assumption is arguable, since there is significant interobserver variability in interpreting the findings of conventional angiography. Furthermore, a stenosis that was not round in the axial plane would tend to be underestimated by projection angiogra-
phy, unless the projections obtained were per-
tectly tangential to the narrowest span of the stenosis (41, 42). It is possible that in some vessels designated as false-positive for stenosis at MR angiography, there actually was a severe stenosis missed by conventional angiography. The impact of this limitation is difficult to define. The standard of evidence is a recurring problem in the assessment of diagnostic technologies for which there currently is not an acceptable solu-
tion. As noted above, the thrust of our analysis was not to determine the actual accuracy of MR angiography but to identify a source of bias that limits applicability of current MR angiographic research.

We did not aim to question the use of MR angiography in general for evaluating the carotid arteries. Our focus was narrow: to call into question the current practice of using MR an-
giography to confirm positive sonographic re-
sults. Carotid MR angiography has other poten-
tial value, including its use in determining the level of a carotid stenosis and, possibly, in un-
covering tandem lesions.

Research to date has not appropriately de-
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