

**Title:**

**Percutaneous coronary intervention has better in-hospital outcomes in severe renal failure patients**

Renxi Li, BS<sup>1</sup>, Qianyun Luo, BS<sup>2</sup>

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

**Disclosure:** The authors have no conflict of interest.

**Informed Patient Consent:** Given the use of retrospective, de-identified NIS data, this study was exempted 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:** 2301 words.

**Corresponding Author:** Renxi Li, 2300 I St NW, Washington, DC 20052.

The George Washington University School of Medicine and Health Sciences, Department of Surgery.

[renxili@gwu.edu](mailto:renxili@gwu.edu)

## Abstract

**Background:** In patients with severe renal failure, coronary artery bypass surgery (CABG) was found to have better long-term outcomes than percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI). This study aims to provide a retrospective analysis of short-term in-hospital peri-operative outcomes between PCI and CABG in patients with severe renal failure.

**Methods:** Patients who underwent CABG and PCI in Q4 2015-2020 were identified in National Inpatient Sample (NIS) database. Patients of age < 40 were excluded for congenital heart defects. Patients with comorbidity of severe renal failure were included. Between patients undergoing PCI and CABG, preoperative variables were compared and corrected in multivariable logistic regression examining their in-hospital peri-operative outcomes. Adjusted odds ratios (aOR) were estimated for mortality and morbidities.

**Results:** In NIS, 4,512 CABG and 13,242 PCI cases were identified. Compared to CABG, patients who underwent PCI had lower mortality (4.24% vs 5.47%, aOR 0.725,  $p < 0.0001$ ) and lower morbidity including heart failure (0.14% vs 2.97%, aOR 0.044,  $p < 0.0001$ ), stroke (0.12% vs 0.47%, aOR 0.264,  $p < 0.0001$ ), respiratory complications (0.51% vs 7.34%, aOR 0.063,  $p < 0.0001$ ), renal complications (0.05% vs 0.49%, aOR 0.075,  $p < 0.0001$ ), acute kidney injury (8.67% vs 12.66%, aOR 0.646,  $p < 0.0001$ ), deep wound complications (0.02% vs 0.35%, aOR 0.042,  $p < 0.0001$ ), shock (0.22% vs 0.95%, aOR 0.228,  $p < 0.0001$ ), and length of in-hospital stay over 7 days (24.75% vs 73.52%, aOR 0.106,  $p < 0.0001$ ).

**Conclusion:** NIS is a comprehensive database of nationwide providers, providing robust power in analysis. In patients with severe renal failure, PCI offers an advantage over CABG in terms of short-term in-hospital perioperative outcomes.

## **Introduction**

Coronary Artery Disease (CAD) is a leading cause of death in the US. When indicated for coronary revascularization, coronary artery bypass grafting (CAGB) and percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) are the two most modalities <sup>1</sup>. Severe renal failure, which includes stage 5 chronic kidney disease (CKD) and end-stage renal disease (ESRD), is a risk factor for developing CAD <sup>2</sup>. There are targeted randomized controlled trials such as EXCEL (Evaluation of XIENCE Versus Coronary Artery Bypass Surgery for Effectiveness of Left Main Revascularization) <sup>3</sup>. However, a comprehensive randomized controlled trial comparing the outcomes of CABG and PCI in patients with severe renal failure is still lacking and there is still ongoing debate on which modality is better <sup>4</sup>.

Previous meta-analysis found CABG offers better long-term outcomes than PCI in terms of all-cause and cardiac mortality while short-term mortality is higher in CABG <sup>5</sup>. However, there is a lack of research focused on other short-term in-hospital outcomes, such as infection, acute kidney injury, venous thromboembolism/pulmonary embolism. It is crucial to emphasize the significance of these short-term in-hospital outcomes in clinical decision-making as they can help physicians provide prompt in-patient care to avoid further complications.

This study aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the in-hospital peri-operative outcomes between PCI and CABG in patients with severe renal failure. This study will be retrospective based on National/Nationwide Inpatient Sample (NIS), which is the largest inpatient database that records 20% of all discharges from hospitals in the US. As many previous studies were

based on local institutional data, this study will provide considerably more statistical power to assess the peri-operative outcomes.

