

## **BIFURCATION LEFT MAIN STENTING WITH OR WITHOUT INTRACORONARY IMAGING: OUTCOMES FROM THE EBC MAIN TRIAL**

**Short title:** Intracoronary imaging and left main bifurcation PCI

**Authors:** Annette Maznyczka PhD<sup>a</sup>, Sandeep Arunothayaraj MD<sup>b</sup>, Mohaned Egred MD<sup>c</sup>, Adrian Banning MD<sup>d</sup>, Philippe Brunel MD<sup>e</sup>, Mirosław Ferenc MD<sup>f</sup>, Thomas Hovasse MD<sup>g</sup>, Adrian Włodarczak PhD<sup>h</sup>, Manuel Pan PhD<sup>i</sup>, Thomas Schmitz MD<sup>j</sup>, Marc Silvestri MD<sup>k</sup>, Andrejs Erglis MD<sup>l</sup>, Evgeny Kretov PhD<sup>m</sup>, Jens Flensted Lassen PhD<sup>n</sup>, Alaide Chieffo MD<sup>o</sup>, Thierry Lefevre MD<sup>g</sup>, Francesco Burzotta MD<sup>p</sup>, James Cockburn MD<sup>b</sup>, Olivier Darremont MD<sup>q</sup>, Goran Stankovic PhD<sup>r</sup>, Marie-Claude Morice MD<sup>g</sup>, Yves Louvard MD<sup>g</sup>, David Hildick-Smith MD<sup>b</sup> for the EBC MAIN (European Bifurcation Club Left Main Coronary Stent study) investigators.

### **Institutions:**

<sup>a</sup>Leeds General Infirmary, Leeds, UK.

<sup>b</sup>Sussex Cardiac Centre, Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals, Brighton, UK.

<sup>c</sup>Freeman Hospital, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK.

<sup>d</sup>John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford, UK.

<sup>e</sup>Hopital Prive, Dijon, France.

<sup>f</sup>Universitäts-Herzzentrum Bad Krozingen, Bad Krozingen, Germany.

<sup>g</sup>Institute Cardiovasculaire Paris Sud, Massy France.

<sup>h</sup>Poland Miedziowe Centrum Zdrowia Lubin, Lubin, Poland.

<sup>i</sup>Department of Cardiology, Reina Sofia Hospital, University of Cordoba, (IMIBIC), Cordoba, Spain.

<sup>j</sup>Elisabeth Hospital Essen, Essen, Germany.

<sup>k</sup>Clinique Axiom, Aix en Provence, France.

<sup>l</sup>Paul Stradins University hospital, Riga, Latvia

<sup>m</sup>Sibirsky Federal Biomedical Research Center Novosibirsk, Russia.

<sup>n</sup>Rigshospitalet University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark.

<sup>o</sup>San Raffaele Scientific Institute, Milan, Italy.

<sup>p</sup>Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Rome, Italy.

<sup>q</sup>Clinique Saint-Augustin-Elsan, 114 Avenue d'Ares, Bordeaux 33200, France.

<sup>r</sup>Department of Cardiology, Clinical Centre of Serbia, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia.

### **Correspondence:**

Dr Annette Maznyczka, Yorkshire Heart Centre, Leeds General Infirmary, Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, Great George Street, Leeds, LS1 3EX, UK. Telephone: +44-0113-2432799. E.mail: [amaznyczka@nhs.net](mailto:amaznyczka@nhs.net).

**Clinical Trial Registration:** ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier NCT02497014

**Word count: 2001 (from introduction to conclusion)**

## **Funding**

This work was supported by the Educational and Research Grant from Medtronic Europe.

## **Disclosures**

D.H-S. Proctor/Advisory Boston, Abbott, Medtronic, Terumo, Edwards, Occlutech, Gore; CERC.

M.E.: Honorarium, proctorship and speaker fees from Abbott, Boston Scientific, Terumo, Phillips, Vascular Perspectives, Teleflex and Miracor.

A.C.: Consultant Abiomed, Biosensor, Magenta; Speakers fees Abbott vascular, Abiomed, Boston Scientific, Cardinal Health.

T.L.: Abbott Proctoring, Edwards Proctoring, Lectures, Boston scientific, Terumo Proctoring, lectures, Medtronic speaker fees.

M.-C.M.: CERC CEO.

M.P.: Lecture fees Abbott, Boston, Philips, Asahi

J.F.L.: Lecturing and Honoraria for Medtronic, Boston Scientific, Biotronik, Biosensors.

A.B.: Lecture fees Boston.

G.S.: Speaker fees Abbott, Terumo, Boston Scientific, Medtronic

A.E. Grant support Abbott, Boston Scientific

O.D.: Lecture fees for Boston and Edwards.

All other authors report no conflicts of interest.

## **Abstract**

**Background:** The impact of intracoronary imaging on outcomes, after provisional versus dual-stenting for bifurcation left main (LM) lesions, is unknown.

**Objectives:** We investigated the effect of intracoronary imaging in the EBC MAIN trial (European Bifurcation Club Left Main Coronary Stent study).

**Methods:** 467 patients were randomised to dual-stenting or a stepwise provisional strategy. 455 patients were included. Intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) or optical coherence tomography (OCT) was undertaken at the operator's discretion. The primary endpoint was death, myocardial infarction or target vessel revascularisation at 1-year.

**Results:** Intracoronary imaging was undertaken in 179 patients (39%; IVUS n=151, OCT n=28). As a result of IVUS findings, operators re-intervened in 42 procedures. The primary outcome did not differ with intracoronary imaging versus angiographic-guidance alone (17% vs. 16%; odds ratio (OR): 1.09 [95% confidence interval (CI): 0.66-1.82] p=0.738), nor for re-intervention based on IVUS versus none (14% vs. 16%; OR: 0.86 [95% CI: 0.35-2.12] p=0.745). With angiographic-guidance only, primary outcome events were more frequent with dual versus provisional stenting (21% vs. 10%; OR: 2.24 [95% CI: 1.13-4.45] p=0.022). With intracoronary imaging, there were numerically fewer primary outcome events with dual versus provisional stenting (13% vs. 21%; OR: 0.54 [95% CI: 0.24-1.22] p=0.137).

**Conclusions:** In EBC MAIN, the primary outcome did not differ between patients who did or did not have intracoronary imaging. However, in patients without intracoronary imaging, outcomes were worse with a dual-stent than provisional strategy, and when intracoronary imaging was used, there was a trend toward better outcomes with the dual-stent than provisional strategy.

