International Journal of Healthcare Sciences ISSN 2348-5728 (Online)
Vol. 4, Issue 2, pp: (1700-1706), Month: October 2016 - March 2017, Available at: www.researchpublish.com

Coronary Heart Disease, Diagnostic Methods and Reducing Risk Factors, In Primary Care

[1]Hassan saleh felemban, [2]Mohammed Khalid Naif AlHarbi,
[3]Muath Abdulmohsen Alahmadi, [4]Saad dakerl allah althubaiti,
[5]Mutaz Mohammad Alandonisi, [6]Arej A. Fadel, [7]Adelah H. alturaifi,
[8]Ismail A. Alzahrani, [9]Noha jameel alhamawi, [10]Meshari Saleem M Alwagdani

Abstract: **Our main goal of this study was to examine the effective screening methods used in primary care for diagnosis of Coronary artery disease (CAD) (coronary heart disease (CHD)), and demonstrating also the prevention methods as well. We carried out a computerized searched via Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL); MEDLINE (PubMed); and EMBASE, databases for studies reporting coronary heart disease screening and prevention in primary care any studies match these criteria and published up to December 2016 were included. Coronary artery disease (CAD) is the single most common cause of death in the developed world. Although private requirements for evaluating for CHD in medical care just reasonably efficient, in mix they can assist to decide about further management of patients with CHD in primary care.**

Keywords: **coronary heart disease (CHD), EMBASE, (CENTRAL), patients.**

1. INTRODUCTION

Coronary artery disease (CAD) or coronary heart disease (CHD) is the most typical reason for mortality in the developed world. In 2007, coronary heart problem (CHD) death rates per 100,000 people were about 165.6 for white guys, 191.6 for black guys, 94.2 for white females, and 121.5 for black women [(1,2)]. Numerous research studies have actually shown useful results of way of life modification, such as diet plan and exercise, on the prevention of CHD [(3,4)]. The high material of polyphenols present in grains, fruits, vegetables, nuts, tea, and cocoa has been reported to play an essential function in reducing the risk of CHD [(4)]. Chest pain raises issues about the event of a severe condition such as CHD [(5,6)], which is present in about 12% of primary care patients with chest pain [(5,7)]. Family practitioners need to be geared up to rule out an acute CHD related event quickly. They are utilized to estimating the likelihood of CHD in a patient with chest pain on the basis of pain attributes, patient's age, gender, history and cardiovascular risk factors [(8)]. Cardiovascular risk factors and chest pain history are related to CHD, and have actually been extensively studied [(9)]. Nevertheless, chest pain qualities alone are not enough to reliably rule out ischemic heart disease [(10)]. Predictive ratings for CHD in emergency situation settings have been established [(11)], and are now executed [(12,13)]. These ratings are not necessarily helpful in the primary care setting [(14)]. In primary care, 0.7- 2.7% of patient encounters are due to chest pain [(15,16,17)]. While the underlying aetiology in the majority of patients is non-cardiac, coronary heart problem (CHD) accounts for 12.8 - 14.6 % of cases of chest pain in this setting [(17)]. family physicians need to dependably identify major cardiac disease, while likewise safeguarding patients from unnecessary examinations and hospital admissions. Based upon medical history taking and physical exam, they decide whether further diagnostic procedures are suggested. Bösner and his colleagues at the University of Marburg, Germany, established an easy clinical forecast rule (CPR) proposed to help general practitioners (GPs) in eliminating CHD in patients presenting with chest pain [(18,19)]. The Marburg Heart-Score (MHS) is based upon 5 findings of the medical history and health examination (**Table 1**) [(19)].

Table 1: Components of the Marburg Heart Score [19]

Score component	Assigned points
Age/sex (female ≥65 years, male ≥55 years)	1
Known clinical vascular disease	1
Patient assumes cardiac origin of pain	1
Pain worse with exercise	1
Pain not reproducible by palpation	1

Our main goal of this study was to examine the effective screening methods used in primary care for diagnosis of Coronary artery disease (CAD) (coronary heart disease (CHD)), and demonstrating also the prevention methods as well.