## Patients and Methods

Patients who underwent CABG and PCI in the last quarter of 2015-2020 were identified in the NIS database by ICD10-PCS (CABG: 0210xxx; PCI: 02703xx, 02713xx, 02723xx, and 02733xx, excluding 027x3Tx and 027x3Zx). Patients of age less than 40 were excluded for congenital heart defects. Comorbidities were defined by Elixhauser measure<sup>6</sup>. Patients with severe renal failure comorbidity (Stage 5 CKD and ESRD) were included.

Fisher's exact test was used to test for categorical variables while a two-sample independent t-test was used for continuous variables. Preoperative differences between patients undergoing PCI and CABG were noted. Perioperative outcomes were examined by univariate analysis and then adjusted for preoperative differences using multivariable logistic regression, where preoperative variables with noted differences (p-value < 0.1) were included in the regression. Adjusted odds ratios (aOR) were estimated between PCI and CABG groups for mortality, heart failure, stroke, myocardial infarction (MI), major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE), respiratory complications, pulmonary embolism (PE), venous thromboembolism (VTE), renal complications, acute kidney injury, bleeding, superficial/deep wound, sepsis, shock, length of stay > 7 days, and transfer.

All statistical analyses were performed using SAS (version 9.4). Given the usage of retrospective, de-identified NIS data, this study was exempted from IRB approval.

## Results

There were 4,512 CABG and 13,242 PCI cases with severe renal failure identified. The comorbidities and demographics of the patients are summarized in Table 1. Severe renal failure patients who underwent PCI were more likely to be Black, female, older age, and with comorbidities of lymphoma, malignant solid tumor without metastasis, dementia, diabetes, severe liver disease, chronic lung disease, hypothyroidism, and valve disease. In contrast, patients who underwent CABG are more likely to be Hispanic, Asian, male, and have heart failure and complicated hypertension.

The univariate and multivariable logistic regression comparing the in-hospital perioperative outcomes of CABG and PCI in severe renal failure patients were summarized in Table 2.

Compared to CABG, severe renal failure patients who received PCI had lower mortality (4.24% vs 5.47%, aOR 0.725,  $p < 0.0001$ ) and had lower morbidity including heart failure (0.14% vs 2.97%, aOR 0.044,  $p < 0.0001$ ), stroke (0.12% vs 0.47%, aOR 0.264,  $p < 0.0001$ ), respiratory complications (0.51% vs 7.34%, aOR 0.063,  $p < 0.0001$ ), renal complications (0.05% vs 0.49%, aOR 0.075,  $p < 0.0001$ ), acute kidney injury (8.67% vs 12.66%, aOR 0.646,  $p < 0.0001$ ), deep wound complications (0.02% vs 0.35%, aOR 0.042,  $p < 0.0001$ ), shock (0.22% vs 0.95%, aOR 0.228,  $p < 0.0001$ ), and length of in-hospital stay over 7 days (24.75% vs 73.52%, aOR 0.106,  $p < 0.0001$ ). There was no difference in MI, PE, VTE, bleeding, superficial wound infection, or sepsis.

## Comment

NIS is a comprehensive database of nationwide providers, providing robust power in the analysis in in-hospital outcomes. This study aimed to provide a comprehensive comparison of PCI and CABG in terms of their in-hospital peri-operative outcome in patients with severe renal failure.

CABG is more invasive and had worse immediate outcomes, as shown in the study. Thus, patients in more unfavorable conditions such as being at an older age, having diabetes, malignancy, liver and lung diseases tended to undergo PCI. However, since CABG offers a better long-term prognosis, it is a better option for patients with a history of heart failure and complicated hypertension <sup>7</sup>.

