Safety and efficacy of percutaneous coronary intervention versus coronary artery bypass graft in patients with STEMI and unprotected left main stem disease: A systematic review & meta-analysis
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1. Introduction

Coronary artery disease is a major cause of morbidity and mortality in developed countries [1] Coronary artery disease involving stenosis of the left main artery, or left main coronary artery disease (LMCAD) has the highest mortality of any coronary lesions owing to its vast area of supply [2]. Significant LMCAD is defined as more than 50% angiographic narrowing of the artery and is found in about 4 to 6 % of the patients undergoing coronary angiography [3]. Because of its vital significance, the optimal revascularization technique for LMCAD has been a topic of much debate.

Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting (CABG) had been the main revascularization procedure for LMCAD for several decades, but with the advent of modern minimally invasive techniques, Percutaneous...
Coronary Intervention (PCI) has emerged as an acceptable alternative. The 2017 US appropriate use criteria and the 2018 European Guidelines suggest PCI as an appropriate alternative to CABG in patients with LMCA and low-to-intermediate anatomical complexity. [4].

Our meta-analysis aims to compare the safety and efficacy of PCI versus CABG in treating LMCA for different follow-up periods. Several studies have previously been conducted on this topic, however most of the previous meta-analyses comparing PCI versus CABG have only taken into account randomized controlled trials (RCTs), while ignoring observational studies. While RCTs are considered to be more reliable, observational studies are said to give a more accurate representation of “real world” data, therefore in this study, we are also pooling data from observational studies in addition to RCTs, to analyze the adverse outcomes such as MACCE (major adverse cardiac and cardiovascular events), mortality, repeat revascularization, myocardial infarction and stroke in patients suffering from unprotected LMCA and undergoing PCI or CABG surgery. Moreover, a number of major RCTs done on this topic have reported outcomes after updated follow-up periods; hence it is necessary to do a meta-analysis taking these studies into account for updated data. Finally, our study aims to provide outcomes for different follow-up lengths including follow-ups for adverse outcomes after 10 years, which has not been provided by previous meta-analyses done on this topic.

2. Methodology

This meta-analysis is reported in concordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. This meta-analysis only included data from previously published studies, therefore ethical approval was deemed unnecessary.

2.1. Search strategy

An electronic search of the MEDLINE, TRIP, and Cochrane Central databases was conducted from their inception to 25 April 2021, without any language restrictions, using a search string containing, but not limited to the terms “left main disease”, “coronary stent” and “bypass surgery”.

No time or language restrictions were used. Moreover, the reference lists of relevant articles were also searched for any other eligible studies. Articles were first shortlisted based on abstracts after which full literature was reviewed to select studies. Bibliographies of the relevant review articles were also queried. In addition to this, grey and white literature was also searched. Articles retrieved from the systematic search were exported to the EndNote Reference Library (Version x7.5; Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania) software, where duplicates were searched for and removed. The remaining articles were carefully assessed by two independent authors (FAJ and SA). A third investigator (ZA) was then consulted to resolve any disparities with consensus. The process for study selection is summarized in the PRISMA flow chart in Supplemental Fig. 2.

2.2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The population of interest is patients undergoing a revascularization procedure for unprotected LMCA. All RCTs including open, single-blind, double-blind, triple-blind, and quadruple blind, and observational studies comparing PCI with drug-eluting or bare-metal stents versus CABG for unprotected LMCA were selected. Patients undergoing intervention for anything other than LMCA, animal studies, case reports, conference presentations, editorials, expert opinions, and unpublished studies were excluded. Any duplicate studies from the same database having the same follow-up length [5-12] as well as studies that did not meet the desired quality according to the quality assessment tools mentioned below (results), were also excluded. [13,14].

2.3. Data extraction and analysis

The data from the selected studies were extracted independently by two authors (AA and HF) and verified by a third author (SY).

From the finalized trials, the following outcomes were assessed: MACCE (major adverse cardiac and cardiovascular events), all-cause mortality, repeat revascularization, myocardial infarction, and stroke. Review Manager (v5.4.1, Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2020) was used for all statistical analyses. To visually assess the results of pooling forest plots were constructed. The results were presented as odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals. Subgroups were made for different follow-up lengths including in-hospital follow-up, follow-up after 30 days, short-term (1 year) follow-up, intermediate-term (1 to 5 years) follow-up, long-term (5 years) follow-up, and very long-term (>10 years) follow-up.