2. METHODOLOGY

We carried out a computerized searched via Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL); MEDLINE (PubMed); and EMBASE, databases for studies reporting coronary heart disease screening and prevention in primary care any studies match these criteria and published up to December 2016 were included. Bibliographies of identified articles were searched for more eligible studies to be included in the present review.

3. RESULTS

- **Risk factors and prediction values:**

A person's risk for CHD occasions (or often CVD occasions) guides the intensity of LDL-C lowering and other interventions. For this reason, assessing a person's risk plays an important function in starting measures to customize risk. A number of risk stratification systems are readily available for this function. The Adult Treatment Panel III (ATP III) of the National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) algorithm, which is the most widely used system, classifies people into 3 risk categories (**Table 1**) [20,21]. This system utilizes the Framingham risk scoring system to stratify people who do not have developed CHD, diabetes, or noncardiac vascular disease. The sex-specific Framingham risk functions anticipate a person's 10-year risk of risk of developing "difficult CHD occasions," that is, the combined risk of myocardial infarction (MI) or death from coronary disease [22]. The functions were derived from 2439 white guys and 2812 white females, 30 to 74 years of age, in either the initial Framingham mate or the Framingham Offspring Study. When utilized with the ATP III algorithm, the sex-specific Framingham risk works considers age, high blood pressure, the serum amount to cholesterol level, the high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C) level, and cigarette smoking. Otherwise, the Framingham risk score consists of these factors plus diabetes. The Framingham score does not take into account family history, weight problems, triglycerides, little LDL particles, lipoprotein(a) (Lp [a], coagulation factors, homocysteine, or the metabolic syndrome. Of these omitted factors, the best-established is a family history of coronary disease in first-degree loved ones, which was a reasonably strong, independent predictor of CHD events in the Framingham Offspring Study [23]. The metabolic syndrome is a common constellation of findings connected with a higher risk of establishing diabetes. It may likewise be an independent predictor of stroke [24]. The Framingham risk functions likewise do not take race or ethnic background into account, however have been confirmed in numerous populations. The risk functions carry out well in black men and women, [25] however overestimate the risk of CHD occasions in Japanese-American and Hispanic males, Native American women, and in Chinese males and females [26]. Framingham risk factors represent most of the excess risk for CHD morbidity and death among individuals who have not had a previous cardiovascular event or diagnosis [22,27]. Nevertheless, 10-- 20% of people with CHD have actually no recognized risk factors and miss the chance for primary prevention [28].

Table 1: ATP-III Risk Categories

1	**Established CHD and CHD equivalents.** ***Any of the following:***
	- established CHD
	- diabetes
	- established noncardiac vascular disease, peripheral arterial disease, abdominal aortic aneurysm, carotid artery disease (symptomatic, e.g., transient ischemic attack or stroke of carotid origin, or >50 percent stenosis on angiography or ultrasound)
	- a 10-year risk of CHD events ≥20% using Framingham scoring
2	**Multiple (2+) risk factors that modify LDL goals (cigarette smoking, hypertension, HDL <40 mg/dL, family history of premature CHD, age ≥45 in men, ≥55 in women)**
0–1 Risk Factors	

- **Screening methods for Coronary artery disease (CAD):**

Chronic stable angina, the preliminary symptom of CAD in around 50% of all patients,6 is generally caused by the blockage of a minimum of 1 big epicardial coronary artery by atheromatous plaque. Angina is because of the inequality in between myocardial oxygen need and supply, resulting in myocardial ischemia. Angina pectoris is defined by substernal discomfort, heaviness, or a pressure-like sensation, which may radiate to the jaw, shoulder, back, or arm and which typically lasts a number of minutes. These signs are generally caused by effort, emotional stress, cold, or a heavy meal and are eliminated by rest or nitroglycerin within minutes. Signs can be classified as particular of common angina, atypical angina, or noncardiac chest pain, depending on whether the chest pain qualities meet all 3, 2, or less than 2 of the aforementioned requirements, respectively (Diamond classification) [(29)]. The Canadian Cardiovascular Society (CCS)'s grading for angina severity has actually gotten widespread popularity (**Table 1**) [(30)].

