

Title:

**Percutaneous Coronary Intervention vs Coronary Artery Bypass Graft In- hospital Outcomes in
Diabetes**

Qianyun Luo, BS¹, Renxi Li, BS²

1.University of Minnesota Medical School

2.The George Washington University School of Medicine and Health Sciences

Disclosure: The authors have no conflict of interest.

Informed Patient Consent: Given the use of retrospective, de-identified NIS data, this study excepted from IRB approval.

Meeting Presentation: This paper is to be presented at The 2023 Society of Thoracic Surgeons (STS) Coronary Conference, Miami, FL, June 3-4, 2023.

Article Word Count: 4122 words.

Corresponding Author: Qianyun Luo, 2515 University Ave SE W119-3, Minneapolis, MN, 55414.

University of Minnesota Medical School Department of Microbiology and Immunology.

luo00336@umn.edu.

Abstract

Background: Despite extensive research on coronary artery bypass surgery (CABG) and percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) outcome differences, current literature lacks representation of short-term in-hospital outcomes in patients with existing medical conditions. This study aimed to compare perioperative outcomes of these two revascularization procedures in diabetes mellitus (DM) patients.

Methods: The National Inpatient Sample (NIS) was used to extract patients who received CABG or PCI surgery between the last quarter of 2015 to 2020 based on ICD10-PCS. Patients of age<40 were excluded for congenital heart defects. Preoperative differences were noted and adjusted using multivariable logistic regression. Adjusted odds ratios (aOR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI) were estimated between PCI and CABG groups.

Results: A total number of 90,662 CABG and 173,725 PCI cases of patients with DM were identified in NIS. Compared to CABG, patients who underwent PCI had increased mortality (2.75% vs 2.00%, aOR 1.266, p<0.0001), myocardial infarction (1.5% vs 1.17%, aOR 1.223, p<0.0001), and were less likely to experience respiratory events (0.38% vs 6.33%, aOR 0.055, p<0.0001), stroke (0.03% vs 0.06%, aOR 0.385, p<0.0001), acute kidney injury (20.37% vs 25.37%, aOR 0.727, p<0.0001), sepsis (0.01% vs 0.05%, aOR 0.172, p<0.0001), shock (0.11% vs 0.74%, aOR 0.139, p<0.0001).

Conclusions: The NIS database collects enormous records from nationwide providers, offering great statistical power. PCI was associated with a markedly higher in-hospital mortality rate but a lower morbidity rate in patients with DM as compared to CABG. Therefore, physicians should weigh both mortality and morbidity when considering surgical treatment to DM patients.

Introduction

Coronary artery disease (CAD) is the leading cause of mortality in the United States, accounting for approximately 610,000 deaths annually.¹ For CAD patients with an indication for revascularization, two established modalities, coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) and percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI), are the two most common surgical procedures employed for myocardial revascularization.² While there is a plethora of studies comparing the outcomes of CABG and PCI, the debate on which procedure provided better results for the treatment of CAD still remains.^{3,4}

Diabetes Mellitus (DM) is a common medical condition affecting approximately 11.3% of the United States population.¹ CAD is the main cause of death and a major determinant of long-term prognosis for patients with DM.⁵ Patients with DM have a high mortality rate after myocardial infarction (MI) and are at a higher risk of developing CAD with accelerated atherosclerosis and worsened coronary artery stenosis due to factors such as hyperglycemia, lipoprotein abnormalities, and inflammation.⁶

Approximately 25% of CABG and 33% of PCI procedures were performed on patients with DM in the United States, and the results of these procedures are less effective than in patients without DM with a higher risk of restenosis and stent thrombosis.⁵

Previous studies,³⁻²⁹ including large randomized controlled trial Coronary Artery Revascularization in Diabetes (CARDia) trial¹¹ and Fibromyalgia Relapse Evaluation and Efficacy for Durability of Meaningful Relief (FREEDOM) trial,¹² indicated patients with DM who underwent CABG have a lower mortality rate and reduced risk of MI than those who underwent PCI. Despite extensive research on long-term outcome differences of CABG vs PCI in patients with DM, there is very little representation¹⁰ of short-term in-hospital outcomes, and no studies have been powered to detect in-hospital short-term outcomes between the two revascularization strategies in patients with DM. However, the importance of in-hospital short-term outcomes for clinical decision-making cannot be overstated, as it can inform prompt treatment options and guide physicians to provide the effective in-patient care. Therefore, this study aimed to compare the in-hospital perioperative outcomes of CABG vs PCI in DM patients. This

study employed the National (Nationwide) Inpatient Sample (NIS) dataset, which approximates 20% of all discharges from U.S. community hospitals, providing considerable statistical power and allowing for comprehensive analysis of trends and outcomes. Therefore, this study was informative for clinicians to assess and initiate perioperative management accordingly.