## **Key words**

Bifurcation

Left main

Percutaneous coronary intervention

Intravascular ultrasound

Optical coherence tomography

## **Condensed abstract**

We investigated whether intracoronary imaging during LM bifurcation stenting was associated with less death, myocardial infarction and revascularisation at 1 year, for patients undergoing systematic dual versus stepwise provisional stenting. We included 455 patients from the EBC MAIN trial; 39% had intracoronary imaging. Overall, outcomes were similar between patients who did or did not have intracoronary imaging. In those with angiographic guidance only, outcomes were worse with dual versus provisional stenting (21% vs. 10%; OR: 2.24 [95% CI: 1.13-4.45] p=0.022). In those with intracoronary imaging, there was a trend toward better outcomes with dual versus provisional stenting (13% vs. 21%).

## **Abbreviations**

IVUS = intravascular ultrasound

LM = Left main

MACE = major adverse cardiac events

MI = myocardial infarction

OCT = optical coherence tomography

OR = odds ratio

PCI = percutaneous coronary intervention

SD = standard deviation

TVR = target vessel revascularization

TIMI = Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction

## Introduction

Left main (LM) bifurcation lesions may require demanding stenting techniques, with an increased risk of sub-optimal results(1). When angiography alone is used to guide percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) it can be difficult to determine plaque calcification, atherosclerosis burden(2, 3) stent under-expansion and stent malapposition(4). Use of intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) or optical coherence tomography (OCT) may be associated with better stent expansion and fewer major adverse cardiac events (MACE) compared with angiography guidance alone (4-7).

Evidence from non-randomized studies(8-12) indicates that IVUS use in LM PCI is associated with lower mortality and that the benefit is most evident with complex lesions(8, 13). Moreover, the randomized ULTIMATE trial (Intravascular Ultrasound Guided Drug Eluting Stents Implantation in “All-Comers” Coronary Lesions), which included ~55% LM lesions, showed lower rates of target vessel failure and stent thrombosis with use of IVUS. (14).

The EBC MAIN trial (European Bifurcation Club Left Main Coronary Stent Study) showed a trend to better clinical outcomes with provisional stenting compared to upfront dual-stenting for LM bifurcations(15). Our aim was to determine whether intracoronary imaging during LM bifurcation PCI was associated with less death, myocardial infarction (MI) and target vessel revascularization (TVR), for patients treated with a dual-stenting strategy versus provisional stepwise approach. We also aimed to determine the effect of intracoronary imaging on clinical outcomes, in relation to: extent of lesion calcification, lesion length in the side vessel, and stent length in the main vessel.

## **Methods**

### ***Trial Design***

We performed a sub-analysis within the EBC MAIN trial. It was an investigator-led prospective, randomized, multicentre trial, involving 31 centres from 11 European countries. The trial was administered and overseen by the Cardiovascular European Research centre (CERC, Massy, France) and the study was supported by an unrestricted educational grant from Medtronic. The trial complied with the Declaration of Helsinki and the study protocol was approved by the relevant authorities in all countries involved in the study.

Details of the trial design and eligibility criteria have been published previously(15). In brief, from 2016 to 2019, patients who required PCI for unprotected bifurcation LM disease (Medina type 1,1,1 or 0,1,1) were randomised to a provisional single stent group, or to upfront dual-stenting. For patients in the systematic dual-stent group, the stent technique undertaken was at the operator's discretion. In the EBC MAIN trial, 53% of patients randomized to the systematic dual-stent strategy had culotte stenting, 32% had T or TAP, 5% had DK Crush stenting, and 5% had no stent implanted in the side vessel. IVUS or OCT was undertaken at the operator's discretion. The Onyx® zotarolimus-eluting stent (Medtronic) was used. Aspirin 75mg daily was continued long-term. Clopidogrel 75mg daily was given for at least 6 months (or appropriate dose of ticagrelor or prasugrel).

### ***Clinical outcomes***

The clinical outcome data were adjudicated by the clinical events committee. The primary outcome was a composite of all-cause death, MI, and TVR at 1 year. The definitions for MI and TVR used in the trial have been described previously(15).

### *Statistical analysis*

Twelve patients were excluded from the analysis because of missing information on whether intracoronary imaging was undertaken (n=9), or because stenting of the left main was not performed (n=3). Normally distributed continuous data were summarized using mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (SD). Categorical variables were reported as frequency and percentages. The trial endpoints were assessed using logistic regression. Regression models were used to assess treatment effects through interactions. We pre-specified the following sub-groups of interest according to procedural characteristics hypothesized to affect any association between intracoronary imaging use and the primary outcome: (i) bifurcation PCI strategy (dual-stent vs. provisional); (ii) lesion length in side vessel (<10mm vs.  $\geq$ 10mm)(16); (iii) stent length in main vessel (<28mm vs.  $\geq$ 28mm)(17) and (iv) angiographically defined extent of calcification (moderate-severe vs. none-mild)(16). All tests were assessed at the 5% significance level. There were no adjustments for multiple statistical comparisons. Statistics were performed using SPSS version 28.

## **Results**

### *Population*

The patient characteristics are shown in Tables 1 and 2. The flow of subjects through the study is shown in Figure 1. Of 455 patients included in this analysis, 226 patients were in the group randomized to the provisional stepwise approach, and 229 were in the group randomized to the systematic dual-stent approach. The mean age was  $71.2 \pm 9.8$  years and 77% were male. The procedural indication was stable angina in 63%, and acute coronary syndrome in 37%.

Intracoronary imaging was used in 179 participants (39%; IVUS n=151, 33%; OCT n=28, 6%). The use of intracoronary imaging was similarly common with the stepwise provisional strategy (40%) as with the systematic dual-stent approach (38%). At the start of the case, operators planned to perform IVUS in 33% of procedures. Among the participants who had IVUS, 87 (58%) had both main vessel and side vessel imaged, and 64 (42%) had one vessel imaged. As a result of IVUS findings, operators reintervened with a balloon or stent in 42 procedures (28%), 28 of these procedures were in the stepwise provisional group, whereas 14 were in the systematic dual-stent group.

Lesions had severe coronary calcification in 98 participants (22%), and moderate calcification in 124 (27%). Calcified lesions ( $\geq$  moderately calcified) were less prevalent among patients who underwent intracoronary imaging than those who had angiography guidance only (42.5%, vs. 52.9%,  $p=0.030$ ). In the group randomized to dual-stenting, there were again fewer calcified lesions in those who had intracoronary imaging than those who did not (44.3% vs. 58.9%,  $p=0.032$ ), whereas in the provisional group there was no difference in lesion calcification between those who had intracoronary imaging or not (Table 2).

