Long-term adverse outcomes associated with drug-eluting stents and bare-metal stent in patients with small coronary artery disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
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Introduction

Small coronary arteries are (variably) defined as having a reference vessel diameter (RVD) of <3.0 mm.¹² It is estimated that approximately 20–30 % of patients with symptomatic coronary artery disease (CAD) have small vessel CAD.¹ For small CAD myocardial revascularization remains a challenge in daily practice for interventional cardiologists. Revascularization by means of percutaneous coronary interventions (PCI) or coronary artery bypass grafts (CABG) is indicated when medical therapy fails to improve the patients’ symptom burden. However, CABG in this group of patients is limited by high rates of graft failure¹ whereas PCI are associated with increased risks of restenosis and adverse clinical outcomes.⁵

PCI with drug eluting stents (DES) reduce restenosis rate by preventing vessel wall recoil and restraining neointimal growth.⁶ However, they are associated with many serious complications like late stent thrombosis, non-homogenous drug delivery and delayed vascularization, which makes bare metal stent (BMS) preferred with shorter dual antiplatelet therapy in patients at high bleeding risk.⁷⁻⁸ A previously published meta-analysis⁹ comparing DES and BMS in small coronary vessels showed lower rate of major adverse cardiovascular events, but no differences were observed in mortality, myocardial infarction and stent thrombosis. In their study among 12 included trials only two studies had a long-term follow-up. Since then several studies were published comparing long-term adverse events associated with DES and BMS in patients with small vessel.¹⁰⁻¹⁴ However, single studies were underpowered for clinical end-points and only pooled analyses of data from multiple studies can help to clarifying the long-term issue.

Therefore, we performed a systematical review and meta-analysis to evaluate the long-term adverse cardiovascular outcomes between DES and BMS treated patients with small CAD.

Abstract

Objective: The main purpose of this meta-analysis was to compare the long-term adverse outcomes associated with drug-eluting stents (DES) and bare-metal stent (BMS) in patients with small coronary artery disease (CAD).

Method: Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) and observational studies comparing the adverse outcomes such as mortality, major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE), myocardial infarction (MI), stent thrombosis (ST), target lesion revascularization (TLR), target vessel revascularization (TVR), and restenosis in small CAD patients receiving DES and BMS were searched from Embase, PubMed, and Cochrane Library databases. Odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated and the pooled analyses were performed with RevMan 5.3.

Result: A total number of 4,106 patients with small CAD (2,123 patients received DES and 1,983 patients received BMS) have been included in this meta-analysis. Pool-analysis demonstrated that the risk of mortality, MACE, MI, ST, TLR, TVR, and restenosis were significantly lower in DES group, with OR 0.77(95%CI 0.59-0.99, P=0.04), 0.48(95%CI 0.41-0.56, P<0.00001), 0.74(95%CI 0.55-0.98, P=0.04), 0.51(95%CI: 0.26-0.98, P=0.04), 0.24(95%CI: 0.16-0.37, P<0.00001), 0.47(95%CI: 0.38-0.59, P<0.00001), and 0.24 (95%CI 0.14-0.43, P<0.00001), respectively.

Conclusion: Compared with BMS, DES had lower rates of adverse clinical outcomes, and restenosis during long-term follow-up.
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### Methods

**Data Sources and Search Strategy**

We have searched EMBASE, PubMed and Cochrane Library databases for relevant studies comparing the long-term adverse outcomes associated with DES and BMS in small CAD patients by typing the words ‘drug-eluting stents, bare-metal stent, percutaneous coronary intervention, small coronary artery, and small vessel disease’. To further enhance this search, the abbreviations ‘DES, BMS, PCI, and small CAD’ have also been used. References have also been checked for relevant studies. No language restriction was applied.

### Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

#### Studies were included if:

1. They were randomized controlled trials (RCTs) or observational studies dealing with small CAD (<3mm) patients.
2. They compared DES with BMS.
3. Adverse outcomes were reported in these patients.
4. They had a mean follow-up period of ≥12 months after stents implantation.