Patients and Methods

Data Source

This population-based, retrospective observational study utilized data from the US NIS database, which is the largest all-payer, continuous inpatient care database in the United States, obtaining data from about 1,050 hospitals across 44 States in the US, representing a 20% stratified sample of all discharges from U.S. community hospitals as defined by the American Hospital Association.

Study Population

Patients with DM were identified by Elixhauser Comorbidity³³ and those underwent CABG or PCI procedures were identified in the database from the last quarter of 2015 to 2020. Patients of age less than 40 were excluded for congenital heart defects. Patients who underwent CABG and PCI were identified using *Internal Classification of Disease, Tenth Revision, Procedural Coding System* (ICD-10-PCS) codes: 0210xxxx for CABG; 02703xx, 02713xx, 02723xx, and 02733xx (027x3Tx and 027x3Zx excluded) for PCI.

Preoperative Values

Patient demographics and comorbidities were collected and compared between CABG and PCI groups (Table 1). Demographics included race and sex. Comorbidities were identified by Elixhauser Comorbidities³³, which included AIDS, alcohol use, autoimmune disease, lymphoma, leukemia, metastatic cancer, solid tumor without metastasis in situ, solid tumor without metastasis malignant, cerebral vascular disease, heart failure, dementia, depression, drug abuse, uncomplicated hypertension,

complicated hypertension, severe liver disease, chronic lung disease, obese, paralysis, peripheral vascular disease, severe renal failure, hypothyroidism, other thyroid disorders, and valve disease.

Operative and In-hospital Perioperative Values

Postoperative values considered in this study included in-hospital mortality, stroke, myocardial infarction, major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE), respiratory events, pulmonary embolism, venous thromboembolism, renal failure, acute kidney injury, bleeding events, superficial wound, deep wound, sepsis, shock, length of in-hospital stay greater than 7 days, and transfer. In-hospital mortality was recorded in NIS and other perioperative outcomes were identified using *International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision, Clinical Modification* (ICD-10-CM) codes.

Statistical analysis

Fisher's exact test was used for categorical variables. Two sample t-test was used for continuous variable. Preoperative differences were noted. Perioperative outcomes were examined by univariate analysis (Fisher's exact test) and then adjusted for preoperative differences using multivariable logistic regression. Preoperative variables with noted difference (p -value < 0.1) were included in the regression. Adjusted odds ratios (aOR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI) were estimated between PCI and CABG groups. All statistical analyses were performed using SAS (version 9.4) with $p < 0.05$ considered statistically significant.

Ethics Statement

Given the use of retrospective, de-identified NIS data, this study excepted from IRB approval by The George Washington University.

Results

There were 90,662 patients with DM who underwent CABG and 173,725 who underwent PCI identified in NIS between the last quarter of 2015 and 2020. The comorbidities and demographics of the patients were summarized in Table 1. Compared to CABG, there were more female (36.71% vs 27.45%, $p < 0.0001$), Black (11.37% vs 7.89%, $p < 0.0001$), Hispanic (10.74% vs 9.89%, $p < 0.0001$), and Native Americans (0.77% vs 0.67%, $p = 0.0049$) in DM patients who underwent PCI (Table 1). In contrast, White and Asian DM patients were more likely to undergo CABG than PCI (70.55% vs 66.83%, $p < 0.0001$; 4% vs 3.3%, $p < 0.0001$). CABG patients (66.18 ± 10.08 years old) were older ($p < 0.0001$) than PCI patients (65.26 ± 12.39 years old).

