



Complete Summary

GUIDELINE TITLE

Exercise testing in asymptomatic adults: a statement for professionals From the American Heart Association Council on Clinical Cardiology, Subcommittee on Exercise, Cardiac Rehabilitation, and Prevention.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

Lauer M, Froelicher ES, Williams M, Kligfield P. Exercise testing in asymptomatic adults: a statement for professionals from the American Heart Association Council on Clinical Cardiology, Subcommittee on Exercise, Cardiac Rehabilitation, and Prevention. *Circulation* 2005 Aug 2;112(5):771-6. [51 references] [PubMed](#)

GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

COMPLETE SUMMARY CONTENT

SCOPE
METHODOLOGY - including Rating Scheme and Cost Analysis
RECOMMENDATIONS
EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS
BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE
INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT
CATEGORIES
IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY
DISCLAIMER

SCOPE

DISEASE/CONDITION(S)

Coronary artery disease (CAD)

GUIDELINE CATEGORY

Assessment of Therapeutic Effectiveness
Diagnosis
Risk Assessment
Screening

CLINICAL SPECIALTY

Cardiology
Family Practice
Internal Medicine

INTENDED USERS

Physicians

GUIDELINE OBJECTIVE(S)

To consider, on the basis of existing evidence, what role, if any, exercise testing plays in risk stratification in asymptomatic subjects

TARGET POPULATION

Asymptomatic adults at intermediate risk of developing coronary artery disease (CAD)

INTERVENTIONS AND PRACTICES CONSIDERED

1. Exercise electrocardiography (ECG) testing
2. Nonelectrocardiographic measures
 - Functional capacity
 - Chronotropic response
 - Heart rate (HR) recovery
 - Ventricular ectopy

Note: All of the above tests were considered, but not recommended as routine screening modalities in asymptomatic adults.

MAJOR OUTCOMES CONSIDERED

- Predictive value of diagnostic tests
- Sensitivity and specificity of diagnostic tests
- Mortality
- Cardiac morbidity

METHODOLOGY

METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT EVIDENCE

Searches of Electronic Databases

DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT THE EVIDENCE

Not stated

NUMBER OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS

Not stated

METHODS USED TO ASSESS THE QUALITY AND STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE

Expert Consensus

RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE

Not applicable

METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE

Review

DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE

Not stated

METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Expert Consensus

DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Not stated

RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Not applicable

COST ANALYSIS

A formal cost analysis was not performed and published cost analyses were not reviewed.

METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION

Peer Review

DESCRIPTION OF METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION

Expert peer review of American Heart Association (AHA) Scientific Statements is conducted at the AHA National Center. For more on AHA statements and guidelines development, visit <http://www.americanheart.org/presenter.jhtml?identifier=3023366>.

This statement was approved by the American Heart Association Science Advisory and Coordinating Committee on April 22, 2005.

RECOMMENDATIONS

MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Appropriateness of Exercise Testing in Asymptomatic Subjects

The exercise test historically has been considered a potential useful modality for coronary disease screening. It is simple to administer, inexpensive, and safe. Nonetheless, the relatively poor accuracy of exercise electrocardiography for diagnosing hemodynamically significant coronary disease, even in symptomatic subjects, has led to recommendations against the use of exercise testing as a screening tool, as is well documented by a recent report from the US Preventive Services Task Force. These recommendations have been largely based on an extensive body of literature documenting the limitations of the ST segment for diagnosing coronary disease in asymptomatic subjects. Indeed, when used as a purely diagnostic test, it must be realized that false-positive tests are common among asymptomatic adults, especially women, and may lead to unnecessary testing, over-treatment, and labeling. Still, reports on modifications to ST-segment interpretation, consideration of non-ST-segment measures, and evaluation of the exercise test as a prognostic rather than a diagnostic test suggest that the prognostic value of the screening exercise test may have been underestimated.