3. Results

3.1. Search results, study, and patients’ characteristics

Our initial search of the databases yielded 17,281 studies, of which 15,125 were removed after screening titles/abstracts. A total of 57 studies including 7 RCTs (all of which were open blinded) and 50 observational studies published between 2006 and 2021 met our inclusion criteria.

Altogether, clinical data of 56,701 patients who underwent coronary intervention for unprotected left main disease is reported, with 30,259 undergoing PCI and 26,442 undergoing CABG. The characteristics of the selected individual studies and the patients’ baseline characteristics are outlined in the tables below. (Table 1 and Supplemental Tables 3 and 4).

3.2. Quality assessment and publication bias

Both the RCTs and observational studies collected for this pooled analysis were of high quality. The Newcastle-Ottawa scale was used to filter observational studies for quality, while the Cochrane risk of bias tool was used to determine the quality of RCTs. There was no evidence of small study bias (p = 0.322 for Egger’s regression test) (supplementary file, Fig. 3).

4. Results of meta-analysis

4.1. Macce

The definition of MACCE (major adverse cardiac and cerebrovascular events) varies from study to study. For our meta-analysis, we only considered studies that reported MACCE as a composite endpoint of all-cause mortality, repeat revascularization, myocardial infarction and stroke. Out of the 57 selected studies, 39 studies (6 RCTs and 33 observational studies) containing data for a total of 44,353 patients, reported outcomes for MACCE. Our pooled analysis in Supplemental Figure 4 shows there was no significant difference in the rate of MACCE post-PCI compared to the rate of MACCE post-CABG during the in-hospital period (OR = 0.64, 95% CI [0.38–1.10]; I² = 14; p = 0.33), long term follow-up (OR = 1.14, 95% CI [0.90–1.44]; I² = 81; p = 0.29) or very long term follow-up (OR = 1.10, 95% CI [0.90–1.35]; I² = 9; p = 0.37). However, PCI was associated with significantly lower rates of MACCE compared to CABG after 30 days of follow-up (OR = 0.41, 95% CI [0.27–0.62]; I² = 70; p < 0.001), while PCI had significantly higher rates of MACCE compared to CABG in our short term (OR = 1.23, 95% CI [1.02 – 1.48]; I² = 42; p = 0.03) and intermediate term follow-up (OR = 1.45, 95% CI [1.21–1.75]; I² = 73; p < 0.0001).

4.2. All-cause mortality

Out of the 57 selected studies, 52 studies (6 RCTs and 46
Fig. 1. Forest plot for Repeat Revascularization outcome in percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) versus coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) for unprotected left main coronary artery disease for varying follow-up lengths.
unprotected left main coronary artery disease for varying follow-up lengths. Coronary intervention (PCI) versus coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) for myocardial infarction (MI) outcome in percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI). Our pooled analysis in Fig. 2 shows that there was no significant difference in the rates of all-cause mortality following PCI compared to that with CABG during the in-hospital period (OR = 0.67, 95% CI [0.45–1.00]; I^2 = 57%; p = 0.05), after 30 days (OR = 0.78, 95% CI [0.54–1.12]; I^2 = 52%; p = 0.17), in our short term follow-up (OR = 0.82, 95% CI [0.64–1.04]; I^2 = 39%; p = 0.03), intermediate follow-up (OR = 1.08, 95% CI [0.89–1.32]; I^2 = 72%; p = 0.44), or long term follow-up (OR = 0.89, 95% CI [0.73–1.08]; I^2 = 68%; p = 0.24). However, in the very long term follow-up, PCI had significantly lower rates of mortality as compared to CABG (OR = 0.77, 95% CI [0.61–0.96]; I^2 = 46%; p = 0.02).

4.3. Repeat revascularization

Out of the 57 selected studies, 47 studies (6 RCTs and 41 observational studies) containing data for 71,685 patients reported outcomes for repeat revascularization. Our pooled analysis in Fig. 1 shows there was no significant difference in the rates of repeat revascularization post-PCI compared to the repeat revascularization rates post-CABG during the in-hospital period (OR = 1.21, 95% CI [0.56–2.63]; I^2 = 0%; p = 0.62) and after 30 days (OR = 0.82, 95% CI [0.42–1.62]; I^2 = 26%; p = 0.57), however there were significantly higher rates of repeat revascularization for PCI as compared to CABG in the short term follow-up (OR = 3.58, 95% CI [2.47–5.20]; I^2 = 77%; p < 0.0001), intermediate follow-up (OR = 3.47, 95% CI [2.72–4.44]; I^2 = 76%; p < 0.0001) long term follow-up (OR = 2.58, 95% CI [1.89–3.52]; I^2 = 84%; p < 0.0001) and very long term follow-up (OR = 2.91, 95% CI [1.58–5.35]; I^2 = 89%; p = 0.0006).

