angiographic no-reflow and infarct size. We have shown both in patients receiving thrombolytic therapy (2) and in patients undergoing primary percutaneous intervention (3) that grade 3 ischemia is the strongest independent predictor available on admission for the no-reflow phenomenon. Because electrocardiography is the most widely available and least expensive tool at our disposal, and because this simple parameter is a robust predictor of no-reflow, we believe that it should be widely used to predict the risk of no-reflow and possibly to select patients for protective therapies.
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We thank Drs. Zahger and Wolak for their interest in our paper (1) and for the observation about the role of grade of ischemia on surface electrocardiography (ECG) in the prediction of no-reflow. Many ECG-derived indexes including the QRS score (number of Q waves) (2) and the QRS duration (3) along with terminal distortion of the QRS, known as grade of ischemia (4), have been used in the assessment of no-reflow risk. In our review (1), we mentioned the QRS score because it is the most widely used ECG index in the triage of ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction patients. We acknowledge that other indexes including grade of ischemia may be useful in risk stratification before primary percutaneous coronary intervention. Interestingly, in a previous study performed by Wolak et al. (4), grade of ischemia was associated with infarct size, thrombus burden, and admission glycermia, which may all contribute to the multifactorial pathogenesis of no-reflow. We agree with Drs. Zahger and Wolak that, in an era of superspecialist and expensive tools that are not widely available, such as cardiac magnetic resonance imaging, inexpensive and readily available ECG still has a central role in the management of ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction patients with regard to microvascular obstruction after primary percutaneous coronary intervention. Indeed, ECG is useful for risk prediction and diagnosis of no-reflow, for monitoring the efficacy of mechanical or pharmacological therapies against no-reflow, and finally, for prognostic information.

Value of a High Exercise Workload to Rule Out Myocardial Ischemia

We read with great interest the paper by Bourque et al. (1) regarding the value of a high exercise workload to rule out significant myocardial ischemia. In that study, only 2 (0.4%) of 473 patients reaching ≥10 metabolic equivalents (METs) and ≥85% of maximum age-predicted heart rate (MAPHR) had ≥10% left ventricular ischemia on myocardial perfusion imaging. Furthermore, of the 430 patients reaching ≥10 METs and ≥85% MAPHR without exercise-induced ST-segment depression, none had significant myocardial ischemia. These results suggest that the information provided by cardiac imaging in these patients is questionable.

Our group previously assessed the prevalence and prognostic value of myocardial ischemia on exercise echocardiography in a population of 1,433 patients with known or suspected coronary artery disease achieving a high exercise workload (defined as ≥10 METs in men and ≥8 METs in women) (2). Of them, in 437 (30%) patients, new or worsening wall motion abnormalities developed during exercise. Over a follow-up of 2.3 ± 1.5 years, 201 (14%) patients underwent coronary revascularization and 57 (4%) patients had a hard cardiac event. Furthermore, exercise echocardiography was shown to provide incremental value for predicting hard cardiac events in these patients.

It might be argued that, in this study, 19% of the patients failed to achieve ≥85% of MAPHR, and ST-segment changes during the tests developed in 14% of the patients. Thus, we further explored whether the findings obtained by Bourque et al. (1) would