#### Studies were excluded if:

1. Adverse outcomes were not reported among their clinical endpoints.
2. They did not include patients with small CAD.
3. They were case studies, meta-analyses or letter to editors.
4. They have not compared DES with BMS.
5. They had follow-up period of <12 months.
6. They were duplicates.

### Outcomes and Follow-up Periods

Adverse clinical outcomes analyzed included:

- Major adverse cardiovascular events
- Mortality
- Myocardial infarction
- Stent thrombosis
- Target lesion revascularization
- Target vessel revascularization
- Restenosis

The Long-term follow-up period was defined as a follow up at ≥ 12 months. The analyzed clinical adverse outcomes and follow-up periods have been represented in Table 1.

### Table 1. Baseline characteristics, Numbers of DES and BMS implanted patients, endpoints and with their corresponding follow-up periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Study population</th>
<th>Age (year)</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>HTN (%)</th>
<th>DM (%)</th>
<th>HL (%)</th>
<th>DES/ BMS</th>
<th>DES/ BMS</th>
<th>DES/ BMS</th>
<th>DES/ BMS</th>
<th>Outcomes analyzed</th>
<th>Types of DES used</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jimenez-Quevedo</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65.1/68.3</td>
<td>54.8/62.8</td>
<td>73.8/67.4</td>
<td>100/100</td>
<td>57.1/55.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortality, MACE, MI, ST, TLR</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>12m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan 2008</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58.7/62.5</td>
<td>69/66</td>
<td>66.7/75.9</td>
<td>100/100</td>
<td>76.9/71.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortality, MACE, MI, ST, TLR, TVR</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>12m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menozzi 2009</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>63.2/63.7</td>
<td>76.7/66.4</td>
<td>65.1/64.3</td>
<td>19.4/29.7</td>
<td>61.2/64.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortality, MACE, MI, ST, TLR, TVR</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>24m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umeda 2009</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>67.2/66.0</td>
<td>78/70</td>
<td>60/68</td>
<td>31/34</td>
<td>60/61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortality, MACE, MI, ST, TLR</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>12m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfisterer 2009</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>62/62</td>
<td>61/64</td>
<td>83/78</td>
<td>100/100</td>
<td>88/87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortality, MACE, MI, ST, TLR</td>
<td>SES, PES, EES, ZES</td>
<td>36m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koh 2010</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>71/72</td>
<td>63/69</td>
<td>68/60</td>
<td>62/9*</td>
<td>67/66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortality, MACE, MI, TVR</td>
<td>SES, PES, EES, ZES</td>
<td>36m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puymirat 2011</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>63.3/63.9</td>
<td>64.4/53.4*</td>
<td>78.0/69.3*</td>
<td>37.8/30.2*</td>
<td>78.1/68.7*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortality, MACE, MI, TVR</td>
<td>SES, PES, EES, ZES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parikh 2011</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>81/82</td>
<td>58/55</td>
<td>74/69</td>
<td>62/9*</td>
<td>64/60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortality, MACE, MI, TVR</td>
<td>SES, PES, EES, ZES</td>
<td>12m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puymirat 2013</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>71.1/81.1</td>
<td>88.4/94.6</td>
<td>60.3/54.1</td>
<td>66.9/70.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortality, MACE, MI, ST, TLR</td>
<td>SES, PES, EES, ZES</td>
<td>42m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang 2016</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>72.5/72.7</td>
<td>71.1/81.1</td>
<td>88.4/94.6</td>
<td>60.3/54.1</td>
<td>66.9/70.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortality, MACE, MI, ST, TLR</td>
<td>SES, PES, EES, ZES</td>
<td>32m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DES**: drug-eluting stents, **BMS**: bare-metal stent, **MACE**: major adverse cardiovascular events, **MI**: myocardial infarction, **ST**: stent thrombosis, **TVR**: target vessel revascularization, **TLR**: target lesion revascularization, **SES**: sirolimus-eluting stent, **PES**: paclitaxel-eluting stent, **EES**: everolimus-eluting Stent, **ZES**: zotarolimus-eluting stent, **RCT**: randomized controlled trial, **OS**: observational study, **HTN**: hypertension, **DM**: diabetes mellitus, **HL**: hyperlipidemia, **m**: months, *P<0.05*
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Methodological Quality and Statistical Analysis