4.4. Myocardial infarction

Out of the 57 selected studies, 44 studies (6 RCTs and 38 observational studies) containing data for 60,296 patients reported outcomes for myocardial infarction. Our pooled analysis in Fig. 2 shows that there was no significant difference in the rates of MI post-PCI compared to post-CABG during the in-hospital period (OR = 0.56, 95% CI [0.22–1.42]; I^2 = 88%; p = 0.22), after 30 days (OR = 0.99, 95% CI [0.64–1.54]; I^2 = 43%; p = 0.97), in the short-term follow-up (OR = 1.42, 95% CI [1.00–2.02]; I^2 = 28%; p = 0.05) or long term follow-up (OR = 1.27 95% CI [0.75–2.16]; I^2 = 87%; p = 0.38) however there were significantly higher rates of MI following PCI as compared to after CABG in the intermediate follow-up (OR = 1.39, 95% CI [1.17–1.64]; I^2 = 12%; p = 0.0002) and very long term follow-up (OR = 1.63, 95% CI [1.10–2.41]; I^2 = 16%; p = 0.02).

4.5. Stroke

Out of the 57 selected studies, 38 studies (5 RCTs and 33 observational studies) containing data for 56,614 patients reported outcomes for stroke. Our pooled analysis in Fig. 3 shows that there were significantly lower rates of stroke following PCI as compared to after CABG during the in-hospital period (OR = 0.20, 95% CI [0.09–0.44]; I^2 = 0%; p < 0.0001), after 30 days (OR = 0.31, 95% CI [0.18–0.54]; I^2 = 0%; p < 0.0001), in our short term follow-up OR = 0.55, 95% CI [0.38–0.81]; I^2 = 1%; p = 0.002), intermediate follow-up (OR = 0.54, 95% CI [0.42–0.70]; I^2 = 22%; p < 0.0001) and very long term follow-up. (OR = 0.47, 95% CI [0.23 – 0.94]; I^2 = 49%; p = 0.03). Although the rates of stroke following PCI were lesser than those following CABG in our long term follow-up as well, this difference was not found to be statistically significant. (OR = 0.69, 95% CI [0.47 – 1.03] I^2 = 55; p = 0.07).

5. Discussion

Treatment selection for unprotected left main artery disease remains a contentious issue. Several meta-analyses, including RCTs with short...
Table 1
Characteristics of the included studies.