There were no statistically significant differences in AIDS, autoimmune disease, solid tumor, or paralysis between the two groups. DM patients with alcohol use (1.81% vs 2.39%, $p < 0.0001$), leukemia (0.36% vs 0.41%, $p = 0.042$), cerebral vascular disease (2.42% vs 2.56%, $p = 0.02$), heart failure (0.04% vs 0.08%, $p < 0.0001$), complicated (43.18% vs 44.74%, $p < 0.0001$) and uncomplicated (44.76% vs 47.01%, $p < 0.0001$) hypertension, chronic lung disease (21.04% vs 21.49%, $p = 0.0074$), obese (29.57% vs 36.67%, $p < 0.0001$), peripheral vascular disease (10.38% vs 13.08%, $p < 0.0001$), and other thyroid disorders (0.87% vs 1.14%, $p < 0.0001$) were less likely to undergo PCI than CABG. On the other hand, patients with the following comorbidities were more likely to undergo PCI than CABG: metastatic cancer (0.5% vs 0.021%, $p < 0.0001$), lymphoma (0.41% vs 0.34%, $p = 0.0027$), dementia (2.66% vs 1.15%, $p < 0.0001$), depression (9.9% vs 9.65%, $p = 0.0418$), drug abuse (1.77% vs 1.48%, $p < 0.0001$), severe liver disease (0.17% vs 0.12%, $p = 0.0005$), severe renal failure (5.67% vs 3.8%, $p < 0.0001$), hypothyroidism (12.88% vs 12.2%, $p < 0.0001$), and valve disease (1.45% vs 0.95%, $p < 0.0001$).

The univariate and multivariable logistic regression comparing the in-hospital perioperative outcomes of CABG and PCI were summarized in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively. Compared to CABG, DM patients who underwent PCI had increased in-hospital mortality (2.75% vs 2.00%, aOR 1.266, $p < 0.0001$),

myocardial infarction (1.5% vs 1.17%, aOR 1.223, $p < 0.0001$), and MACE (1.53% vs 1.27%, aOR 1.154, $p < 0.0001$). In addition, DM patients who went under PCI were less likely to experience stroke (0.03% vs 0.06%, aOR 0.385, $p < 0.0001$), respiratory events (0.38% vs 6.33%, aOR 0.055, $p < 0.0001$), venous thromboembolism (0.41% vs 0.66%, aOR 0.605, $p < 0.0001$), acute kidney injury (20.37% vs 25.37%, aOR 0.727, $p < 0.0001$), renal failure (0.05% vs 0.81%, aOR 0.068, $p < 0.0001$), deep wound (0.01% vs 0.2%, aOR 0.055, $p < 0.0001$), sepsis (0.01% vs 0.05%, aOR 0.172, $p < 0.0001$), shock (0.11% vs 0.74%, aOR 0.139, $p < 0.0001$), length of stay greater than 7 days (13.93% vs 58.02%, aOR 0.089, $p < 0.0001$), or transfer (9.47% vs 24.72%, aOR 0.254, $p < 0.0001$). No difference was observed in perioperative pulmonary embolism, bleeding events, or superficial wounds.

Comment

Previous studies have compared perioperative outcomes in patients with DM treated with either CABG or PCI,^{3–29} however, only a few focused on short-term in-hospital outcomes^{7,8,10,24–29} with limited data size. The objective of this study was to assess the in-hospital perioperative outcomes of CABG vs PCI in patients with DM to direct clinical decisions for surgery, monitor prognosis, and guide post-surgical management in this patient population. Our results showed minority groups such as female, Black, Hispanic, Native Americans were more likely to undergo PCI over CABG (Table 1). This disparity may be due to PCI having a shorter length of in-hospital stay (Table 2 and 3), and in turns, less financial burden for these patients. Patients with underlying heart, lung, and peripheral vascular diseases were more likely to undergo CABG. In contrast, patients with liver and renal conditions were more likely to undergo PCI surgery; this may be due to concern for compromised peri-operative recovery for the more invasive CABG.