The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) was considered for this meta-analysis. The Cochrane Q-statistic (P>0.05 was considered statistically insignificant) and I²-statistic were used to assess heterogeneity across the trials. I² described the percentage of total variation across studies, that is, due to heterogeneity rather than chance. A value of 0% indicated no heterogeneity, and larger values especially above 50% and above indicated increasing heterogeneity. If I² was <50%, a fixed-effect model was used. However, if I² was >50%, a random effect model was considered. Publication bias was visually estimated by assessing funnel plots. We calculated the odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for categorical variables. The pooled analyses were performed with RevMan 5.3 software. Since this is a systematic review and meta-analysis, ethical approval was not required.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Three authors (N.C., P.K.B. and S.S.) independently reviewed the data and assessed the eligibility and methodological quality of each eligible trial. Information regarding the author names, the study type, year of publication, the total number of small CAD patients with stents implantation, the patient characteristics, and the adverse clinical outcomes reported as well as the follow-up periods was systematically extracted. If any of the 3 authors disagreed about the information or data extracted, disagreements were discussed between the authors, and if they could not reach a decision, it was discussed and resolved by the fourth author (H.Y.). The bias risk of trials was assessed with the components recommended by the Cochrane Collaboration.

Results

Study Selection

As illustrated in the flow diagram (Fig. 1), 577 articles were identified by title and abstract. After elimination of duplicates, 198 articles were further screened. 160 articles were excluded since they were not related to the title of our study. Thirty eight full-text articles were finally assessed for eligibility of which, 28 were further excluded for several reasons: they were case studies, meta-analyses or letters to the editor, follow-up<12 months, in some trials DES treated group was compared with BMS plus drug-eluting balloon treated group. Finally, 10 studies (3 RCTs and 7 observational studies) were selected and included in this study.

Baseline Characteristics of Included Trials

These 10 studies which have been included in this systematic review and meta-analysis consisted of a total of 4,106 small CAD patients; among them, 2,123 patients received DES and remaining 1,983 patients received BMS treatment. The baseline characteristics of each included study is shown in Table 2. Data from each study were reported. Publication year, the design of studies, the number of the population involved in DES and BMS group mean age of patients, the percentage of male patients, the percentage of patients with hypertension, diabetes mellitus, dyslipidemia and follow-up periods is listed in Table 1.

In this meta-analysis, the mean follow-up duration ranged from 12-42 months. In 6 studies, the follow-up period was ≥24 months. The mean ages of the patients ranged from 62-82 years. Among 9 studies, 1 study reported that the age of patients was >80 years. The percentage of men was 53.4-81.1%. In three studies, PCI were done in small CAD patients with diabetes mellitus (DM). Moreover, in another 3 studies, the proportion of patients with DM was higher in DES group. In one study, the proportion of patients with hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and percentage of the male were higher in DES group. In two studies, the proportion of patients with ACS was higher in BMS group.