Notably, intracoronary imaging use was associated with longer procedure duration ( $90.5 \pm 36.7$  mins vs.  $68.7 \pm 35.4$  mins,  $p<0.001$ ), but was not associated with increased contrast volume, or radiation dose (Table 2). Furthermore, LM lesion length was on average longer in patients who underwent intracoronary imaging compared to those who had angiography guidance only ( $6.9 \pm 3.2$  vs.  $6.0 \pm 2.8$ ,  $p=0.003$ ).



### ***Clinical outcomes***

The primary outcome (all-cause death, MI or TVR) occurred in 73 participants (16%) at 1 year. Overall, the primary outcome did not differ for patients who had intracoronary imaging versus angiography-guidance (17% vs. 16%; OR: 1.09 [95% CI: 0.66, 1.82] p=0.738).

Similarly, the primary outcome did not differ for participants who had re-intervention based on IVUS findings compared to the rest of the participants (14% vs. 16%; OR: 0.86 [95% CI: 0.35, 2.12] p=0.745).

There was a significant interaction between intracoronary imaging use and LM bifurcation PCI strategy, with respect to the primary outcome (p=0.009, Table 3). In those who did not have intracoronary imaging, the prevalence of the primary outcome was higher with the systematic dual approach compared to the stepwise provisional approach (21% vs. 10%; OR: 2.24 [95% CI: 1.13, 4.45] p=0.022) (Figure 2). In those who had intracoronary imaging, there was a trend toward a lower prevalence of the primary outcome with the systematic dual approach compared to the stepwise provisional approach (13% vs. 21%; OR: 0.54 [95% CI: 0.24, 1.22] p=0.137). There was also a significant interaction between intracoronary imaging use and LM bifurcation PCI strategy with respect to MI and periprocedural MI (p=0.015 and p=0.035 respectively, Table 3). There were no interactions with intracoronary imaging use, the primary outcome, and the following: (i) extent of calcification; (ii) lesion length in the side vessel, or (iii) stent length in the main vessel (Table 4).

### **Discussion**

The main findings of our study are:

- 1) The primary outcome did not differ for patients who had intracoronary imaging vs. angiography guidance (17% vs. 16%; OR: 1.09 [95% CI: 0.66, 1.82] p=0.738).

- 2) The primary outcome did not differ for participants who had re-intervention based on IVUS findings compared to the rest of the participants (14% vs.16%; OR: 0.86 [95% CI: 0.35, 2.12] p=0.745).
- 3) In patients where no intracoronary imaging was undertaken, primary outcome events were more frequent with the systematic dual-stent strategy compared to the provisional approach.
- 4) When intracoronary imaging was used, there was a trend toward fewer primary outcome events with the systematic dual-stent strategy compared to the provisional approach.

These findings are not uniform, but suggest that intravascular imaging may be important to optimize the results from a dual-stent strategy during LM bifurcation PCI. This is in accordance with previous non-left-main bifurcation studies which have shown that IVUS guidance for bifurcations treated with a dual-stent technique was associated with lower rates of MI and late stent thrombosis than angiographic guidance(18), and that IVUS guidance for bifurcation PCI was associated with lower rates of cardiac death and MI, compared to angiography-guidance(19).

Among participants who underwent the stepwise provisional approach, we unexpectedly observed more primary outcome events when intracoronary imaging was used, than with angiography guidance (20.9% vs. 10.4%). This might have occurred because operators in the stepwise provisional group opted to use IVUS or OCT in cases where the procedure was not progressing smoothly.

Even though intravascular imaging use in the EBC MAIN population may be lower than expected given current guideline recommendations(20), it represents real-life current practice, across multiple high volume European sites during the recruitment period (2016 to 2019). In the DKCRUSH-V trial IVUS use was similar at 41%(21). Furthermore, data from 11264 unprotected LM PCIs, from the British Cardiovascular Intervention Society national database, showed that intracoronary imaging was used in 50% of cases in 2014(11). The limited uptake of intracoronary imaging worldwide may be partly due to perceived increased procedural times(22) and costs(23), and inadequate training(24). Indeed, in our study the procedure duration was on average 22 minutes longer among patients who underwent intracoronary imaging, than in those who did not.

There are several trials hoping to clarify the role of imaging in bifurcation coronary disease. The OPTIMAL trial (optimization of left main PCI with intravascular ultrasound, NCT04111770) is randomizing patients to IVUS or angiogram guidance for LM PCI, and is using standardized IVUS criteria that define adequate stent optimization. The DKCRUSH VIII trial (IVUS Guided DK Crush Stenting Technique for Patients with Complex Bifurcation Lesions, NCT03770650) is comparing the composite of cardiac death, MI or TVR at 1-year for an IVUS-guided vs. angiography-guided dual-stent strategy for complex bifurcation lesions, according to DEFINITION criteria(16), including LM bifurcations. The OCTOBER trial (European Trial on Optical Coherence Tomography Optimised Bifurcation Event Reduction; NCT03171311) is comparing 2-year MACE for OCT- vs. angiography-guided bifurcation stenting, in LM or non-LM disease. The ILUMIEN IV trial is comparing OCT- vs. angiography-guided PCI, in complex lesions including non-left-main bifurcations treated with a dual-stent strategy (NCT03507777).

A clear limitation of this study is the fact that patients were not randomly allocated to the use of intravascular imaging. Therefore, there is selection bias inherent in the results we have demonstrated. Additionally, because this study was not principally concerned with intravascular imaging, criteria for optimal stent deployment were not recorded after performing IVUS. It is unclear if adequate stent optimization was achieved in all patients. Future studies are needed to validate and standardize IVUS-guided stent optimization methods. Furthermore, although we had data on whether operators re-intervened based on IVUS findings, we did not have information on whether operators re-intervened based on OCT findings. Importantly, the rates of the primary outcome limited power to detect statistically significant associations. Hence, the study was underpowered to detect significant interactions between intracoronary imaging use, the primary outcome, and additional factors. Finally, although intracoronary imaging use was a pre-specified sub-group, no adjustment for multiplicity was made in this analysis. Due to the potential for type 1 statistical error, the findings of this analysis should be interpreted as exploratory and not definitive.