Despite limited research on short-term outcomes, studies that examine in-hospital perioperative outcomes of patients with DM who underwent PCI or CABG have produced conflicting results. Ben-Gal et al reported higher mortality (4.7% vs 1.6%, $p = 0.0003$) and MI incidence (11.7% vs 7.1%, $p = 0.003$) in

patients who underwent CABG as compared to those who underwent PCI.²⁴ However, Zheng et al reported lower mortality (0.3% vs 0.8%, $p = 0.03$) among the patients who underwent CABG.²⁸ Both Zheng et al and Ramanathan et al found a lower rate of MI (2.1% vs 3.1%, $p = 0.05$; 1.1% vs 4.5%, $p < 0.01$) in patients who underwent CABG as compared to those who underwent PCI,^{27,28} which aligned with our findings (Table 3). Other studies demonstrated no significance in mortality or MI difference between patients who underwent either of the two revascularizations procedures.^{8,10,26} Stroke was also demonstrated as insignificant between the two procedures.^{24,26,28} Despite inconsistency in mortality and MI, our study showed similar findings as Ben-Gal et al who demonstrated higher acute kidney injury (36.1% vs 16%, $p < 0.0001$) and bleeding events (54.1% vs 9.8%, $p < 0.0001$) in the CABG group as compared to PCI.²⁴ Inconsistency in findings could be attributed to underpowered sample sizes from previous studies.

Our findings indicated while morbidities were lower for patients who underwent PCI compared to CABG, mortality, MI, and MACE incidence were higher (Tables 2 and 3). These findings aligned with the long-term survival benefit of CABG.¹⁰⁻¹² We hypothesized the leading cause of mortality is cardiovascular-related death such as MI and MACE; however, further research is needed to investigate the underlying cause. While minimally invasive PCI might be chosen to avoid complications compared to CABG, the percentage of complete revascularization is lower,²⁶ which leads to a greater risk of cardiac death and potential risk of reoperation for repeated revascularization. Furthermore, sampling bias may contribute to the unobserved morbidities in patients who underwent PCI, since mortality was higher in PCI and deceased patients were excluded from the morbidity comparison. PCI is a less invasive procedure than CABG and may be preferred for patients who are not ideal candidates for complex surgery. As a result, patients who receive PCI may be sicker or have more comorbidities than those who receive CABG. Accelerated vascular aging, arterial stiffening, and arteriosclerosis in DM patients also cannot be discounted as potential explanations for increased mortality of PCI.³⁰ These findings had important implications for clinical practice. Clinicians should carefully consider the risks and benefits of each

revascularization strategy when making treatment decisions for DM patients. Future research should be conducted to evaluate the primary cause of death, such as by incomplete revascularization or by morbidity, following the procedures of PCI or CABG.

There are a number of limitations of this study. As shown by numerous prior studies, NIS does not capture all pertinent intraoperative parameters – such as the coronary segment directly affected, the diameter of the stenosis, right or left dominance of the coronary arteries, the presence of a lesion, calcification, and diffusion to small vessels – that contribute to successful revascularization and can have a significant impact on morbidity and mortality.^{2,19,26,28} In addition, NIS does not record lab values. Notably, the hemoglobin A1c level of patients with DM is major aspect that may affect the mortality rate of both revascularization procedures.^{31,32}

Overall, the NIS database is a valuable source of information, containing vast amounts of data from providers across the United States. This provides researchers with considerable statistical power, allowing for a comprehensive analysis of trends and outcomes. Our study shows PCI was associated with a markedly higher in-hospital mortality rate but a lower morbidity rate in patients with DM as compared to CABG. Therefore, healthcare providers should take into account both the individual patient's medical history and overall health status when deciding between CABG and PCI, and providers should consider the potential risks and benefits of each intervention in order to provide the best possible care for patients with DM and CAD.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the guidance and support of colleagues and reviewers who provided useful feedback throughout the work. The authors also thank our loved ones whose patience and support helped us to complete this research.

Disclosures

The authors have no conflict of interest.