Because no large-scale randomized trials have been performed to demonstrate a clinical benefit, recent American Heart Association (AHA)/American College of Cardiology (ACC) and US Preventive Services Task Force guidelines have discouraged the use of exercise testing as a screening modality for routine use (Class III; according to ACC/AHA classifications, class III is defined as conditions for which evidence and/or general agreement that the procedure/treatment is not useful/effective and in some cases may be harmful). The guidelines acknowledge the possible value of exercise testing in people with diabetes who are contemplating an exercise program (Class IIa; according to ACC/AHA classifications, a class IIa rating means that the weight of evidence/opinion is in favor of usefulness/efficacy); in patients with multiple risk factors for whom risk-reduction therapy needs to be guided (Class IIb; according to ACC/AHA classifications, a class IIb rating indicates that usefulness/efficacy is less well established by evidence/opinion); and in men >45 years old and women >55 years old who plan to start vigorous exercise programs, are involved in high-risk occupations, and are at risk for coronary disease because of other diseases such as peripheral atherosclerosis and chronic renal failure (all Class IIb). The US Preventive Services Task Force found that screening exercise testing had no value in low-risk subjects and found insufficient evidence for or against testing in subjects at higher risk.

A recent article by Greenland et al in *Circulation* recommended that all subjects undergo global risk assessment based on office tools such as the Framingham Risk Score. Subjects who are deemed to be at low risk for a cardiac event (<0.6% per year) need not undergo any further evaluation, whereas those deemed to be at high risk for such events (>2% per year) deserve to undergo aggressive treatment. There may be a role for screening in patients who are at intermediate risk of events (0.6% to 2.0% per year). Greenland et al noted 4 tests that may be

of value: exercise electrocardiography, carotid ultrasound, coronary artery calcium scanning, and ankle-brachial indexes.

Relation of Predictive Value to Test Performance Characteristics

Recommendations against screening asymptomatic subjects by exercise testing are rooted in a well-established Bayesian argument. Given the limited sensitivity and imperfect specificity of standard ST-segment depression criteria for the identification of coronary artery disease, the positive predictive value of the exercise test in populations with a low prevalence of disease must be low. Even if positive predictive value is improved by altering test criteria to improve specificity, sensitivity must be reduced, meaning that a number of people with significant disease will be missed.

Limitations of ST-Segment Depression in Asymptomatic Subjects

The diagnostic value of ST-segment depression in asymptomatic subjects is difficult to assess because few asymptomatic patients undergo coronary angiography. There are conflicting data with regard to its value for prognosis. This may be due to the inability of standard ST-segment changes to reflect the workload and degree of myocardial ischemia present. Another important issue that affects the predictive value of the exercise test is verification bias. Nearly all of the studies in the literature have been based on cohorts of patients in whom the decision to perform the "gold standard" test of coronary angiography was at least in part related to the result of the exercise electrocardiogram (ECG). Because physicians believe that the exercise ECG may be of value in identifying patients with and without coronary disease, populations of patients undergoing coronary angiography are heavily influenced by a selection bias. This selection bias, or more correctly "verification bias," results in an inflated sensitivity and deflated specificity. One large recent study of a clinical population in which patients underwent coronary angiography largely independent of the exercise ECG result showed that a poor sensitivity of <50% was associated with a relatively high specificity of >80%. Because one can assume that asymptomatic patients are even less likely to be referred to coronary angiography than are symptomatic patients unless marked ST-segment depression is noted (e.g., at a very low workload in the absence of left ventricular hypertrophy), the problem with workup bias may be even worse.

Another problem with ST-segment interpretation is the use of coronary angiography as the gold standard. Coronary angiography represents an incomplete look at disease within the coronary vessel wall, which does not enable clinicians to determine the physiological response of a diseased endothelium under conditions of stress. Thus, a noninvasive test that demonstrates stress-induced ischemia may well be associated with a coronary angiogram showing only mild disease. If stress leads to a paradoxical vasoconstriction, then ischemia may be present, despite a benign-appearing resting coronary angiogram. Thus, the apparent lack of correlation between a noninvasive exercise test finding and coronary angiogram findings may be caused more by the inadequacy of the coronary angiogram to best describe severity of atherosclerosis than by an inherent problem in the exercise test itself.

Consideration of the Exercise Test as a Screening Tool

Consideration of the exercise test as a screening tool in asymptomatic patients involves several issues for investigation and development. First, improvement in the sensitivity and specificity of electrocardiographic criteria for the identification of ischemia may improve the positive and negative predictive values of the test in populations with any prevalence of disease. Second, recognition of the predictive value of nonelectrocardiographic exercise test findings for coronary and noncoronary events suggests that these may be incorporated productively into combined exercise test scores. Third, risk as a predictive end point of the exercise test requires distinguishing between the identification of any disease and the identification of prognostically important disease.