PCI has less mortality, heart failure, and stroke, which are consistent with the previous meta-analysis <sup>5</sup>. Pulmonary complications are unavoidable in CABG, which is confirmed by the presence of more immediate respiratory complications in CABG patients in this study <sup>8</sup>. A randomized control trial revealed less AKI/acute-on-chronic kidney disease in severe renal failure patients who underwent PCI for left main coronary artery revascularization <sup>3</sup>. This study further shows in all severe renal failure patients who underwent PCI, there is less risk for acute-on-chronic kidney diseases. The rate of VTE and PE were low in both CABG and PCI and there is no difference in their occurrence, which maybe account for by both adequate anti-coagulant management in both modalities. CABG, as a more complex and invasive procedure, not surprisingly required longer stay in the hospital, higher transfer rate to other healthcare facilities, and has more perioperative deep wound infection and shock.



There are various limitations of this study. Previous studies demonstrated intraoperative factors, including affected stenosis diameter, coronary segment, the dominance of the coronary arteries, presence of lesions, and diffusion to small vessels, that are relevant to successful revascularization and may affect morbidity and mortality but are not recorded in NIS<sup>1,9</sup>. Also, numerous factors cannot be controlled for retrospective studies, such as the accuracy of the record and selection bias of the participating hospitals in NIS. Thus, comprehensive randomized studies are needed in the future to assess these coronary revascularization modalities in patients with severe renal failure.

Overall, while the literature shows CABG offers better long-term outcomes in CAD patients with severe renal failure, this study demonstrated that short-term outcomes are superior in PCI not only in mortality and cardiac complications but also in terms of pulmonary, renal, and wound complications. This study is thus instructive for providers to consider the potential risks and benefits of each intervention for patients with severe renal failure. For example, high-risk renal failure patients might prefer the early benefit of PCI. In addition, this study provides insight on perioperative management, where in patients with severe renal failure, besides cardiac complications, acute-on-chronic kidney disease and pulmonary complications should be continuously monitored, especially in patients with relevant comorbidities.

## **Acknowledgments**

The authors acknowledge the guidance and support of colleagues and reviewers who provided useful feedback throughout the work.

## **Disclosures**

The authors have no conflict of interest.

## References

1. Authors/Task Force members, Windecker S, Kolh P, 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*. 2014;35(37):2541-2619. doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehu278
2. Costanzo P, Džavík V. Coronary Revascularization in Patients With Advanced Chronic Kidney Disease. *Can J Cardiol*. 2019;35(8):1002-1014. doi:10.1016/j.cjca.2019.02.026
3. Giustino G, Mehran R, Serruys PW, et al. Left Main Revascularization With PCI or CABG in Patients With Chronic Kidney Disease. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2018;72(7):754-765. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2018.05.057
4. Charytan DM, Zelevinsky K, Wolf R, Normand SLT. All-Cause Mortality and Progression to End-Stage Kidney Disease Following Percutaneous Revascularization or Surgical Coronary Revascularization in Patients with CKD. *Kidney International Reports*. 2021;6(6):1580-1591. doi:10.1016/j.ekir.2021.03.882
5. Li X, Xiao F, Zhang S. Coronary revascularisation in patients with chronic kidney disease and end-stage renal disease: A meta-analysis. *Int J Clin Pract*. 2021;75(11):e14506. doi:10.1111/ijcp.14506
6. Elixhauser A, Steiner C, Harris DR, Coffey RM. Comorbidity measures for use with administrative data. *Med Care*. 1998;36(1):8-27. doi:10.1097/00005650-199801000-00004

7. Gan L, Sun D, Cheng Y, et al. Post-operative blood pressure and 3-year major adverse cardiac events in Chinese patients undergoing PCI. *BMC Cardiovascular Disorders*. 2021;21(1):623. doi:10.1186/s12872-021-02435-2
8. Mali S, Haghaninejad H. Pulmonary complications following cardiac surgery. *Arch Med Sci Atheroscler Dis*. 2019;4:e280-e285. doi:10.5114/amsad.2019.91432
9. Zheng Z, Xu B, Zhang H, et al. Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Surgery and Percutaneous Coronary Interventions in Patients With Unprotected Left Main Coronary Artery Disease. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. 2016;9(11):1102-1111. doi:10.1016/j.jcin.2016.03.039