| Author          | Year     | Study design | PCI (n) | CABG (n) | Region     | Outcome                                                                 |
|-----------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Palmerini 2006  | 2006     | Observational| 157     | 154      | Italy      | Mortality, Cardiac Mortality, MI, TLR                                    |
| Palmerini 2007  | 2007     | Observational| 98      | 161      | Italy      | Mortality, Cardiac Mortality, MI, TLR                                    |
| Lee [17]        | 2007     | Observational| 50      | 123      | USA        | MACCE, death, myocardial infarction, urgent TVR, cerebrovascular events, VT / VF, requirement for pacemaker, renal failure, vessel perforation, cardiac tamponade, bleeding |
| Sanmartin [18]  | 2007     | Observational| 96      | 245      | Spain      | Death, Q-wave MI, Cerebrovascular events, Repeat revascularization, MACCE |
| Brener [19]     | 2008     | Observational| 97      | 190      | USA        | Mortality                                                                |
| C Wu [20]       | 2008     | Observational| 135     | 135      | USA        | Death, Repeat Revascularization                                         |
| LEMANS Trial    | 2008-2016| RCT          | 52      | 53       | America    | MACCE, Death, MI, Stroke, Major bleeding                                |
| MAIN-COMPARE    | 2008-2018| Observational| 1102    | 1138     | Korea      | MACCE, Death, MI, Stroke, Repeat Revascularization                      |
| Makkikalio [27]| 2008     | Observational| 49      | 238      | Finland    | Death, Stroke, MI, Repeat Revascularization, MACCE                      |
| Ritter [28]     | 2008     | Observational| 95      | 205      | Germany    | MACCE, all cause death, cardiac death, cerebrovascular events, TLR      |
| Rodes-Cabau [29]| 2008     | Observational| 104     | 105      | Canada     | MACCE, all cause death, MI, Revascularization, Cerebrovascular events, Life threatening arrhythmias, new onset atrial fibrillation, acute renal failure, any bleeding, pleural effusion, respiratory distress, pneumonia |
| White [30]      | 2008     | Observational| 67      | 67       | USA        | MACCE, All cause mortality                                              |
| Cheng [31]      | 2009     | Observational| 147     | 216      | Taiwan     | MACCE, All cause mortality, TLR, Cardiac Death, Acute Renal Failure, Ventricular Tachycardia |
| Ghenim [32]     | 2009     | Observational| 105     | 106      | France     | MACCE, Repeat Revascularization                                         |
| ASAN-MAIN (DES) | 2010     | Observational| 176     | 219      | Korea      | Death, Repeat revascularization, Composite point of MI, stroke and TVR |
| Chieffo [34]    | 2010     | Observational| 107     | 142      | Italy      | MACCE, Death, Cardiac Death, MI, TLV, TVR, Cerebrovascular events       |
| Kang [35]       | 2010     | Observational| 205     | 257      | Korea      | All cause death, Cardiac death, Myocardial Infarction, TVR, MACCE       |
| Shimizu [36]    | 2010     | Observational| 64      | 89       | Japan      | MACCE, Death, MI, Stroke, Repeat revascularization, Hospitalization costs |
| SYNTAX [37-40]  | 2010-2014| RCT          | 357     | 348      | 17 countries | MACCE, Death, Cardiac mortality, MI, Repeat revascularization, Death, TVR, MACCE, MI, Stroke |
| Wu [41]         | 2010     | Observational| 131     | 245      | China      | MACCE, Death, Cardiac death, MI, Repeat revascularization, Composite point of MI, stroke and TVR |
| Anan Multivessel | 2011     | Observational| 178     | 372      | Korea      | Death, Repeat revascularization, Composite point of MI, stroke and TVR |
| Boudriot [43]   | 2011     | RCT          | 100     | 101      | Germany    | Death, MI, TVR, Any major adverse cardiac event                          |
| CUSTOMIZE [44,45]| 2011     | Observational| 285     | 361      | Italy      | Major adverse cardiac events, All-cause death, Cardiac Death, MI, TVR, TLR |

(continued on next page)
Table 1 (continued)

| Author | Year       | Study design | PCI (n) | CABG (n) | Region            | Outcome                                                                 | FU (y) |
|--------|------------|--------------|---------|----------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| PRECOMBAT Study [46-48] | 2011–2015 | RCT          | 300     | 300      | South Korea       | MACCE, MI, Stroke, Death, TVR, Cardiac mortality, Repeat revascularization, Stent thrombosis or symptomatic graft occlusion | 2      |
| Zhao [49] | 2011      | Observational | 56      | 116      | China             | MACCE, death, cardiac tamponade, acute MI, acute left heart failure, requirement for pacemaker, VT / VF, pleural effusion, postoperative pneumothorax, shock, required dialysis, repeat thoracotomy, bleeding, vascular hematoma, target vessel revascularization, cerebrovascular events, major adverse cardiac events | ≥ 2    |
| Chang [50] | 2012      | Observational | 558     | 309      | Korea             | MACCE, Death, MI, Repeat Revascularization, Stroke                        | 5      |
|             | 2012–2015 | Observational | 365     | 640      | Japan             | Death, MI, Stroke, Cardiac death, Repeat revascularization                | 5      |
| CREDO-KYOTO [51,52] |           |              |         |          |                   |                                                                         |        |
| DELTA [53] | 2012      | Observational | 1874    | 900      | 7 countries       | Cardiac death, Non cardiac death, MI, TLR, TVR, Cerebrovascular Accident, MACCE | ≥ 1    |
| Kawecki [54] | 2012      | Observational | 88      | 111      | Poland            | MACCE, Death, Stroke, ACS                                               | ≥ 1    |
|             | 2012      | Observational | 128     | 128      | Korea             | MACCE, TVR, MI, Stroke                                                  | 5      |
| Gao [56] | 2013      | Observational | 154     | 154      | China             | All-Cause Mortality, MI, TVR, Stroke                                    | ≥ 2    |
| Jeong [57] | 2016      | Observational | 159     | 159      | South Korea       | MACCE including death, stroke, acute myocardial infarction and target-vessel revascularization | ≥ 4    |
| Qin [58] | 2013      | Observational | 233     | 282      | China             |                                         | ≥ 2    |
| Yin [59] | 2015      | Observational | 106     | 121      | China             | MACCE, MI, Stroke, Death, Cardiac mortality                             | 1      |
| EXCEL Trial [60,61] | 2016      | RCT          | 948     | 957      | All world         | Death, Stroke, Cardiac mortality, MI, Repeat revascularization, TVR, Major bleeding | 5      |
| Lu [62] | 2016      | Observational | 208     | 270      | Taiwan            | MACCE, All Cause Death, Repeat Revascularization, MI, Stroke, Stent Thrombosis | 5      |
| NOBLE study [63,64] | 2016      | RCT          | 592     | 592      | Northern Europe   | Death, Cardiac mortality, All-cause mortality, MI, TVR, Stroke, Repeat revascularization | 5      |
| Wei [65] | 2016      | Observational | 64      | 62       | China             | Cardiac death, Stroke, MACCE                                           | ≥ 1    |