Table 2: Modified Canadian Cardiovascular Society Grading for Angina Severity [(30)]

Class I	Angina occurs with strenuous or rapid or prolonged exertion
Class II	Angina occurs with moderate exertion (eg, walking >2 blocks on level ground and climbing >1 flight of ordinary stairs at a normal pace and in normal conditions; walking uphill; or walking or climbing stairs rapidly, in the cold, in wind, under emotional stress, or during the first few hours after awakening)
Class III	Angina occurs with mild exertion (walking 1 or 2 blocks on level ground and climbing 1 flight of stairs in normal conditions and at a normal pace)
Class IV	Angina occurs with any level of exertion and may be present at rest

Anginal "equivalents," such as epigastric discomfort, fatigue, faintness, or dyspnea, might be the dominant sign in some patients, particularly elderly ones. Coronary artery disease may be asymptomatic or present with such complications as an acute coronary syndrome (unsteady angina or MI), heart disease, cardiac arrhythmias, or sudden death. Health examination is typically unrevealing in patients with stable angina. Nonetheless, assessment to check for the presence of such comorbid conditions as hypertension, tobacco stains, chronic lung disease (cigarette smoking), xanthelasma (hyperlipidemia), and evidence of noncoronary atherosclerotic disease (decreased peripheral pulses, carotid or kidney artery bruits, abdominal aortic aneurysm) is essential because these findings may be necessary in identifying the threats and advantages of an extensive treatment strategy and the need for additional investigations. Cardiac auscultation, particularly during an episode of chest pain, can expose a third or fourth heart noise due to short-term left ventricular (LV) dysfunction or a mitral regurgitation murmur due to papillary muscle dysfunction during myocardial ischemia. Bibasilar rales may be indicative of heart disease [(31,32)].

The importance of estimating the likelihood of significant CAD by acquiring a detailed history and performing a risk factor evaluation and focused physical exam cannot be overemphasized. Knowing the frequency of CAD in the population assists the physician estimate pretest possibility [31,32]. Risk factors, such as cigarette smoking, hypertension, diabetes, hyperlipidemia, and a family history of MI before age 60 years, increase the possibility of CAD [33,34]. Resting electrocardiography ought to be carried out in all patients with suspected angina, although findings might be typical in roughly half of patients with steady angina, consisting of those with severe CAD [35], particularly in the setting of preserved LV function [36]. Electrocardiographic evidence of ST-T wave changes or LV hypertrophy (even though nonspecific) favor the medical diagnosis of angina, and prior Q wave MI on electrocardiography is highly suggestive of underlying CAD [37]. Different conduction disturbances, the majority of often left bundle branch block (LBBB) and left anterior fascicular block, might take place in patients with steady angina and are often associated with impairment of LV function and show multivessel disease or previous myocardial damage. During an episode of angina pectoris, 50% of patients with typical findings on resting electrocardiography develop electrocardiographic problems, with the most typical finding being ST-segment depression. ST-segment elevation and normalization of previous resting ST-T wave depression or inversion (pseudonormalization) might likewise establish.