## **Conclusions**

In conclusion, in the EBC MAIN trial, the primary outcome did not differ between patients who did or did not have intracoronary imaging, nor for those who had re-intervention based on IVUS findings. However, in patients where no intracoronary imaging was undertaken, clinical outcomes were worse with the systematic dual-stent strategy compared to the provisional approach, and when intracoronary imaging was used, there was a trend toward better clinical outcomes with the systematic dual-stent strategy compared to the provisional approach.

## **Impact on daily practice**

When angiography is used to guide PCI there can be unrecognized stent under-expansion. Observational studies and subgroup analyses from clinical trials suggest potential benefit from IVUS use during LM PCI, however, the value of IVUS has never been proven in appropriately powered randomized trials. In this study, overall there was no difference in clinical outcomes between intracoronary imaging use and angiogram guidance, during LM bifurcation PCI. However, not using intracoronary imaging may worsen outcomes for dual-stent, compared to single-stent approaches. This suggests that intracoronary imaging might be important to optimize results particularly from dual-stent strategies. Future studies are needed to validate and standardize IVUS-guided stent optimization methods, and future studies comparing IVUS- vs. angiography-guided PCI should include standardized criteria that define adequate stent optimization.

## Acknowledgements

We want to acknowledge and thank the support of the European Bifurcation Club with all its members: Dr Remo Albiero, Dr Adrian Banning, Dr Francesco Burzotta, Dr Yiannis Chatzizisis, Dr Alaide Chieffo, Dr Olivier Darremont, Dr Mirosław Ferenc, Dr David Hildick-Smith, Dr Tom Johnson, Dr Jens Lassen, Dr Thierry Lefevre, Dr Yves Louvard, Dr Manuel Pan, and Dr Goran Stankovic. We also acknowledge Dr Anno Diegeler, Dr Norbert Frey, Dr Jan Tijssen as DSMB members and Dr Jacques Machecourt, Dr Lisette O. Jensen and Dr Jose R. Rumoroso as CEC members. We thank all the CERC Team, including Dr Marie-Claude Morice, Alice Popineau, Laure Morsiani, Benedicte Borsik, and Dr Antoinette Neylon and her Corelab Team for the analyses performed. We thank all the principle investigators at each site: Dr Adrian Wlodarczak, Dr Adrian Banning, Dr Philippe Brunel, Dr Francesco Burzotta, Dr Alaide Chieffo, Dr Evald Christiansen, Dr Gerald Clesham, Dr David Hildick-Smith, Dr Mohaned Egred, Dr Andrejs Erglis, Dr Evgeny Kretov, Dr Jean Fajadet, Dr Mirosław Ferenc, Dr Frédéric Bouisset, Dr Thomas Hovasse, Dr René Koning, Dr Krzysztof Reczuch, Dr Marc Silvestri, Dr Monica Masotti, Dr Lindsay Mitchell, Dr Darren Mylotte, Dr Olivier Darremont, Dr Manuel Pan, Dr Pierluigi Omede', Dr Simon Redwood, Dr Antonieta Serra, Dr Mark Spence, Dr Goran Stankovic, Dr Thomas Enstroem, Dr Thomas Schmitz, and Dr Beatriz Vaquerizo. We thank Medtronic for the grant which allowed us to undertake this trial. Finally, the contribution of all the patients who willingly participated in this study is gratefully acknowledged.

## References

1. Garot P, Lefevre T, Savage M, Louvard Y, Bamlet WR, Willerson JT, Morice MC, Holmes DR. Nine-month outcome of patients treated by percutaneous coronary interventions for bifurcation lesions in the recent era: a report from the Prevention of Restenosis with Tranilast and its Outcomes (PRESTO) trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2005;46(4):606-12.
2. Mintz GS, Painter JA, Pichard AD, Kent KM, Satler LF, Popma JJ, Chuang YC, Bucher TA, Sokolowicz LE, Leon MB. Atherosclerosis in angiographically "normal" coronary artery reference segments: an intravascular ultrasound study with clinical correlations. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 1995;25(7):1479-85.
3. Mintz GS, Popma JJ, Pichard AD, Kent KM, Satler LF, Chuang YC, Ditrano CJ, Leon MB. Patterns of calcification in coronary artery disease. A statistical analysis of intravascular ultrasound and coronary angiography in 1155 lesions. *Circulation*. 1995;91(7):1959-65.
4. Ali ZA, Maehara A, Genereux P, Shlofmitz RA, Fabbicchi F, Nazif TM, Guagliumi G, Meraj PM, Alfonso F, Samady H, Akasaka T, Carlson EB, Leeser MA, Matsumura M, Ozan MO, Mintz GS, Ben-Yehuda O, Stone GW. Optical coherence tomography compared with intravascular ultrasound and with angiography to guide coronary stent implantation (ILUMIEN III: OPTIMIZE PCI): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2016;388(10060):2618-28.
5. Gao XF, Wang ZM, Wang F, Gu Y, Ge Z, Kong XQ, Zuo GF, Zhang JJ, Chen SL. Intravascular ultrasound guidance reduces cardiac death and coronary revascularization in patients undergoing drug-eluting stent implantation: results from a meta-analysis of 9 randomised trials and 4724 patients. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2019;35(2):239-47.
6. Zhang J, Gao X, Kan J, Ge Z, Han L, Lu S, Lu Q, Wu X, Li Q, Liu Z, Chen Y, Qian X, Wang J, Chai D, Chen C, Li X, Gogas BD, Pan T, Shan S, Ye F, Chen SL. Intravascular

Ultrasound Versus Angiography-Guided Drug-Eluting Stent Implantation: The ULTIMATE Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2018;72(24):3126-37.

7. Buccheri S, Franchina G, Romano S, Puglisi S, Venuti G, D'Arrigo P, Francaviglia B, Scalia M, Condorelli A, Barbanti M, Capranzano P, Tamburino C, Capodanno D. Clinical Outcomes Following Intravascular Imaging-Guided Versus Coronary Angiography-Guided Percutaneous Coronary Intervention With Stent Implantation: A Systematic Review and Bayesian Network Meta-Analysis of 31 Studies and 17,882 Patients. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. 2017;10(24):2488-98.

8. Ye Y, Yang M, Zhang S, Zeng Y. Percutaneous coronary intervention in left main coronary artery disease with or without intravascular ultrasound: A meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(6):e0179756.

9. Park SJ, Kim YH, Park DW, Lee SW, Kim WJ, Suh J, Yun SC, Lee CW, Hong MK, Lee JH, Park SW. Impact of intravascular ultrasound guidance on long-term mortality in stenting for unprotected left main coronary artery stenosis. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv*. 2009;2(3):167-77.