Nonelectrocardiographic Advances in Stress Testing Applied to Asymptomatic Subjects

During the past 10 to 15 years, a number of discoveries have extended our understanding of exercise testing as a prognostic tool. The assessment of prognosis was previously difficult because of the need for assembling and electronically characterizing large cohorts and the need for long periods of follow-up. Several groups have successfully overcome this hurdle and have shown that measures other than those directly related to myocardial ischemia are strong predictors of mortality in cardiovascular risk (see the table below for descriptions and abnormal values). Furthermore, although exercise testing is traditionally thought of as an appropriate modality for evaluating patients with symptoms suggestive of coronary disease, clinical and population-based analyses have suggested that once risk factors and exercise test findings are accounted for, the presence or absence of symptoms is a relatively weak predictor of risk.

Table: Nonelectrocardiographic Exercise Test Variables of Prognostic Value in Asymptomatic Subjects

Exercise Test Variable	Method of Measurement	High-Risk Value and Remarks
Exercise capacity	Estimated according to protocol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No widely accepted abnormal values for asymptomatic subjects Some derive abnormal values based on age and sex Some advocate cutoff values of <5 metabolic equivalents (METs), 5-8 METs, and >8 METs
Chronotropic response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peak HR Achievement of target HR based on age Proportion of HR reserve used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 85% of (220-age) (Peak HR-resting HR)/ (220-age-resting HR) Value of ≤ 0.80 higher risk
Heart rate (HR) recovery	Difference between HR at peak exercise and 1 or 2 min later	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peak HR-HR 1 or 2 min later Abnormal value of ≤ 12 beats per minute (bpm) after 1-min

Exercise Test Variable	Method of Measurement	High-Risk Value and Remarks
		recovery based on use of a cool-down period

Functional Capacity

Perhaps the most important marker of risk yielded by the exercise test is the measure of functional capacity. Ideally, functional capacity would be measured via either direct measurement of oxygen consumption or work production as a function of oxygen consumption. In routine exercise testing, however, this is simply not practical. Despite the discrepancies between estimated exercise capacity and directly measured exercise capacity, estimations of exercise capacity have been shown to be reasonably accurate and predictive of risk.

Several population-based studies have looked at the ability of functional capacity to predict mortality and cardiovascular risk in asymptomatic subjects. Essentially without exception, all have shown that impaired functional capacity predicts increased risk over and above demographics and standard risk factors. In fact, in a large Cooper Institute study involving >20,000 men, it was noted that the apparent association between obesity and increased risk could be explained almost entirely by the association of obesity with impaired functional capacity. Recently, 2 large population-based studies (St James Heart Study and Lipid Research Clinics Prevalence Study) found that exercise capacity is a strong predictor of risk in women. Both population-based (Framingham Heart Study) and clinically based (Cleveland Clinic Preventive Medicine Program) studies of asymptomatic subjects have shown that exercise capacity predicts risk over and above the Framingham and European Risk Scores.

HR and Rhythm

Chronotropic Incompetence

Chronotropic incompetence refers to the inability of HR to increase appropriately during exercise. There are a number of ways of assessing chronotropic incompetence, including simply noting the peak HR, noting what proportion of age-predicted maximal HR is achieved, and noting what proportion of HR reserve is used at peak exercise (see table above for details). All 3 of these measures have been shown to be of prognostic value, although a large recent report in a clinical population suggests that the proportion of HR reserve used at peak exercise is most strongly correlated with risk.

The increase in HR during exercise is a reflection of decreased parasympathetic tone and increased sympathetic tone. An important study of normal subjects and subjects with varying degrees of heart failure demonstrated that chronotropic incompetence in cardiac disease may be caused by decreased sympathetic sensitivity of the sinus node. As with functional capacity, population-based studies of asymptomatic subjects have demonstrated that people with an impaired chronotropic response have higher rates of death and higher rates of major cardiac events, even after accounting for the Framingham Risk Score.

