PCI for Bifurcation Coronary Lesion



Bifurcation Lesions PCI is Challenging

Higher acute complication

- Lower success rates
- Higher restenosis & TLR
 Restenosis Rate
 21 ~ 57%
 TLR
 8 ~ 43%



Event Free Survival after PCI NHLBI Registry



Suwaidi J, et al. AJC 2001;87:1139-44

Side Branch Loss

Main Mechanism of Adverse Outcomes





Predictors of Side Branch Occlusion

Side branch DS > 50 %
Disease burden in parent vessel at take-off of side branch
Dissection of parent vessel



How to Stent?

Stenting Technique





T Stenting



Main vessel

Crediovascular Research Foundation

Y (Culotte) Stenting





Kissing Stenting Large proximal reference size





Issues in the DES Era For Bifurcation Disease

- BMS vs. DES
- Single stent vs. Multiple stent
- Stenting technique



DES is better than **BMS**

No doubt !

Striking reduction of intimal growth at least in the main vessel



Cardiovascular Research Foundation

Single vs. Multiple Stents

Unanswered yet.



Single vs. Multiple Stents

In the Era of Bare Metal Stent



Single Stent vs. Two Stent				
Procedural Results				
	Single (n=39)	Double (n=53)	Р	
Ref. Vessel (mm)	3.0 ± 0.4	3.1 ± 0.6	NS	
Kissing balloon (%)	56	92	< 0.05	
Procedural time (min)	98 ± 45	127 ± 52	< 0.05	
Success (%)	92	87	NS	
In-hosp. MACE (%)	0	13	< 0.05	

Yamashita T, et al. JACC 2000;35:1145-51

Single Stent vs. Two Stent 6 Month Restenosis Rate



Anzuini A, et al. Am J Cardiol 2001;88:1246-50

Single Stent vs. Two Stent Event Free Survival Freedom from death, MI, CABG, rePTCA & severe angina





Two bare metal stents are not better than single stent.

Stent in main vessel and POBA in side branch with Optional kissing balloon





Cardiovascular Research Foundation

Single vs. Multiple Stents

In the Era of Drug Eluting Stent

Cardiovascular Research Foundation

Cypher Bifurcation RCT

	PTCA of the SB (n=47)	Routine stent SB (n=44)	Р
Death	0 (0 %)	1 (2.3 %)	NS
MI	2 (4.3 %)	0 (0 %)	NS
TLR	1 (2.1 %)	2 (4.5 %)	NS
MACE	3 (6.4 %)	3 (6.8 %)	NS
Restenosis			
Main vessel	1 (3 %)	2 (6 %)	NS
Side branch	2 (6 %)	4 (13 %)	NS

Pan M et al, ACC 2004





A Colombo, et al. AHA 2002



Procedural Technique			
SIRIUS Bifurcation Study			
Technique	Stent / Stent (n=63)	Stent / PTCA (n=22)	
T- stenting	60		
Side branch first	40		
Main vessel first	20		
V- stenting	1		
Y- stenting	2		
Kissing balloon	60 (95%)	19 (86%)	
GP II b/IIIa inhibitor	27 (43%)	8 (37%)	

A Colombo, et al. AHA 2002



Main Vessel **Minimal Lumen Diameter SIRIUS Bifurcation**





CORF Cardiovascular Research Foundation

Side Branch Minimal Lumen Diameter SIRIUS Bifurcation





CORF Cardiovascular Research Foundation

In-Segment Restenosis

SIRIUS Bifurcation





In-Segment Restensis Site SIRIUS Bifurcation



A Colombo, et al. AHA 2002



What We Learned DES In Bifurcation Lesion

• Effective

Nearly eliminate restenosis in the main vessel

• Ineffective

Persistent disturbingly high restenosis at the uncovered side branch ostium



Stenting Technique

In the Era of Drug Eluting Stent



Lesson from SIRIUS Bifurcation Limitation of T-Stenting Potential gap susceptible to restenosis





How to solve the problem ? Complete coverage of side branch ostium



New Technique with DES Stent - Crush



Stent Crush with Cypher 108 patients, April 2003 ~ Nov. 2003 **In-hospital events** No death, MI, CABG, urgent TLR **30- day outcome** No death Stent thrombosis 1.9 % (2/108) **Intermediate- term clinical outcome** No death, MI **TLR** 12 % (9/108)

I Moussa, ACC 2004

One More Step of Stent - Crush Final Kissing Balloon Dilatation



Re-advancement of wire into the side branch Opening of the side branch ostium Final kissing balloon inflation