Reference

1. Friede, A., O'Carroll, P. W., Thralls, R. B. & Reid, J. A. CDC WONDER on the Web. *Proc. Conf. Am. Med. Inform. Assoc. AMIA Fall Symp.* 408–412 (1996).
2. Authors/Task Force members *et al.* 2014 ESC/EACTS Guidelines on myocardial revascularization: The Task Force on Myocardial Revascularization of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS) Developed with the special contribution of the European Association of Percutaneous Cardiovascular Interventions (EAPCI). *Eur. Heart J.* **35**, 2541–2619 (2014).
3. Doenst, T. *et al.* PCI and CABG for Treating Stable Coronary Artery Disease. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* **73**, 964–976 (2019).
4. Kirov, H. *et al.* A systematic review and meta-analysis of percutaneous coronary intervention compared to coronary artery bypass grafting in non-ST-elevation acute coronary syndrome. *Sci. Rep.* **12**, 5138 (2022).
5. Aronson, D. & Edelman, E. R. Coronary artery disease and diabetes mellitus. *Cardiol. Clin.* **32**, 439–455 (2014).
6. Mazzone, T., Chait, A. & Plutzky, J. Cardiovascular disease risk in type 2 diabetes mellitus: insights from mechanistic studies. *Lancet Lond. Engl.* **371**, 1800–1809 (2008).
7. Li, Y. *et al.* Outcomes of Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Surgery Versus Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in Patients Aged 18–45 Years with Diabetes Mellitus. *Chin. Med. J. (Engl.)* **130**, 2906–2915 (2017).
8. Tam, D. Y. *et al.* Long-Term Survival After Surgical or Percutaneous Revascularization in Patients With Diabetes and Multivessel Coronary Disease. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* **76**, 1153–1164 (2020).
9. Kamalesh, M. *et al.* Percutaneous Coronary Intervention Versus Coronary Bypass Surgery in United States Veterans With Diabetes. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* **61**, 808–816 (2013).
10. Bianco, V. *et al.* Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting vs Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in Patients With Diabetes. *Semin. Thorac. Cardiovasc. Surg.* **33**, 368–377 (2021).
11. Kapur, A. *et al.* Randomized comparison of percutaneous coronary intervention with coronary

- artery bypass grafting in diabetic patients. 1-year results of the CARDia (Coronary Artery Revascularization in Diabetes) trial. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* **55**, 432–440 (2010).
12. Farkouh, M. E. *et al.* Strategies for multivessel revascularization in patients with diabetes. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **367**, 2375–2384 (2012).
 13. Arabi, A. *et al.* Comparing clinical outcomes in patients with diabetes undergoing coronary artery bypass graft and percutaneous coronary intervention in real world practice in Iranian population. *BMC Cardiovasc. Disord.* **22**, 75 (2022).
 14. Boden, W. E., De Caterina, R. & Taggart, D. P. Is there equivalence between PCI and CABG surgery in long-term survival of patients with diabetes? Importance of interpretation biases and biological plausibility. *Eur. Heart J.* **43**, 68–70 (2022).
 15. Caldonazo, T., Kirov, H., Riedel, L. L., Gaudino, M. & Doenst, T. Comparing CABG and PCI across the globe based on current regional registry evidence. *Sci. Rep.* **12**, 22164 (2022).
 16. EL-Andari, R. *et al.* Coronary Revascularization for Patients with Diabetes Mellitus: A Contemporary Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Ann. Surg.* **275**, 1058–1066 (2022).
 17. Flaherty, J. D. & Davidson, C. J. Diabetes and Coronary Revascularization. *JAMA* **293**, 1501–1508 (2005).
 18. Godoy, L. C., Rao, V. & Farkouh, M. E. Coronary Revascularization of Patients With Diabetes Mellitus in the Setting of Acute Coronary Syndromes. *Circulation* **140**, 1233–1235 (2019).
 19. Musa, A. F. *Is Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting (CABG) Surgery Still Preferable to Percutaneous Coronary Intervention (PCI) in View of Long-Term Outcomes among Diabetic Patients? Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting* (IntechOpen, 2022). doi:10.5772/intechopen.104993.
 20. Pandey, A. *et al.* Revascularization Trends in Patients With Diabetes Mellitus and Multivessel Coronary Artery Disease Presenting With Non–ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction. *Circ. Cardiovasc. Qual. Outcomes* **9**, 197–205 (2016).
 21. Singh, M., Arora, R., Kodumuri, V., Khosla, S. & Jawad, E. Coronary revascularization in diabetic patients: Current state of evidence. *Exp. Clin. Cardiol.* **16**, 16–22 (2011).