Noninvasive stress tests, although incredibly useful tools, are frequently underused in the United States and the United Kingdom in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) (38,39); however, they might maybe be excessive used in other scenarios. These tests are most helpful in patients with an intermediate pretest probability of CAD since in such patients the results of the tension test, whether favorable or negative, will have the greatest impact on the posttest possibility (inning accordance with Bayesian principles) and subsequently on medical management. This information has actually been acquired from little research studies with catheterization lab recommendation biases with a high pretest likelihood of CAD. Workout electrocardiography is a good initial choice in patients who can work out and who have typical electrocardiographic findings at rest [33]; nevertheless, in many other circumstances an imaging method is chosen. Imaging research studies are suggested for patients whose findings on resting electrocardiography make the importance of changes with tension (LBBB, ST-segment depression ≥ 1 mm, ventricular paced rhythm, or Wolff-Parkinson-White syndrome) tough to evaluate, for patients who have had previous coronary revascularization, and for patients in whom scientific evaluation and workout electrocardiography have actually supplied insufficient information to direct management. The choice between tension nuclear imaging vs stress echocardiography in many cases need to depend on the regional knowledge of the lab. Due to the fact that of increased false-positive findings with workout or dobutamine echocardiography, adenosine or dipyridamole nuclear perfusion imaging is the preferred test for patients with LBBB or ventricular paced rhythm. In obese patients or women with large breasts, positron emission tomography tension might be superior to standard myocardial perfusion imaging since of its capability to carry out attenuation correction. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is an amazing new stress imaging strategy that may be utilized for both adenosine perfusion and dobutamine wall motion imaging; nevertheless, it is not extensively readily available [33].

The American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association guidelines [33] discourage usage of noninvasive screening for CAD in asymptomatic patients, except in those with evidence of possible myocardial ischemia on ambulatory electrocardiography or with extreme coronary calcification on electron-beam computed tomography (CT). Screening of asymptomatic patients with type 2 diabetes does not lower MI or death and is not suggested [40].

Invasive coronary angiography might be suggested for diagnostic purposes in all patients who have actually survived abrupt cardiac death, in patients with a high pretest probability of having left 3-vessel or primary disease, and in patients who cannot go through noninvasive screening. Other signs include patients with unsure diagnosis on noninvasive screening, high-risk occupational requirements (eg, pilots), scientifically believed nonatherosclerotic reasons for ischemia or possible vasospasm with requirement for intriguing screening, numerous hospital admissions, or an overriding patient desire for definitive medical diagnosis of the presence or lack of obstructive disease [33].

4. CONCLUSION

Coronary artery disease (CAD) is the single most common cause of death in the developed world. Although private requirements for evaluating for CHD in medical care just reasonably efficient, in mix they can assist to decide about further management of patients with CHD in primary care.

REFERENCES

[1] Lloyd-Jones D, Adams R, Carnethon M, et al. American Heart Association Statistics Committee and Stroke Statistics Subcommittee Heart disease and stroke statistics--2009 update: a report from the American Heart Association Statistics Committee and Stroke Statistics Subcommittee [published correction appears in *Circulation.* 2009;119(3):e182] *Circulation* 2009;119(3):480-486

[2] Xu J, Kochanek KD, Murphy S, Tejada-Vera B. Deaths: final data for 2007. Hyattsville, Md: National Center for Health Statistics; 2010. National Vital Statistics Reports, Vol 58, No. 19.

[3] Hu FB, Willett WC. Optimal diets for prevention of coronary heart disease. JAMA. 2002;288:2569–78.

[4] Tanasescu M, Leitzmann MF, Rimm EB, et al. Exercise type and intensity in relation to coronary heart disease in men. JAMA. 2002;288:1994–2000.

[5] Ruigomez A, Rodriguez LA, Wallander MA, Johansson S, Jones R. Chest pain in general practice: incidence, comorbidity and mortality. Fam Pract. 2006;23:167–174. doi: 10.1093/fampra/cmi124.

[6] Luepker RV, Apple FS, Christenson RH, Crow RS, Fortmann SP, Goff D, Goldberg RJ, Hand MM, Jaffe AS, Julian DG, Levy D, Manolio T, Mendis S, Mensah G, Pajak A, Prineas RJ, Reddy KS, Roger VL, Rosamond WD, Shahar E, Sharrett AR, Sorlie P, Tunstall-Pedoe H. AHA Council on Epidemiology and Prevention; AHA Statistics Committee; World Heart Federation Council on Epidemiology and Prevention; European Society of Cardiology Working Group on Epidemiology and Prevention; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. Case definitions for acute coronary heart disease in epidemiology and clinical research studies: a statement from the AHA Council on Epidemiology and Prevention; AHA Statistics Committee; World Heart Federation Council on Epidemiology and Prevention; the European Society of Cardiology Working Group on Epidemiology and Prevention; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. Circulation. 2003;108:2543–2549.