10. Andell P, Karlsson S, Mohammad MA, Gotberg M, James S, Jensen J, Frobert O, Angeras O, Nilsson J, Omerovic E, Lagerqvist B, Persson J, Koul S, Erlinge D. Intravascular Ultrasound Guidance Is Associated With Better Outcome in Patients Undergoing Unprotected Left Main Coronary Artery Stenting Compared With Angiography Guidance Alone. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv*. 2017;10(5).

11. Kinnaird T, Johnson T, Anderson R, Gallagher S, Sirker A, Ludman P, de Belder M, Copt S, Oldroyd K, Banning A, Mamas M, Curzen N. Intravascular Imaging and 12-Month Mortality After Unprotected Left Main Stem PCI: An Analysis From the British Cardiovascular Intervention Society Database. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. 2020;13(3):346-57.



12. Tan Q, Wang Q, Liu D, Zhang S, Zhang Y, Li Y. Intravascular ultrasound-guided unprotected left main coronary artery stenting in the elderly. *Saudi Med J*. 2015;36(5):549-53.
13. de la Torre Hernandez JM, Baz Alonso JA, Gomez Hospital JA, Alfonso Manterola F, Garcia Camarero T, Gimeno de Carlos F, Roura Ferrer G, Recalde AS, Martinez-Luengas IL, Gomez Lara J, Hernandez Hernandez F, Perez-Vicayno MJ, Cequier Fillat A, Perez de Prado A, Gonzalez-Trevilla AA, Jimenez Navarro MF, Mauri Ferre J, Fernandez Diaz JA, Pinar Bermudez E, Zueco Gil J. Clinical impact of intravascular ultrasound guidance in drug-eluting stent implantation for unprotected left main coronary disease: pooled analysis at the patient-level of 4 registries. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. 2014;7(3):244-54.
14. Gao XF, Ge Z, Kong XQ, Kan J, Han L, Lu S, Tian NL, Lin S, Lu QH, Wang XY, Li QH, Liu ZZ, Chen Y, Qian XS, Wang J, Chai DY, Chen CH, Pan T, Ye F, Zhang JJ, Chen SL. 3-Year Outcomes of the ULTIMATE Trial Comparing Intravascular Ultrasound Versus Angiography-Guided Drug-Eluting Stent Implantation. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. 2021;14(3):247-57.
15. Hildick-Smith D, Egred M, Banning A, Brunel P, Ferenc M, Hovasse T, Wlodarczak A, Pan M, Schmitz T, Silvestri M, Erglis A, Kretov E, Flensted Lassen J, Chieffo A, Lefevre T, Burzotta F, Cockburn J, Darremont O, Stankovic G, Morice MC, Louvard Y. The European bifurcation club Left Main Coronary Stent study: a randomised comparison of stepwise provisional vs. systematic dual stenting strategies (EBC MAIN). *Eur Heart J*. 2021;42(37):3829-39.
16. Chen SL, Sheiban I, Xu B, Jepson N, Paiboon C, Zhang JJ, Ye F, Sansoto T, Kwan TW, Lee M, Han YL, Lv SZ, Wen SY, Zhang Q, Wang HC, Jiang TM, Wang Y, Chen LL, Tian NL, Cao F, Qiu CG, Zhang YJ, Leon MB. Impact of the complexity of bifurcation lesions treated with drug-eluting stents: the DEFINITION study (Definitions and impact of

complex bifurcation lesions on clinical outcomes after percutaneous coronary intervention using drug-eluting stents). *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2014;7(11):1266-76.

17. Hong SJ, Zhang JJ, Mintz GS, Ahn CM, Kim JS, Kim BK, Ko YG, Choi D, Jang Y, Kan J, Pan T, Gao X, Ge Z, Chen SL, Hong MK. Improved 3-Year Cardiac Survival After IVUS-Guided Long DES Implantation: A Patient-Level Analysis From 2 Randomised Trials. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2022;15(2):208-16.

18. Chen SL, Ye F, Zhang JJ, Tian NL, Liu ZZ, Santoso T, Zhou YJ, Jiang TM, Wen SY, Kwan TW. Intravascular ultrasound-guided systematic two-stent techniques for coronary bifurcation lesions and reduced late stent thrombosis. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* 2013;81(3):456-63.

19. Chen L, Xu T, Xue XJ, Zhang JJ, Ye F, Tian NL, Chen SL. Intravascular ultrasound-guided drug-eluting stent implantation is associated with improved clinical outcomes in patients with unstable angina and complex coronary artery true bifurcation lesions. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2018;34(11):1685-96.

20. Neumann FJ, Sousa-Uva M, Ahlsson A, Alfonso F, Banning AP, Benedetto U, Byrne RA, Collet JP, Falk V, Head SJ, Juni P, Kastrati A, Koller A, Kirstensen SD, Niebauer J, Richter DJ, Seferovic PM, Sibbing D, Stefanini GG, Windecker S, Yadav R, Zembala MO. 2018 ESC/EACTS Guidelines on myocardial revascularization. *Eur Heart J.* 2019;40(2):87-165.


21. Chen SL, Zhang JJ, Han Y, Kan J, Chen L, Qiu C, Jiang T, Tao L, Li L, Xia Y, Gao C, Santoso T, Paiboon C, Wang Y, Kwan TW, Ye F, Tian N, Liu Z, Lin S, Lu C, Wen S, Hong L, Zhang Q, Sheiban I, Xu Y, Wang L, Rab TS, Li Z, Cheng G, Cui L, Leon MB, Stone GW. Double Kissing Crush Versus Provisional Stenting for Left Main Distal Bifurcation Lesions: DKCRUSH-V Randomised Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2017;70(21):2605-17.

22. Koskinas KC, Nakamura M, Raber L, Colleran R, Kadota K, Capodanno D, Wijns W, Akasaka T, Valgimigli M, Guagliumi G, Windecker S, Byrne RA. Current use of intracoronary imaging in interventional practice - Results of a European Association of Percutaneous Cardiovascular Interventions (EAPCI) and Japanese Association of Cardiovascular Interventions and Therapeutics (CVIT) Clinical Practice Survey. *EuroIntervention*. 2018;14(4):e475-e84.
23. Zhou J, Liew D, Duffy SJ, Shaw J, Walton A, Chan W, Gerber R, Stub D. Intravascular Ultrasound Versus Angiography-Guided Drug-Eluting Stent Implantation: A Health Economic Analysis. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes*. 2021;14(5):e006789.
24. Leesar MA, Hage FG. IVUS Guidance on Optimal Stent Deployment: New Insights and Perspectives. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. 2022;15(2):217-9.