22. Xie, Q., Huang, J., Zhu, K. & Chen, Q. Percutaneous coronary intervention versus coronary artery bypass grafting in patients with coronary heart disease and type 2 diabetes mellitus: Cumulative meta-analysis. *Clin. Cardiol.* **44**, 899–906 (2021).
23. Zhai, C. *et al.* Clinical outcome comparison of percutaneous coronary intervention and bypass surgery in diabetic patients with coronary artery disease: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials and observational studies. *Diabetol. Metab. Syndr.* **11**, 110 (2019).
24. Ben-Gal, Y. *et al.* Surgical versus percutaneous coronary revascularization for multivessel disease in diabetic patients with non-ST-segment-elevation acute coronary syndrome: analysis from the Acute Catheterization and Early Intervention Triage Strategy trial. *Circ. Cardiovasc. Interv.* **8**, e002032 (2015).
25. Marui, A. *et al.* Five-year outcomes of percutaneous versus surgical coronary revascularization in patients with diabetes mellitus (from the CREDO-Kyoto PCI/CABG Registry Cohort-2). *Am. J. Cardiol.* **115**, 1063–1072 (2015).
26. Milojevic, M. *et al.* Bypass Surgery or Stenting for Left Main Coronary Artery Disease in Patients With Diabetes. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* **73**, 1616–1628 (2019).
27. Ramanathan, K. *et al.* Surgical Versus Percutaneous Coronary Revascularization in Patients With Diabetes and Acute Coronary Syndromes. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* **70**, 2995–3006 (2017).
28. Zheng, Z. *et al.* Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Surgery and Percutaneous Coronary Interventions in Patients With Unprotected Left Main Coronary Artery Disease. *JACC Cardiovasc. Interv.* **9**, 1102–1111 (2016).
29. Shafi, A. M. A., Dhanji, A. A. A., Habib, A. M., Kennon, S. R. O. & Awad, W. I. Coronary artery bypass vs percutaneous coronary intervention in under 50s. *J. Card. Surg.* **35**, 320–327 (2020).
30. Kozakova, M. & Palombo, C. Diabetes Mellitus, Arterial Wall, and Cardiovascular Risk Assessment. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **13**, 201 (2016).
31. Nyström, T., Holzmann, M. J., Eliasson, B., Kuhl, J. & Sartipy, U. Glycemic Control in Type 1 Diabetes and Long-Term Risk of Cardiovascular Events or Death After Coronary Artery Bypass

Grafting. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* **66**, 535–543 (2015).

32. Abu Tailakh, M. *et al.* Hemoglobin A1c in Patients with Diabetes Predict Long-Term Mortality Following Coronary Artery Surgery. *J. Clin. Med.* **10**, 2739 (2021).
33. Elixhauser, A., Steiner, C., Harris, D. R. & Coffey, R. M. Comorbidity measures for use with administrative data. *Medical Care* 36, 8–27 (1998).

Table 1. Comorbidities and demographics of patients who underwent CABG or PCI between the last quarter of 2015 and 2020 in NIS database.

	CAGB (n = 90,662)	PCI (n = 173,725)	p-value
Race, n (%)			
White	64405 (70.55%)	117884 (66.83%)	<.0001
Black	7207 (7.89%)	20053 (11.37%)	<.0001
Hispanic	9029 (9.89%)	18939 (10.74%)	<.0001
Asian	3651 (4%)	5823 (3.3%)	<.0001
Native Americans	613 (0.67%)	1358 (0.77%)	0.0049
Others	3044 (3.33%)	6718 (3.81%)	<.0001
Sex, n (%)			
Male sex	66221 (72.54%)	111623 (63.28%)	<.0001
Female sex	25060 (27.45%)	64745 (36.71%)	<.0001
Age, mean ± SD, years old	66.18 ± 10.08	65.26 ± 12.39	<.0001
Comorbidities, n (%)			
AIDS	292 (0.32%)	617 (0.35%)	0.22
Alcohol use	2179 (2.39%)	3184 (1.81%)	<.0001
Autoimmune Disease	2139 (2.34%)	4292 (2.43%)	0.1505
Lymphoma	306 (0.34%)	725 (0.41%)	0.0027
Leukemia	373 (0.41%)	631 (0.36%)	0.042
Metastatic cancer	191 (0.21%)	887 (0.5%)	<.0001
Solid tumor without metastasis, in situ	23 (0.03%)	34 (0.02%)	0.3298
Solid tumor without metastasis, malignant	1113 (1.22%)	2231 (1.26%)	0.3216
Cerebral vascular disease	2341 (2.56%)	4263 (2.42%)	0.02
Heart Failure	71 (0.08%)	69 (0.04%)	<.0001
Dementia	1051 (1.15%)	4690 (2.66%)	<.0001
Depression	8808 (9.65%)	17455 (9.9%)	0.0418
Drug abuse	1354 (1.48%)	3126 (1.77%)	<.0001
Hypertension complicated	40847 (44.74%)	76174 (43.18%)	<.0001
Hypertension uncomplicated	42917 (47.01%)	78952 (44.76%)	<.0001