HR Recovery

HR recovery refers to the decline of HR after exercise. In normal asymptomatic subjects and in athletes, there is a rapid fall in HR during the first 30 seconds after exercise, followed by a shallower fall. This rapid decline in HR can be prevented by administration of atropine, which suggests that the decrease in HR early after exercise is a manifestation of vagal reactivation.

Because of the strong relationship between vagal tone and cardiac risk, investigators studying clinical populations suspected and confirmed that attenuated HR recovery, as a reflection of impaired vagal tone, would be predictive of an increased risk of death. Recently, HR recovery has been evaluated in several cohorts of asymptomatic subjects or subjects undergoing stress testing as part of a population-based epidemiological study; HR recovery was found to have prognostic value in these subjects as well, and this association persisted even after accounting for the Framingham and European Risk Scores. An important uncertainty, however, is whether beta-blockers affect the ability of HR recovery to predict risk. Studies that focused solely on asymptomatic subjects had few patients taking beta-blockers.

Ventricular Ectopy

The occurrence of ventricular ectopy during and after exercise may also be a reflection of electrical instability and altered autonomic tone. A recent report on a population-based study of asymptomatic French civil servants has demonstrated that frequent ventricular ectopy during and after exercise was associated with an increased risk of death; however, the prevalence of frequent ventricular ectopy was very low. In a study of a primarily clinical population, ventricular ectopy during recovery after exercise was a stronger predictor of risk than was ventricular ectopy during exercise; whether this also applies to asymptomatic subjects is unclear. A major problem with the literature on ventricular ectopy during exercise testing is the failure to record the entire exercise test, as recording the entire test would allow for a fully objective count and description of ectopic beats.

Conclusions

Although current data suggest that in patients who have an estimated intermediate risk of developing disease there may be value in additional noninvasive screening tests, including exercise testing, the writing group agrees with the recent recommendations of the US Preventive Services Task Force that there is insufficient evidence at this time to recommend exercise testing as a routine screening modality in asymptomatic adults. Although nonelectrocardiographic measures, including functional capacity, chronotropic response, HR recovery, and ventricular ectopy, have been shown to predict adverse events in asymptomatic subjects, and although exercise testing measures have been shown to improve the prediction of coronary heart disease events over and above the Framingham Risk Score, there is no evidence that gaining this knowledge improves outcomes. It is not known whether some of the nonischemic measures, such as HR recovery and ventricular ectopy, are modifiable in a clinically meaningful way. It is not even known whether pursuing more intensive

risk factor modification or obtaining imaging data in this clinical setting produces real clinical benefits for individual patients.

CLINICAL ALGORITHM(S)

None provided

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

TYPE OF EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The type of evidence supporting the recommendations is not specifically stated.

BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS

POTENTIAL BENEFITS

The exercise test historically has been considered a potential useful modality for coronary disease screening. It is simple to administer, inexpensive, and safe.

POTENTIAL HARMS

Although it makes intuitive sense to diagnose disease at a stage before it causes major clinical events, screening may actually be harmful.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE

DESCRIPTION OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

An implementation strategy was not provided.

INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT CATEGORIES

IOM CARE NEED

Staying Healthy

IOM DOMAIN

Effectiveness

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

Lauer M, Froelicher ES, Williams M, Kligfield P. Exercise testing in asymptomatic adults: a statement for professionals from the American Heart Association Council

on Clinical Cardiology, Subcommittee on Exercise, Cardiac Rehabilitation, and Prevention. *Circulation* 2005 Aug 2;112(5):771-6. [51 references] [PubMed](#)

ADAPTATION

Not applicable: The guideline was not adapted from another source.

DATE RELEASED

2005 Aug 2

GUIDELINE DEVELOPER(S)

American Heart Association - Professional Association

SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING

American Heart Association

GUIDELINE COMMITTEE

Not stated

COMPOSITION OF GROUP THAT AUTHORED THE GUIDELINE

Authors: Michael Lauer, MD (*Chair*); Erika Sivarajan Froelicher, RN, PhD; Mark Williams, PhD; Paul Kligfield, MD

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES/CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The American Heart Association (AHA) makes every effort to avoid any actual or potential conflicts of interest that may arise as a result of an outside relationship or a personal, professional, or business interest of a member of the writing panel. Specifically, all members of the writing group are required to complete and submit a Disclosure Questionnaire showing all such relationships that might be perceived as real or potential conflicts of interest.