## Figures


**Figure 1. Study flow diagram**

Number of patients included and excluded from the analysis.



**Figure 2. Summary of main findings (central illustration).**

Bar charts showing primary endpoint event rates and forest plots showing treatment effect estimates. Abbreviations: CI (confidence interval); IVUS (intravascular ultrasound); MI (myocardial infarction); OCT (optical coherence tomography); OR (odds ratio).



**Table 1: Population characteristics according to intracoronary imaging use, and by randomization to provisional or dual-stent strategy.**

Characteristic	Provisional Stepwise (n=226)			Systematic dual (n=229)			Overall		
	IVUS or OCT used (n=91)	Angiogram-guidance (n=135)	p-value	IVUS or OCT used (n=88)	Angiogram-guidance (n=141)	p-value	IVUS or OCT used (n=179)	Angiogram-guidance (n=276)	p-value
Age (years), mean ± SD	70.8 ± 10.0	70.8 ± 10.3	0.981	69.2 ± 9.4	72.8 ± 9.4	0.027	70.4 ± 9.7	71.8 ± 9.9	0.132
Male (%)	76 (83.5%)	102 (75.6%)	0.151	63 (71.6%)	107 (75.9%)	0.470	139 (77.7%)	209 (75.7%)	0.636
Ischemic symptoms (%)	90 (98.9%)	129 (95.6%)	0.155	87 (98.9%)	131 (92.9%)	0.040	177 (98.9%)	260 (94.2%)	0.012
Positive non-invasive imaging for ischemia (%)	37 (40.7%)	52 (38.5%)	0.747	34 (38.6%)	64 (45.4%)	0.315	71 (39.7%)	116 (42.0%)	0.617
Body mass index(kg/m2) mean ± SD	28.6 ± 6.4	28.6 ± 4.8	0.956	28.9 ± 6.2	28.0 ± 4.8	0.199	28.8 ± 6.3	28.3 ± 4.8	0.341
Diabetes (%)	26 (28.6%)	39 (28.9%)	0.959	18 (20.5%)	43 (30.5%)	0.095	44 (24.6%)	82 (29.7%)	0.232
Hypertension (%)	72 (79.1%)	107 (79.3%)	0.980	73 (83.0%)	114 (80.9%)	0.689	145 (81%)	221 (80.1%)	0.806
Hypercholesterolemia (%)	67 (73.6%)	91 (67.4%)	0.317	67 (76.1%)	96 (68.1%)	0.191	134 (74.9%)	187 (67.8%)	0.104
Current smoker (%)	14 (15.4%)	22 (16.4%)	0.802	16 (18.2%)	14 (9.9%)	0.023	30 (16.8%)	36 (13.0%)	0.087
Previous MI (%)	26 (28.6%)	34 (25.2%)	0.572	31 (35.2%)	35 (24.8%)	0.091	57 (31.8%)	69 (25.0%)	0.111
Previous PCI (%)	38 (41.8%)	55 (40.7%)	0.879	37 (42.0%)	60 (43.4%)	0.856	75 (41.9%)	116 (42.0%)	0.978
Previous stroke (%)	8 (8.8%)	8 (5.9%)	0.410	8 (9.1%)	8 (5.7%)	0.324	16 (8.9%)	16 (5.8%)	0.200
Peripheral vascular disease (%)	10 (11.0%)	21 (15.6%)	0.328	10 (11.4%)	26 (18.4%)	0.152	20 (11.2%)	47 (17.0%)	0.085
Renal failure (%)	7 (7.7%)	5 (3.7%)	0.190	4 (4.5%)	5 (3.5%)	0.705	11 (6.1%)	10 (3.6%)	0.210
Left ventricular function (%)			0.148			0.562			0.582
EF >50%	59 (64.8%)	84 (62.2%)		58 (65.9%)	82 (58.2%)		117 (65.4%)	166 (60.1%)	
EF <50%	28 (30.8%)	25 (18.5%)		23 (26.2%)	39 (27.7%)		51 (28.5%)	64 (23.2%)	
Unknown	4 (4.4%)	26 (19.3%)		7 (8.0%)	20 (14.2%)		11 (6.1%)	46 (16.7%)	
Presentation (%)			0.148			0.922			0.310
Stable coronary disease	54 (59.3%)	94 (69.6%)		53 (60.2%)	84 (59.6%)		107 (59.8%)	178 (64.5%)	
Acute coronary syndrome	37 (40.7%)	41 (30.4%)		35 (39.8%)	57 (40.4%)		72 (40.2%)	98 (35.5%)	
Syntax score (%)			0.008			0.765			0.036
≤ 22	22 (24.2%)	63 (46.7%)		29 (33.0%)	57 (40.4%)		51 (28.5%)	120 (43.5%)	
> 23	48 (52.7%)	60 (44.4%)		39 (44.3%)	70 (49.6%)		87 (48.6%)	130 (47.1%)	
Missing	21 (23.1%)	12 (8.9%)		20 (22.7%)	14 (9.9%)		41 (22.9%)	26 (9.4%)	
Medina classification (%)			0.310			0.484			0.225
1,1,1	84 (92.3%)	119 (88.1%)		80 (90.9%)	124 (87.9%)		164 (91.6%)	243 (88.0%)	
0,1,1	7 (7.7%)	16 (11.9%)		8 (9.1%)	17 (12.1%)		15 (8.4%)	33 (12.0%)	
Adverse lesion features (%)									

Trifurcation	10 (11.0%)	3 (2.2%)	0.035	2 (2.3%)	7 (5.0%)	0.238	12 (6.7%)	10 (3.6%)	0.350
Calcification $\geq$ moderate	37 (40.7%)	63 (46.7%)	0.373	39 (44.3%)	83 (58.9%)	0.032	76 (42.5%)	146 (52.9%)	0.030
Tortuosity $\geq$ moderate	13 (14.3%)	30 (22.2%)	0.136	21 (23.9%)	34 (24.1%)	0.966	34 (19.0%)	64 (23.2%)	0.288
Angle between LAD & LCx, mean $\pm$ SD	79.1 $\pm$ 18.1	81.2 $\pm$ 22.9	0.485	81.7 $\pm$ 17.7	82.9 $\pm$ 25.4	0.721	80.4 $\pm$ 17.9	82.0 $\pm$ 24.2	0.288