Severe liver disease	108 (0.12%)	306 (0.17%)	0.0005
Chronic lung disease	19615 (21.49%)	37112 (21.04%)	0.0074
Obesity	33477 (36.67%)	52150 (29.57%)	<.0001
Paralysis	1714 (1.88%)	3349 (1.9%)	0.7083
Peripheral vascular disease	11944 (13.08%)	18315 (10.38%)	<.0001
Severe renal failure	3472 (3.8%)	10004 (5.67%)	<.0001
Hypothyroidism	11138 (12.2%)	22715 (12.88%)	<.0001
Other thyroid disorders	1040 (1.14%)	1536 (0.87%)	<.0001
Valve disease	866 (0.95%)	2552 (1.45%)	<.0001

Table 2. Univariate analysis of peri-operative outcomes of patients who underwent CABG or PCI between the last quarter of 2015 and 2020 in NIS database.

Outcomes, n (%)	CAGB (n = 90,662)	PCI (n = 173,725)	p-value
-----------------	-------------------	-------------------	---------

Mortality	1828 (2%)	4842 (2.75%)	<.0001
Stroke	59 (0.06%)	47 (0.03%)	<.0001
Myocardial infarction	1072 (1.17%)	2649 (1.5%)	<.0001
MACE	1155 (1.27%)	2702 (1.53%)	<.0001
Respiratory events	5775 (6.33%)	664 (0.38%)	<.0001
Pulmonary embolism	26 (0.03%)	60 (0.03%)	0.496
Venous thromboembolism	606 (0.66%)	728 (0.41%)	<.0001
Renal failure	742 (0.81%)	95 (0.05%)	<.0001
Acute kidney injury	23161 (25.37%)	35926 (20.37%)	<.0001
Bleeding events	160 (0.18%)	232 (0.13%)	0.0055
Superficial wound	616 (0.67%)	1160 (0.66%)	0.6155
Deep wound	185 (0.2%)	19 (0.01%)	<.0001
Sepsis	46 (0.05%)	16 (0.01%)	<.0001
Shock	678 (0.74%)	188 (0.11%)	<.0001
Length of stay >7 days	52964 (58.02%)	24569 (13.93%)	<.0001
Transfer	22565 (24.72%)	16704 (9.47%)	<.0001

Table 3. Multivariable logistic regression analysis of peri-operative outcomes of patients who underwent CABG or PCI between the last quarter of 2015 and 2020 in NIS database. Demographics and comorbidities with large difference (p-value < 0.1) were included in the regression.

Outcomes	aOR for PCI/CABG	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI	p-value
----------	------------------	--------------	--------------	---------

Mortality	1.266	1.197	1.338	<.0001
Stroke	0.385	0.262	0.567	<.0001
Myocardial infarction	1.223	1.137	1.315	<.0001
MACE	1.154	1.076	1.239	<.0001
Respiratory events	0.055	0.051	0.06	<.0001
Pulmonary embolism	1.179	0.744	1.868	0.484
Venous thromboembolism	0.605	0.542	0.675	<.0001
Renal failure	0.068	0.055	0.085	<.0001
Acute kidney injury	0.727	0.712	0.742	<.0001
Bleeding events	0.754	0.615	0.924	0.0065
Superficial wound	0.923	0.836	1.02	0.1148
Deep wound	0.055	0.034	0.088	<.0001
Sepsis	0.172	0.097	0.303	<.0001
Shock	0.139	0.118	0.163	<.0001
Length of stay >7 days	0.089	0.087	0.091	<.0001
Transfer	0.254	0.248	0.261	<.0001