Yu [66] | 2016 | Observational | 465 | 457 | China | MACCE, MI, Stroke, Death, Repeat revascularization, Cardiac mortality | 10 |
| Zheng [67] | 2016 | Observational | 1442 | 2604 | China | All-cause death, Cardiac mortality, MI, Stroke, Repeat revascularization, TVR | 3 |
| IRIS-MAIN [68,69] | 2017 | Observational | 2850 | 2337 | South Korea | MACCE, Death, MI, Stroke, Repeat Revascularization | 5 |
| Coughlan [70] | 2018 | Observational | 27 | 29 | Ireland | MACCE, All Cause Mortality, Stroke, MI, Repeat Revascularization | 3 |
| Gripenburg [71] | 2018 | Observational | 94 | 183 | Sweden | All-cause death, MI, Cerebrovascular Accident (CVA), Repeat Revascularization and major bleeding leading to hospital admission. | ≥ 2 |
| Lin [72] | 2018 | Observational | 84 | 101 | Taiwan | | 3.5 |

(continued on next page)
follow-up periods or observational studies, validated using PCI as a safe and effective alternative over CABG in patients with left artery disease.

We accommodated a large number of observational studies and RCTs with a longer follow-up in our study to resolve any discrepancies and overcome deficits in the literature, enhancing generalizability and reliability of our results [86-88]. To our knowledge, our meta-analysis comprising of 57 studies (7 RCTs and 50 observational studies), and 56,701 patients is the largest ever conducted on this topic. It is also the first meta-analysis on this topic to provide data for adverse outcomes for a 10 year follow-up. Most previous meta-analyses done on this topic only included RCTs, but by considering both RCTs and observational studies, our study provides a more accurate representation of data in clinical settings. Our study also provides updated data from major RCTs (such as the SYNTAX [40], EXCEL [61] and NOBLE [64] trials), that have recently provided data for updated longer follow-up lengths.

Our subgroup analysis suggests that PCI is safer than CABG in terms of stroke in both short-term and long-term follow-up (1–5 years). However, CABG produced significant outcomes in the pooled analysis of MI and repeat revascularization compared to PCI. The results were statistically significant, especially in the long-term follow up (≥1 year). The results proposed that compared to PCI, CABG was associated with higher rates of in-hospital mortality; however, no significant differences were discerned in the rates of all-cause mortality on follow-up duration in patients undergoing PCI or CABG. Major adverse cardiac and cerebrovascular events were detected on long-term follow up (1–5 years) in patients who underwent PCI.