**Table 2: Procedural characteristics according to intracoronary imaging use, and by randomization to provisional or dual-stent strategy.**

Characteristic	Provisional Stepwise (n=226)			Systematic dual (n=229)			Overall		
	IVUS or OCT used (n=91)	Angiogram-guidance (n=135)	p-value	IVUS or OCT used (n=88)	Angiogram-guidance (n=141)	p-value	IVUS or OCT used (n=179)	Angiogram-guidance (n=276)	p-value
Access site (%)			0.939			0.982			0.993
Femoral	25 (27.5%)	39 (28.9%)		26 (29.5%)	41 (29.1%)		51 (28.5%)	80 (29.0%)	
Radial	65 (71.4%)	95 (70.4%)		61 (69.3%)	98 (69.5%)		126 (70.4%)	193 (69.9%)	
Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitor (%)	5 (5.5%)	6 (4.4%)	0.719	5 (5.7%)	4 (2.8%)	0.281	10 (5.6%)	10 (3.6%)	0.318
Bivalirudin use (%)	2 (2.2%)	0	0.084	0	1 (0.7%)	0.429	2 (1.1%)	1 (0.4%)	0.331
Main vessel (%)			0.532			0.379			0.110
LM/ LAD	72 (79.1%)	102 (75.6%)		70 (79.5%)	105 (74.5%)		142 (79.3%)	207 (75.0%)	
LM/ Cx	19 (20.9%)	33 (24.4%)		18 (20.5%)	36 (25.5%)		37 (20.7%)	69 (25.0%)	
Stent length involving LM (mm), mean ± SD	25.4 ± 14.3	25.6 ± 11.2	0.908	31.1 ± 18.5	32.3 ± 17.0	0.599	28.2 ± 16.6	29.0 ± 14.9	0.570
Wire jailed after first stent (%)	79 (86.8%)	106 (78.5%)	0.113	80 (90.9%)	107 (75.9%)	0.016	159 (88.8%)	213 (77.2%)	
TIMI flow in side vessel after 1 <sup>st</sup> stent (%)			0.268			0.014			0.015
≤ 2	3 (3.3%)	9 (6.6%)		0	8 (5.7%)		3 (1.7%)	17 (6.2%)	
3	88 (96.7%)	126 (93.3%)		80 (90.9%)	102 (72.3%)		168 (93.9%)	228 (82.6%)	
Missing data	0	0		8 (9.1%)	31 (22.0%)		8 (4.5%)	31 (11.2%)	
Rewiring second vessel (%)			0.443			0.578			0.393
Yes	84 (92.3%)	128 (94.8%)		83 (94.3%)	136 (96.5%)		167 (93.3%)	264 (95.7%)	
No	7 (7.7%)	7 (5.2%)		2 (2.3%)	1 (0.7%)		9 (5.0%)	8 (2.9%)	
Missing	0	0		3 (3.4%)	4 (2.8%)		3 (1.7%)	4 (1.4%)	
Stent to main vessel (%)	91 (100%)	135 (100%)		88 (100%)	141 (100%)		179 (100%)	276 (100%)	
Stent to side vessel (%)	18 (19.8%)	33 (24.4%)	0.633	85 (96.6%)	133 (94.3%)	0.436	103 (57.5%)	166 (60.1%)	0.797
Reason for stenting side vessel in provisional group (%)			0.528						
Dissection	7 (7.7%)	15 (11.1%)							
Residual stenosis	7 (7.7%)	15 (11.1%)							
Impaired flow	1 (1.1%)	0							
Other	3 (3.3%)	3 (2.2%)							
Not applicable	73 (80.2%)	102 (75.6%)							
Planned at start of the case to use IVUS (%)	77 (84.6%)	1 (0.7%)	<0.001	70 (79.5%)	3 (2.1%)	<0.001	147 (82.1%)	4 (1.4%)	<0.001



OCT used (%)	11 (12.1%)	0		17 (19.3%)	0		28 (15.6%)	0	
IVUS used (%)	80 (87.9%)	0		71 (80.7%)	0		151 (84.4%)	0	
IVUS used in main vessel (%)	45 (49.5%)	0		19 (21.6%)	0		64 (35.8%)	0	
IVUS used in both vessels (%)	35 (38.5%)	0		52 (59.1%)	0		87 (48.6%)	0	
Operator reintervened with balloon or stent as a result of IVUS findings (%)	28 (30.8%)	0		14 (15.9%)	0		42 (23.5%)	0	
Length of lesion in LM (mm), mean $\pm$ SD	6.8 $\pm$ 3.3	6.02 $\pm$ 3.0	0.048	6.9 $\pm$ 3.0	6.02 $\pm$ 2.6	0.024	6.9 $\pm$ 3.2	6.0 $\pm$ 2.8	0.003
Length of lesion in side branch (mm), mean $\pm$ SD	6.4 $\pm$ 4.8	5.4 $\pm$ 3.3	0.081	7.6 $\pm$ 5.2	8.1 $\pm$ 6.0	0.455	7.0 $\pm$ 5.0	6.8 $\pm$ 5.0	0.760
Procedural duration (min), mean $\pm$ SD	86.8 $\pm$ 34.5	65.5 $\pm$ 33.4	<0.001	94.3 $\pm$ 38.7	71.7 $\pm$ 37.1	<0.001	90.5 $\pm$ 36.7	68.7 $\pm$ 35.4	<0.001
Fluoroscopy duration (min), mean $\pm$ SD	21.6 $\pm$ 11.9	20.5 $\pm$ 12.0	0.474	25.1 $\pm$ 18.4	22.8 $\pm$ 13.6	0.280	23.3 $\pm$ 15.5	21.7 $\pm$ 12.9	0.212
X-ray dose (cGy.cm <sup>2</sup> ) mean $\pm$ SD	6682.0 $\pm$ 9189.7	7213.0 $\pm$ 5822.1	0.743	7404.7 $\pm$ 7091.5	7497.5 $\pm$ 6261.4	0.918	7138.8 $\pm$ 8206.4	7358.9 $\pm$ 6041.9	0.745
Contrast volume (ml) mean $\pm$ SD	218.1 $\pm$ 83.2	214.0 $\pm$ 97.1	0.743	239.2 $\pm$ 101.1	214.9 $\pm$ 92.1	0.062	228.5 $\pm$ 92.8	214.5 $\pm$ 94.4	0.120