CVRF Cardiovascular Research Foundation

Final Kissing Necessary during Crushing with DES? In-Hospital Clinical Outcome







VRF Cardiovascular Research Foundation

Crush with Cypher Final kissing vs No Kissing

Main Vessel

FKNo FKpAcute gain, mm 2.05 ± 0.6 1.78 ± 0.6 < 0.001Late loss, mm 0.49 ± 0.7 0.62 ± 0.6 0.01

Side Branch

FKNo FKpAcute gain, mm 2.03 ± 0.7 1.27 ± 0.5 < 0.001</td>Late loss, mm 0.66 ± 0.8 1.10 ± 0.8 < 0.001</td>

A Colombo, ACC 2004



Kissing Balloon Inflation Should be performed

Full expansion of the side-branch stent
Release of side-branch from jail
Sequential inflation for increasing successful final kissing dilataion

Stent Crush with DES

What we know

Acutely predictable result
Guaranties stent coverage of the ostium of the side branch

What we don't know

- Acute & long-term safety
- Impact on restenosis

Wait the result of MATRIX Registry !

RESEARCH Bifurcation **SES (n=127) or PES (n=72)** Subacute thrombosis 2.5 % • TLR 7 % 9 % • TVR Binary Restenosis 9 % Main vessel 14 % Side branch

Serruys et al, ACC 2004



Stenting Technique RESEARCH : CYPHER vs. TAXUS

CYPHER (n=123) April 2003 ~ April 2004 TAXUS (n=71) Mar. 2004~ Sep. 2004





TVR in RESEARCH Bifurcation CYPHER vs. TAXUS T stent Crush 35 **Kissing stent** 30 Culotte % TVR 25



CYPHER

20

15

10

5

 \bigcap

Serruys et al, ACC 2004

TAXUS

Bifurcation Lesions in AMC Treatment Strategies Total 205 lesions except left main bifurcation





Cardiovascular Research Foundation

AMC-Bifurcation

Late Loss at 6-month angiography

	No	Main vessel	Side branch
Single stent	62	0.21±0.46	0.06±0.44
T-stent	4	0.21±0.46	0.16±0.49
Stent-crush	14	0.16±0.45	0.51±0.88
Kissing stent	19	0.55±0.60	0.34±0.34



AMC-Bifurcation Restenosis Rate





AMC-Bifurcation Restenosis Rate





Emerging New Technique "Internal" or "Reverse" Crush allows provisional SB stenting with full ostial coverage





Internal or Reverse Crush

 Allows provisional stenting of the side-branch with a fall-back strategy that delivers coverage of the sidebranch ostium without gaps.

• Limitation : it may be difficult to pass stent to side-branch





Future Perspectives in the Era of DES

Following consideration should be evaluated

- Fate of side branch with DES
- Randomized comparison of
 - Two vs. Single DES
 - -Different two DES tecnique
- New bifurcated stent

New Modality for Bifurcation Lesion ?

True Bifurcated Stent
Drug Eluting Stent

Cardiovascular Research Foundation

Bifurcated Stents









Guidant Frontier Stent



BARD Bifurcate XT



Bifurcated Stent

Cordis DBS Stent



34 patients (mean 64 years)

Technical Success 94%
MACE @ 30 days 0%
Restenosis @ 6 Mo 33%
TLR 19%

Dibie A, et al. Am J Cardiol 2002;90:13H



Cardiovascular Research Foundation

Bifurcated Stents

AST SLK-View



Stent length = 17mm Catheter length = 140 cm Crossing profile = 0.055 IN Available in two sizes

- 3.0mm with 2.5mm side hole

- 3.5mm with 3.0mm side hole

Bifurcated Stents

AST SLK-View



Main catheter system comprises of a main stent with a side hole and a stabilizing catheter, which allows access to side branch after stenting



AST SLK-View Stent

AMC Experience 48 patients (mean 58 years), 50 lesions

	Parent vessel	Side branch	
Technical Success	100 %	100 %	
Side branch accessibility		100 %	
Side branch preservation		100 %	
after stenting			

Kim YH, et al. TCT 2002



AST SLK-View Stent

US Safety & Feasibility study

31 patients, 31 bifurcation lesions

Device Success
MACE (a) in-hospital
MACE (a) 30 days
MACE (a) 6 Mo
TLR

92.9 % (29 / 31) 0 % 3.4 % 48 % (14 pts) 45 % (13 pts)

Buchbinder et al. TCT 2003

Bifurcated Stent

Invatec DESIRE study

34 patients (mean 64 years)

- Technical Success 94%
- MACE @ 30 days
- Restenosis @ 6 Mo
- TLR

0% 33% 19%

A Colombo, et al. JIM 2004



Bifurcated Stent





105 patients (mean 62 years)

- Device Success
 <u>MACE (a) 30 days</u>
- *Restenosis* @ 6 Mo *TLR*

92% 3% 29% 13%

Lefevre, et al. TCT 2003