CABG carries a lower risk of mortality in cardiovascular fit individuals. However, the mortality rate associated with CABG increases significantly in older individuals, those requiring repeat vascularization, or those with comorbidities like diabetes and chronic kidney disease [89]. Having said this, previous studies have shown CABG to be safer over PCI in the geriatric population with cardiovascular diseases [90]. This is likely to be due to the fact that these patients have other significant comorbidities that reduce the effectiveness of treatment using stenting. Likewise, data from the BARI (Bypass Angioplasty Revascularization Intervention) trial also supports bypass surgery over PCI for "

| Author          | Year | Study design | PCI (n) | CABG (n) | Region     | Outcome                                                                 |
|-----------------|------|--------------|---------|----------|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Lopez-Aguilar   | 2018 | Observational| 48      | 50       | Mexico     | MACCE, All Cause Mortality, Stroke, MI, Repeat Revascularization, New permanent hemodialysis |
| Obeid           | 2018 | RCT          | 45      | 25       | Switzerland| MACCE, MI, all-cause death, cardiac death, myocardial infarction, Repeat Revascularization, cerebrovascular accident, reoperation for bleeding |
| Ram             | 2018 | Observational| 67      | 185      | Israel     | NACE, MACCE, Moderate GUMBO bleeding                                      |
| Su              | 2018 | Observational| 186     | 286      | Taiwan     | MACCE, MI, all-cause death, TVR                                          |
| Milan           | 2019 | Observational| 11      | 84       | Netherlands| Death, Repeat Revascularization or Death                                 |
| Slim            | 2019 | Observational| 109     | 102      | Tunisia    | MACCE, All Cause Mortality, Stroke, MI, Repeat Revascularization         |
| Sliman          | 2019 | Observational| 74      | 65       | Isreal     | MI, Stroke, Repeat Revascularization, Death                               |
| Trasca          | 2019 | Observational| 38      | 45       | Romania    | Angina Pectoris, Non fatal MI, All Cause Mortality, LVEF, Repeat Revascularization |
| Joy             | 2020 | Observational| 14      | 74       | United Kingdom | MACCE, All Cause Mortality, Stroke, MI, TVR                               |
| Pan             | 2020 | Observational| 511     | 473      | China      | MACCE, All Cause Death, Cardiac Death, MI, Stroke, TVR                    |
| Song            | 2020 | Observational| 149     | 273      | South Korea| MACCE, MI, All Cause Death, Stroke, TVR                                  |
| Mohamed         | 2021 | Observational| 13,994  | 8241     | United Kingdom | In-hospital & 30 day mortality                                         |
| Xun Wang        | 2021 | Observational| 161     | 207      | China      | MACCE                                                                  |

Abbreviations: PCI = percutaneous coronary intervention; CABG = coronary artery bypass grafting; FU = follow-up; RCT = randomized control trial; MI = myocardial infarction; TLR = target lesion revascularization; TVR = target vessel revascularization; VT = ventricular tachycardia; VF = ventricular fibrillation; ACS = acute coronary syndrome; CVA = cerebrovascular accident; MACCE = Major adverse cardiac and cerebrovascular events; MACE = Major adverse cardiac, cerebrovascular and renal events.
Fig. 3. Forest plot for Stroke outcome in percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) versus coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) for unprotected left main coronary artery disease for varying follow-up lengths.
drastically across studies hence, clinical end-points were studied at to reduce morbidity and mortality. Fourthly, the follow-up period varied comparing PCI and CABG although pharmacological treatment is known different time intervals (i.e., in-hospital, 30-days, 1-year, 1 erogeneity among studies, however heterogeneity remained unchanged.

Our endeavors were limited in several aspects. Firstly, substantial heterogeneity was recognized in sub-group analysis because of variation in study characteristics, differences in definitions of outcomes, particularly MI and repeat revascularization, and the type of coronary stents used. A random-effect meta-analysis was incorporated to address heterogeneity among studies, however heterogeneity remained unchanged. Secondly, few studies did not indicate the type of stent employed. Thirdly, adjunctive medical therapy was not taken into account while comparing PCI and CABG although pharmacological treatment is known to reduce morbidity and mortality. Fourthly, the follow-up period varied drastically across studies hence, clinical end-points were studied at different time intervals (i.e., in-hospital, 30-days, 1-year, 1-5 years, 5 years, and ≥ 10-years). Lastly, clinical health records of individual patients were not accessible to measure the benefits of each revascularization strategy.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, PCI can be considered as a safe alternative over CABG, especially for patients with stroke in the short, intermediate, and very long term follow-ups. CABG however is associated with a lower risk of restenosis in healthy patients. No significant difference was seen in PCI vs CABG in rates of all-cause mortality for most follow-up lengths. However, further research is required for determining whether PCI is a safer alternative over CABG when it comes to preventing episodes of myocardial infarction post-surgery.
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