**Table 3: Clinical outcomes according to intracoronary imaging use, and by randomization to provisional or dual-stent strategy.**

Outcome	Randomized to stepwise provisional (n=226)	Randomised to systematic dual (n=229)	Overall (n=455)	Effect of dual-stent vs. provisional single-stent strategy Odds ratio [95% CI] P-value	Interaction P-value
<b>Primary endpoint (Death, MI or TVR at 1 year):</b>					
Intracoronary imaging used (n=179)	19/91 (20.9%)	11/88 (12.5%)	30/179 (16.8%)	0.54 (0.24, 1.22) p=0.137	<b>0.009</b>
Angiography-guidance (n=276)	14/135 (10.4%)	29/141 (20.6%)	43/276 (15.6%)	<b>2.24 (1.13, 4.45) p=0.022</b>	
<b>Secondary endpoints (at 1 year):</b>					
<b>All cause death</b>					
Intracoronary imaging used (n=179)	3/91 (3.3%)	2/88 (2.3%)	5/179 (2.8%)	0.68 (0.11, 4.18) p=0.679	0.240
Angiography-guidance (n=276)	3/135 (2.2%)	8/141 (5.7%)	11/276 (4.0%)	2.65 (0.69, 10.20) p=0.157	
<b>Cardiac death</b>					
Intracoronary imaging used (n=179)	3/91 (3.3%)	1/88 (1.1%)	4/179 (2.2%)	0.34 (0.03, 3.31) p=0.351	0.256
Angiography-guidance (n=276)	3/135 (2.2%)	5/141 (3.5%)	8/276 (2.9%)	1.62 (0.38, 6.91) p=0.516	
<b>TVR</b>					
Intracoronary imaging used (n=179)	7/91 (7.7%)	5/88 (5.7%)	12/179 (6.7%)	0.72 (0.22, 2.37) p=0.592	0.152
Angiography-guidance (n=276)	7/135 (5.2%)	15/141 (10.6%)	22/276 (8.0%)	2.18 (0.86, 5.52) p=0.101	
<b>Stent thrombosis</b>					
Intracoronary imaging used (n=179)	3/91 (3.3%)	0	3/179 (1.7%)	p=0.997	0.998
Angiography-guidance (n=276)	4/135 (3.0%)	4/141 (2.8%)	8/276 (2.9%)	0.96 (0.23, 3.90) p=0.950	
<b>MI</b>					
Intracoronary imaging used (n=179)	14/91 (15.4%)	6/88 (6.8%)	20/179 (11.2%)	0.40 (0.15, 1.10) p=0.076	<b>0.015</b>
Angiography-guidance (n=276)	9/135 (6.7%)	18/141 (12.8%)	27/276 (9.8%)	2.05 (0.89, 4.74) p=0.093	
<b>Periprocedural MI</b>					
Intracoronary imaging used (n=179)	7/91 (7.7%)	3/88 (3.4%)	10/179 (5.6%)	0.42 (0.11, 1.69) p=0.224	<b>0.035</b>
Angiography-guidance (n=276)	2/135 (1.5%)	8/141 (5.7%)	10/276 (3.6%)	4.00 (0.83, 19.19) p=0.083	

**Table 4: Analysis of primary endpoint for intracoronary imaging use vs. angiography-guidance, according to potential confounding factors.**

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>IVUS or OCT used (n=event/total)</b>	<b>Angiography- guidance (n=event/total)</b>	<b>Overall (n=event/total)</b>	<b>Effect of intracoronary imaging use vs. angiography-guidance Odds ratio [95% CI] P-value</b>	<b>Interaction P-value</b>
<b>(a) Lesion length in side vessel</b>					
< 10mm (n=374)	26/147 (18%)	32/227 (14%)	58/374 (16%)	1.31 (0.74, 2.30) p=0.350	0.960
≥ 10mm (n=76)	4/28 (14%)	11/48 (23%)	15/76 (20%)	0.56 (0.16, 1.97) p=0.366	
<b>(b) Stent length in main vessel</b>					
< 28mm (n=258)	18/106 (17.0%)	27/152 (17.8%)	45/258 (17%)	0.95 (0.49, 1.83) p=0.871	0.525
≥ 28mm (n=197)	12/73 (16.4%)	16/124 (12.9%)	28/197 (14%)	1.33 (0.59, 2.99) p=0.493	
<b>(c) Extent of calcification</b>					
Mild or none (n=233)	17/103 (16.5%)	19/130 (14.6%)	36/233 (15%)	1.16 (0.57, 2.35) p=0.692	0.854
Moderate or severe (n=222)	13/76 (17.1%)	24/146 (16.4%)	37/222 (17%)	1.05 (0.50, 2.20) p=0.899	

Missing data: length of obstruction in side branch =5 (IVUS or OCT used group =4, no IVUS or OCT group =1)

**467**  
Patients with left main bifurcation lesions  
(Medina 1,1,1 or 0,1,1) randomized

**230**  
Randomized to stepwise  
provisional approach

**237**  
Randomized to systematic  
dual approach

**12 Excluded from analysis:**  
**9** Missing information on whether or  
not intracoronary imaging used  
**2** Procedure failure with no stent  
implantation  
**1** Left main not meeting criteria for  
stent implantation, so left main  
not stented

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.03.23285434>; this version posted February 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](#).

**226**  
In group randomized to  
stepwise provisional approach

**229**  
In group randomized to  
systematic dual approach

**91**  
Intracoronary imaging

**135**  
Angiography-guidance


**88**  
Intracoronary imaging

**141**  
Angiography-guidance


**455**  
Completed 1 year follow up for the primary outcome  
(death, myocardial infarction or target vessel revascularization)

**455 left main bifurcations (226 randomised to stepwise provisional approach, 229 randomised to systematic dual-stent strategy)**


**Angiography-guidance in 61%**



**IVUS or OCT in 39% (n=179)**



**Overall primary endpoint (death, MI, revascularisation at 1 year) did not differ with intracoronary imaging vs. angiography-guidance**



**Effect of dual-stent vs. provisional approach on primary endpoint, according to intracoronary imaging use**

**Angiography-guidance**

OR: 2.24 (95% CI: 1.13, 4.45) P=0.022

**IVUS or OCT used**

OR: 0.54 (95% CI: 0.24, 1.22) P=0.137

Favors dual-stent strategy

Favors provisional approach

**Significant interaction between intracoronary imaging use and LM bifurcation stenting strategy, with respect to the primary endpoint (p=0.009)**