[7] Verdon F, Herzig L, Burnand B, Bischoff T, Pecoud A, Junod M, Muhlemann N, Favrat B. Chest pain in daily practice: occurrence, causes and management. Swiss Med Wkly. 2008;138:340–347.

[8] Snow V, Barry P, Fihn SD, Gibbons RJ, Owens DK, Williams SV, Weiss KB, Mottur-Pilson C. Evaluation of primary care patients with chronic stable angina: guidelines from the American College of Physicians. Ann Intern Med. 2004;141:57–64.

[9] Eichler K, Puhan MA, Steurer J, Bachmann LM. Prediction of first coronary events with the Framingham score: a systematic review. Am Heart J. 2007;153:722–731.

[10] Swap CJ, Nagurney JT. Value and limitations of chest pain history in the evaluation of patients with suspected acute coronary syndromes. JAMA. 2005;294:2623–2629.

[11] Christenson J, Innes G, McKnight D, Thompson CR, Wong H, Yu E, Boychuk B, Grafstein E, Rosenberg F, Gin K, Anis A, Singer J. A clinical prediction rule for early discharge of patients with chest pain. Ann Emerg Med. 2006;47:1–10. doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2005.08.007.

[12] MacGougan CK, Christenson JM, Innes GD, Raboud J. Emergency physicians' attitudes toward a clinical prediction rule for the identification and early discharge of low risk patients with chest discomfort. CJEM. 2001;3:89–94.

[13] Pearson SD, Goldman L, Garcia TB, Cook EF, Lee TH. Physician response to a prediction rule for the triage of emergency department patients with chest pain. J Gen Intern Med. 1994;9:241–247.

[14] Buntinx F, Knockaert D, Bruyninckx R, de Blaey N, Aerts M, Knottnerus JA, Delooz H. Chest pain in general practice or in the hospital emergency department: is it the same? Fam Pract. 2001;18:586–589.

[15] Svavarsdottir AE, Jonasson MR, Gudmundsson GH, Fjeldsted K. Chest pain in family practice. Diagnosis and long-term outcome in a community setting. Can Fam Physician. 1996;42:1122–1128.

[16] Verdon F, Herzig L, Burnand B, et al. Chest pain in daily practice: occurrence, causes and management. Swiss Med Wkly. 2008;138(23–24):340–347.

[17] Bösner S, Becker A, Haasenritter J, et al. Chest pain in primary care: epidemiology and pre-work-up probabilities. Eur J Gen Pract. 2009;15(3):141–146.

[18] Bösner S, Becker A, Abu Hani M, et al. Accuracy of symptoms and signs for coronary heart disease assessed in primary care. Br J Gen Pract. 2010;60(575):246–257.

[19] Bösner S, Haasenritter J, Becker A, et al. Ruling out coronary artery disease in primary care: development and validation of a simple prediction rule. CMAJ. 2010;182(12):1295–1300.

[20] Executive summary of the third report of the national cholesterol education program (NCEP) expert panel on detection, evaluation, and treatment of the high blood cholesterol in adults (Adult panel III) JAMA. 2001;285:2486–2497.

[21] Grundy SM, Cleeman JI, Bairey Merz CN, et al. Implications of Recent Clinical Trials for the National Cholesterol Education Program Adult Treatment Panel III Guidelines. Circulation. 2004;110:227–239.

[22] Wilson PW, D'Agostino RB, Levy D, et al. Prediction of coronary heart disease using risk factor categories. Circulation. 1998;97(18):1837–1847.

[23] LLoyd-Jones DM, Nam B-H, D'Agostino S, et al. Parental Cardiovascular Disease as a Risk Factor for Cardiovascular Disease in Middle-aged Adults. A Prospective Study of Parents and Offspring. JAMA. 2004;291:2204–2211.