Main Outcomes of This Meta-analysis

At a mean follow-up period of 25.4 months, the pooled result of this meta-analysis showed that DES was associated with a significantly lower incidence of the mortality, MACE, MI, ST, TLR, TVR, and restenosis, with (OR 0.77, 95%CI 0.59-0.99, P=0.04, I²=0%), (OR 0.48, 95%CI 0.41-0.56, P<0.00001, I²=38%), (OR 0.74, 95%CI 0.55-0.98, P=0.04, I²=32%), (OR 0.31, 95%CI 0.26-0.98, P=0.04, I²=0%), (OR 0.24, 95%CI 0.16-0.37, P<0.00001, I²=0%), (OR 0.47, 95%CI 0.38-0.59, P<0.00001, I²=65%), and (OR 0.24, 95%CI 0.14-0.43, P<0.00001, I²=0%), respectively. The detailed result for all adverse events is shown in Fig. 2.
In the subgroup analysis of DM, the risk of MACE, TLR, restenosis were lower in DES group with (OR 0.53, 95% CI 0.37–0.74, P=0.003, I²=80%), (OR 0.17, 95% CI 0.07–0.40, P<0.001, I²=38%), (OR 0.16, 95% CI 0.05–0.51, P=0.002). However, there was no significant difference in the risk of mortality, MI, ST, and TLR between DES and BMS groups (OR 0.76, 95% CI 0.42–1.38, P=0.37, I²=0%; OR 0.77, 95% CI 0.44–1.35, P=0.36, I²=36%; OR 0.20, 95% CI 0.01–4.19, P=0.30; and OR 0.77, 95% CI 0.44–1.35, P=0.36, I²=0%; OR 0.76, 95% CI 0.42–1.38, P=0.37, I²=0%), respectively as shown in Fig.3.

For all of the above analyses, sensitivity analysis yielded consistent results. Based on a visual inspection of the funnel plot, there has been no evidence of publication bias for the included studies that assessed the adverse clinical end-points. The funnel plot is shown in Fig.4.

Discussion:
This meta-analysis investigates the long-term adverse outcomes of DES versus BMS in patients with small CAD treated with percutaneous revascularization. Our findings showed that DES treated group had a lower risk of mortality, MACE, MI, ST, TVL, TVR and restenosis as compared with BMS treated group at 25.4 months of follow-up. However, in DM subgroup the risk of mortality, MI, ST, and TVR were comparable between DES and BMS groups. The risk of MACE, TLR and restenosis were higher in BMS group compared with DES group in DM subgroup analysis.

Worldwide small coronary artery revascularization by means of PCI represents 30–50% of the catheter-based coronary interventions per year.1,2,4,25 PCI in small vessel remain a real challenge for the interventional cardiologists in daily practice because of an increased risk of adverse clinical events.1,2,4,25 In large coronary arteries lesion, stenting has become the main method of myocardial revascularization compared with balloon angioplasty in preventing restenosis.27 However, conflicting results were reported about efficacy in small coronary arteries.2,26,28 Possible explanations for the lack of efficacy of coronary angioplasty in preventing restenosis in small CAD may be associated with the characteristics of patients having atherosclerotic small-vessel lesions, i.e., DM patients, elderly patients, women, multi-vessel diseases and patients with the peripheral vascular disease, all of whom are at a higher risk of restenosis.29,30 Another reason for decreased efficacy of angioplasty may be related to the small diameter of the vessels, which has been reported a powerful independent predictor of restenosis and repeat revascularization.31 This is mainly due to the limited ability of the vessel to accommodate even for limited neointimal proliferation that might develop after stent implantation. To improve the clinical outcomes, DES are increasingly used as a primary angioplasty strategy23,31 even in patients with off-label indications.34

The analyses of several previous studies at <12 months of follow-up showed that the use of DES in small CAD lead to a reduced risk of restenosis and MACE as compared with that of BMS.35–39 Moreover, the meta-analysis published by Cortese et al30 comparing DES with BMS in patients with small coronary vessels using data from 12 trials, showed patients receiving DES to have lower rate of TVF (11.2% vs 21.9%), MACE (12.5% vs 26.5%), binary restenosis (9.7% vs 36.7%) and late lumen loss were higher in BMS group compared with DES group in DM subgroup analysis.