Writing Group Disclosures

Writing Group Member	Employment	Research Grant	Other Research Support	Speakers Bureau/Honoraria	Ownership Interest	Consultant/Advisory Board	
Michael Lauer	The Cleveland Clinic Foundation	None	None	None	None	None	N
Erika Sivarajan Froelicher	University of California, San Francisco	None	None	None	None	None	N
Mark	Creighton	None	None	None	None	None	N

Writing Group Member	Employment	Research Grant	Other Research Support	Speakers Bureau/Honoraria	Ownership Interest	Consultant/Advisory Board	
Williams	University School of Medicine						
Paul Kligfield	Weill Medical College of Cornell University	None	Equipment donations from Quinton, GE, Mortara, Philips	None	GE	Philips Medical; GE; Mortara	N

This table represents the relationships of writing group members that may be perceived as actual or reasonably perceived conflicts of interest as reported on the Disclosure Questionnaire, which all members of the writing group are required to complete and submit.

Reviewer Disclosures

Writing Group Member	Employment	Research Grant	Other Research Support	Speakers Bureau/Honoraria	Ownership Interest	Consultant/Advisory Board	
Dr. Gary Balady	Boston University Medical Center	None	None	None	None	None	N
Dr. Bernard R. Chaitman	Saint Louis University	None	None	None	None	None	N
Dr. Raymond J. Gibbons	Mayo Clinic	None	None	None	None	CV Therapeutics; Molecular Insight Pharm; Cardiovascular Clinical Studies; Consumers Union	N
Dr. Victor Froelicher	Stanford University	None	None	None	None	None	N

This table represents the relationships of reviewers that may be perceived as actual or reasonably perceived conflicts of interest as reported on the Reviewer Disclosure Questionnaire, which all reviewers are required to complete and submit.

GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

GUIDELINE AVAILABILITY

Electronic copies: Available from the American Heart Association Web site:

- [HTML Format](#)
- [Portable Document Format \(PDF\)](#)

Print copies: Available from the American Heart Association, Public Information, 7272 Greenville Ave, Dallas, TX 75231-4596; Phone: 800-242-8721

AVAILABILITY OF COMPANION DOCUMENTS

None available

PATIENT RESOURCES

None available

NGC STATUS

This NGC summary was completed by ECRI on November 18, 2005. The information was verified by the guideline developer on November 28, 2005.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

Copyright to the original guideline is owned by the American Heart Association, Inc. (AHA). Reproduction of the AHA Guideline without permission is prohibited. Single reprint is available by calling 800-242-8721 (US only) or writing the American Heart Association, Public Information, 7272 Greenville Ave., Dallas, TX 75231-4596. Ask for reprint No. 71-0326. To purchase additional reprints: up to 999 copies, call 800-611-6083 (US only) or fax 413-665-2671; 1000 or more copies, call 410-528-4121, fax 410-528-4264, or email kgray@lww.com. To make photocopies for personal or educational use, call the Copyright Clearance Center, 978-750-8400.

DISCLAIMER

NGC DISCLAIMER

The National Guideline Clearinghouse™ (NGC) does not develop, produce, approve, or endorse the guidelines represented on this site.

All guidelines summarized by NGC and hosted on our site are produced under the auspices of medical specialty societies, relevant professional associations, public or private organizations, other government agencies, health care organizations or plans, and similar entities.

Guidelines represented on the NGC Web site are submitted by guideline developers, and are screened solely to determine that they meet the NGC Inclusion Criteria which may be found at <http://www.guideline.gov/about/inclusion.aspx>.

NGC, AHRQ, and its contractor ECRI Institute make no warranties concerning the content or clinical efficacy or effectiveness of the clinical practice guidelines and related materials represented on this site. Moreover, the views and opinions of developers or authors of guidelines represented on this site do not necessarily state or reflect those of NGC, AHRQ, or its contractor ECRI Institute, and inclusion or hosting of guidelines in NGC may not be used for advertising or commercial endorsement purposes.

Readers with questions regarding guideline content are directed to contact the guideline developer.

© 1998-2008 National Guideline Clearinghouse

Date Modified: 11/3/2008