[24] Najarian RM, Sullivan LM, Kannel LM, et al. Metabolic Syndrome Compared With Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus as a Risk Factor for Stroke: The Framingham Offspring Study. Arch Intern Med. 2006;166:106 – 111.

[25] D'Agostino S, R B, Grundy SM, Sullivan LM, et al. Validation of the Framingham Coronary Heart Disease Prediction Scores. Results of a Multiple Ethnic Groups Investigation. JAMA. 2001;286:180–187.

[26] Liu J, Hong Y, D'Agostino Sr RB, et al. Predictive Value for the Chinese Population of the Framingham CHD Risk Assessment Tool Compared With the Chinese Multi-provincial Cohort Study. JAMA. 2004;291:2591–2599.

[27] McGill HC Jr, McMahan CA, Malcom GT, et al. Effects of serum lipoproteins and smoking on atherosclerosis in young men and women. The PDAY Research Group. Pathobiological Determinants of Atherosclerosis in Youth. Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol. 1997;17(1):95–106.

[28] Smith SC Jr. Current and future directions of cardiovascular risk prediction. Am J Cardiol. 2006 Jan 16;97(2A):28A–32A.

[29] Diamond GA. A clinically relevant classification of chest discomfort [letter]. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 1983;1(2, pt 1):574-575

[30] Campeau L. Grading of angina pectoris [letter]. *Circulation* 1976;54(3):522-523

[31] Diamond GA, Forrester JS. Analysis of probability as an aid in the clinical diagnosis of coronary-artery disease. *N Engl J Med.* 1979;300(24):1350-1358

[32] Chaitman BR, Bourassa MG, Davis K, et al. Angiographic prevalence of high-risk coronary artery disease in patient subsets (CASS). *Circulation* 1981;64(2):360-367

[33] Gibbons RJ, Abrams J, Chatterjee K, et al. ACC/AHA 2002 Guideline update for the management of patients with chronic stable angina: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Committee to Update the 1999 Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Chronic Stable Angina)http://www.acc.org/qualityandscience/clinical/guidelines/stable/stable_clean.pdf. http://www.acc.org/qualityandscience/clinical/guidelines/stable/stable_clean.pdf Accessed September 17,2009.

[34] Pryor DB, Shaw L, Harrell FE, Jr, et al. Estimating the likelihood of severe coronary artery disease. *Am J Med.* 1991;90(5):553-562

[35] Ridker PM, Buring JE, Rifai N, Cook NR. Development and validation of improved algorithms for the assessment of global cardiovascular risk in women: the Reynolds Risk Score [published correction appears in *JAMA.* 2007;297(13):1433] *JAMA* 2007;297(6):611-619.

[36] Connolly DC, Elveback LR, Oxman HA. Coronary heart disease in residents of Rochester, Minnesota: IV, Prognostic value of the resting electrocardiogram at the time of initial diagnosis of angina pectoris. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 1984;59(4):247-250.

[37] Rihal CS, Davis KB, Kennedy JW, Gersh BJ. The utility of clinical, electrocardiographic, and roentgenographic variables in the prediction of left ventricular function. *Am J Cardiol.* 1995;75(4):220-223.

[38] Levy D, Salomon M, D'Agostino RB, Belanger AJ, Kannel WB. Prognostic implications of baseline electrocardiographic features and their serial changes in subjects with left ventricular hypertrophy. *Circulation* 1994;90(4):1786-1793

[39] Lin GA, Dudley RA, Lucas FL, Malenka DJ, Vittinghoff E, Redberg RF. Frequency of stress testing to document ischemia prior to elective percutaneous coronary intervention. *JAMA* 2008;300(15):1765-1773.

[40] Young LH, Wackers FJ, Chyun DA, et al. Cardiac outcomes after screening for asymptomatic coronary artery disease in patients with type 2 diabetes: the DIAD study: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2009;301(15):1547-1555