detecting myocardial ischemia in the absence of STEMI and are also indicative of higher risk of death or recurrent ischemia. Serial performance of ECGs (every 30–60 min) is recommended in the ED evaluation of suspected ACS. In addition, an ECG with right-sided lead placement should be considered in patients with clinically suspected ischemia and a nondiagnostic standard 12-lead ECG. Despite the value of the resting ECG, its sensitivity for ischemia is poor—as low as 20% in some studies.

Abnormalities of the ST segment and T wave may occur in a variety of conditions, including pulmonary embolism, ventricular hypertrophy, acute and chronic pericarditis, myocarditis, electrolyte imbalance, and metabolic disorders. Notably, hyperventilation associated with panic disorder can also lead to nonspecific ST and T-wave abnormalities. Pulmonary embolism is most often associated with sinus tachycardia but can also lead to rightward shift of the ECG axis, manifesting as an S-wave in lead I, with a Q-wave and T-wave in lead III (Chaps. 268 and 300). In patients with ST-segment elevation, the presence of diffuse lead involvement not corresponding to a specific coronary anatomic distribution and PR-segment depression can aid in distinguishing pericarditis from acute MI.

CHEST RADIOGRAPHY

(See Chap. 308e) Plain radiography of the chest is performed routinely when patients present with acute chest discomfort and selectively when individuals who are being evaluated as outpatients have subacute or chronic pain. The chest radiograph is most useful for identifying pulmonary processes, such as pneumonia or pneumothorax. Findings are often unremarkable in patients with ACS, but pulmonary edema may be evident. Other specific findings include widening of the mediastinum in some patients with aortic dissection, Hampton's hump or Westermark's sign in patients with pulmonary embolism (Chaps. 300 and 308e), or pericardial calcification in chronic pericarditis.

CARDIAC BIOMARKERS

Laboratory testing in patients with acute chest pain is focused on the detection of myocardial injury. Such injury can be detected by the presence of circulating proteins released from damaged myocardial cells. Owing to the time necessary for this release, initial biomarkers of injury may be in the normal range, even in patients with STEMI. Because of superior cardiac tissue-specificity compared with creatine kinase MB, cardiac troponin is the preferred biomarker for the diagnosis of MI and should be measured in all patients with suspected ACS at presentation and repeated in 3–6 h. Testing after 6 h is required only when there is uncertainty regarding the onset of pain or when stuttering symptoms have occurred. It is not necessary or advisable to measure troponin in patients without suspicion of ACS unless this test is being used specifically for risk stratification (e.g., in pulmonary embolism or heart failure).

The development of cardiac troponin assays with progressively greater analytical sensitivity has facilitated detection of substantially lower blood concentrations of troponin than was previously possible. This evolution permits earlier detection of myocardial injury, enhances the overall accuracy of a diagnosis of MI, and improves risk stratification in suspected ACS. The greater negative predictive value of a negative troponin result with current-generation assays is an advantage in the evaluation of chest pain in the ED. Rapid rule-out protocols that use serial testing and changes in troponin concentration over as short a period as 1–2 h appear promising and remain under investigation. However, with these advantages has come a trade-off: myocardial injury is detected in a larger proportion of patients who have non-ACS cardiopulmonary conditions than with previous, less sensitive assays. This evolution in testing for myocardial necrosis has rendered other aspects of the clinical evaluation critical to the practitioner's determination of the probability that the symptoms represent ACS. In addition, observation of a change in cardiac troponin concentration between serial samples is useful in discriminating acute causes of myocardial injury from chronic elevation due to underlying structural heart disease, end-stage renal disease, or interfering antibodies. The diagnosis of MI is reserved for acute myocardial injury that is marked by a rising and/or falling pattern—with at least one value exceeding the 99th percentile reference limit—and that is caused by ischemia. Other non-ischemic insults, such as myocarditis, may result in myocardial injury but should not be labeled MI.

Other laboratory assessments may include the D-dimer test to aid in exclusion of pulmonary embolism (Chap. 300). Measurement of a B-type natriuretic peptide is useful when considered in conjunction with the clinical history and exam for the diagnosis of heart failure. B-type natriuretic peptides also provide prognostic information regarding patients with ACS and those with pulmonary embolism. Other putative biomarkers of acute myocardial ischemia or ACS, such as myeloperoxidase, have not been adopted in routine use.

INTEGRATIVE DECISION-AIDS

Multiple clinical algorithms have been developed to aid in decision-making during the evaluation and disposition of patients with acute nontraumatic chest pain. Such decision-aids have been derived on the basis of their capacity to estimate either of two closely related but not identical probabilities: (1) the probability of a final diagnosis of ACS and (2) the probability of major cardiac events during short-term follow-up. Such decision-aids are used most commonly to identify patients with a low clinical probability of ACS who are candidates either for early provocative testing for ischemia or for discharge from the ED. Goldman and Lee developed one of the first such decision-aids, using only the ECG and risk indicators—hypotension, pulmonary rales, and known ischemic heart disease—to categorize patients into four risk categories ranging from a <1% to a >16% probability of a major cardiovascular complication. The Acute Cardiac Ischemia Time-Insensitive Predictive Instrument (ACI-TIPI) combines age, sex, chest pain presence, and ST-segment abnormalities to define a probability of ACS. More recently developed decision-aids are shown in Fig. 19-3. Elements common to each of these tools are (1) symptoms typical for ACS; (2) older age; (3) risk factors for or known atherosclerosis; (4) ischemic ECG abnormalities; and (5) elevated cardiac troponin levels. Although, because of very low specificity, the overall diagnostic performance of such decision-aids is poor (area under the receiver operating curve, 0.55–0.65), they can help identify patients with a very low probability of ACS (e.g., <1%). Nevertheless, no such decision-aid (or single clinical factor) is sufficiently sensitive and well validated to use as a sole tool for clinical decision-making.

Clinicians should differentiate between the algorithms discussed above and risk scores derived for stratification of prognosis (e.g., the TIMI and GRACE risk scores, Chap. 295) in patients *who already have an established diagnosis of ACS*. The latter risk scores were not designed to be used for *diagnostic* assessment.

PROVOCATIVE TESTING FOR ISCHEMIA

Exercise electrocardiography ("stress testing") is commonly employed for completion of risk stratification of patients who have undergone an initial evaluation that has not revealed a specific cause of chest discomfort and has identified them as being at low or selectively intermediate risk of ACS. Early exercise testing is safe in patients without high-risk findings after 8–12 h of observation and can assist in refining their prognostic assessment. For example, of low-risk patients who underwent exercise testing in the first 48 h after presentation, those without evidence of ischemia had a 2% rate of cardiac events through 6 months, whereas the rate was 15% among patients with either clear evidence of ischemia or an equivocal result. Patients who are unable to exercise may undergo pharmacological stress testing with either nuclear perfusion imaging or echocardiography. Notably, some experts have deemed the routine use of stress testing for low-risk patients unsupported by direct clinical evidence and a potentially unnecessary source of cost.

Professional society guidelines identify ongoing chest pain as a contraindication to stress testing. In selected patients with persistent pain and nondiagnostic ECG and biomarker data, resting