Possible explanations for the lack of efficacy of coronary angioplasty in preventing restenosis in small CAD may be associated with the characteristics of patients having atherosclerotic small-vessel lesions, i.e., DM patients, elderly patients, women, multi-vessel diseases and patients with the peripheral vascular disease, all of whom are at a higher risk of restenosis.29,30 Another reason for decreased efficacy of angioplasty may be related to the small diameter of the vessels, which has been reported a powerful independent predictor of restenosis and repeat revascularization.31 This is mainly due to the limited ability of the vessel to accommodate even for limited neointimal proliferation that might develop after stent implantation. To improve the clinical outcomes, DES are increasingly used as a primary angioplasty strategy23,31 even in patients with off-label indications.34

The analyses of several previous studies at <12 months of follow-up showed that the use of DES in small CAD lead to a reduced risk of restenosis and MACE as compared with that of BMS.35–39 Moreover, the meta-analysis published by Cortese et al30 comparing DES with BMS in patients with small coronary vessels using data from 12 trials, showed patients receiving DES to have lower rate of TVF (11.2% vs 21.9%), MACE (12.5% vs 26.5%), binary restenosis (9.7% vs 36.7%) and late lumen loss compared to those patients treated with BMS; in contrast ST, MI, and mortality were not statistically different between studies at mean follow-up period of 12 months. Moreover, recently another comprehensive network meta-analysis published by Siontis et al.40 demonstrated that sirolimus eluting stent (SES) is superior to paclitaxel eluting stent (PES), BMS, drug-coated balloons and balloon angioplasty for percutaneous treatment of small vessel CAD. In their study they observed lower TLR, and no differences in mortality and MI in SES group compared with BMS group. Furthermore, a study by Sugihara et al.41 comparing DES and BMS in small coronary arteries showed no significant difference in the incidence of MACE including TLR rate, whereas in-stent restenosis in DES were significantly lower compared with BMS treated group. Possible explanations for the difference in the rate of TLR was that in their study they were included more severe lesions concerning minimal lumen diameter and lesion length than other trials. Moreover, ISAR-SMART42 (intracoronary stenting or angioplasty for restenosis reduction in small arteries) study showed significantly lower angiographic restenosis and TLR with the use of SES compared with BMS. Additionally, post hoc subanalysis of TAXUS V4 trial demonstrated the clinical outcomes of patients with a mean luminal diameter of 2.08mm treated with 2.25mm PES. In their study they observed that restenosis rates were significantly less when compared with BMS, although angiographic binary restenosis and TLR still occurred in approximately 20% and 10% of patients respectively with DES. Moreover, in sub analysis, there were no significant
differences in the rates of mortality, MI, and ST at 1 month and 9 months between PES and BMS.

A previous study identified that smaller reference vessel diameter (RVD) known as a predictor of ST. The study by e-CYPHER registry reported that the rates of ST in small vessel and MI were higher than those in larger vessels in DES and BMS treated groups. In our study, the rates of ST and MI were lower in DES group compared with BMS. These results are consistent with the present findings.

In addition, study another study by Mezzoni et al. showed that at 2 years, the incidence of the composite endpoint of mortality, MI, clinically driven TLR, and cerebrovascular accident for SES were lower in compared with BMS. These results are consistent with the present findings.

Limitations:

The present meta-analysis has several limitations. The articles included in the analysis were mostly non-randomized controlled trials; therefore, there is a possibility of selection bias. Due to the very small number of patients in this study, this analysis may not generate the required or expected results. The follow-up periods were not similar in all the articles. Moreover, among 10 studies, in 3 studies DES and BMS were implanted in small CAD patients with DM, which could limit our results. In addition, percutaneous coronary recanalization by using SES was more than others DES. Out of 10 studies, in 5 studies second generation DES were used, but their adverse outcomes were not demonstrated separately. The best way to answer these shortcomings is a long-term randomized control trial.

Conclusion:

Compared with BMS, DES had lower rates of MACE, MI, stent thrombosis, TLR, TVR, and restenosis at 25.4 months of follow-up. However, patients treated with DES had similar risk of mortality compared with BMS in small CAD patients. RCTs with long-term follow-up in a larger number of patients are needed to fully assess the long-term advantages of DES in small coronary arteries.
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