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

	<b>CABG (n=4,512)</b>	<b>PCI (n=13,242)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Race, n (%)</b>			
White	2109 (46.74%)	6180 (46.67%)	0.9312
Black	900 (19.95%)	3158 (23.85%)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Hispanic	815 (18.06%)	2159 (16.3%)	<b>0.0069</b>
Asian	330 (7.31%)	789 (5.96%)	<b>0.0014</b>
Native Americans	55 (1.22%)	175 (1.32%)	0.6477
Others	174 (3.86%)	474 (3.58%)	0.4080
<b>Sex, n (%)</b>			
Male sex	3184 (70.57%)	8063 (60.88%)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Female sex	1328 (29.43%)	5179 (39.11%)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
<b>Age, mean ± SD, years old</b>	<b>62.42 ± 10.32</b>	<b>64.87 ± 11.43</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
<b>Comorbidities, n (%)</b>			
AIDS	42 (0.93%)	128 (0.97%)	0.9295
Alcohol use	42 (0.93%)	111 (0.84%)	0.5759
Autoimmune Disease	130 (2.88%)	374 (2.82%)	0.8356
Lymphoma	16 (0.35%)	92 (0.69%)	<b>0.0104</b>
Leukemia	18 (0.4%)	42 (0.32%)	0.4572
Metastatic cancer	9 (0.2%)	51 (0.39%)	0.0738
Solid tumor without metastasis, in situ	2 (0.04%)	3 (0.02%)	0.6067
Solid tumor without metastasis, malignant	44 (0.98%)	181 (1.37%)	0.0449
Cerebral vascular disease	161 (3.57%)	518 (3.91%)	0.3227
Heart Failure	7 (0.16%)	1 (0.01%)	<b>0.0004</b>
Dementia	46 (1.02%)	345 (2.61%)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Depression	410 (9.09%)	1324 (10%)	0.0766
Diabetes without chronic complications	246 (5.45%)	829 (6.26%)	0.051
Diabetes with chronic complications	3226 (71.5%)	9175 (69.28%)	<b>0.0051</b>
Drug abuse	62 (1.37%)	166 (1.25%)	0.5404
Hypertension complicated	4176 (92.55%)	11787 (89.01%)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Hypertension uncomplicated	132 (2.93%)	419 (3.16%)	0.4559
Severe liver disease	18 (0.4%)	103 (0.78%)	<b>0.0063</b>
Chronic lung disease	761 (16.87%)	2728 (20.6%)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>

Obesity	1173 (26%)	2735 (20.65%)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Paralysis	131 (2.9%)	425 (3.21%)	0.3225
Peripheral vascular disease	777 (17.22%)	2202 (16.63%)	0.3563
Hypothyroidism	562 (12.46%)	1850 (13.97%)	<b>0.0103</b>
Other thyroid disorders	35 (0.78%)	104 (0.79%)	1
Valve disease	42 (0.93%)	338 (2.55%)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>

**Table 2.** The in-hospital post-CABG and PCI surgical outcomes of patients with severe renal failure from 2015 to 2020 in the NIS database.

	<b>PCI (n = 13243)</b> No. of case (%)	<b>CABG (n = 4512)</b> No. of case (%)	<b>aOR for PCI/CABG, 95% CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>
Mortality	562 (4.24%)	247 (5.47%)	0.725, 0.620-0.847	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Heart failure	19 (0.14%)	134 (2.97%)	0.044, 0.027-0.071	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Stroke	16 (0.12%)	21 (0.47%)	0.264, 0.138-0.507	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Myocardial infarction	358 (2.7%)	115 (2.55%)	1.053, 0.850-1.306	0.6348
Respiratory complication	67 (0.51%)	331 (7.34%)	0.063, 0.049-0.083	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Pulmonary embolism	5 (0.04%)	1 (0.02%)	1.704, 0.199-14.587	0.6267
Venous thromboembolism	54 (0.41%)	24 (0.53%)	0.758, 0.468-1.229	0.2616
Renal failure	6 (0.05%)	22 (0.49%)	0.075, 0.030-0.189	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Acute kidney injury	1148 (8.67%)	571 (12.66%)	0.646, 0.579-0.720	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Bleeding events	27 (0.2%)	12 (0.27%)	0.772, 0.391-1.526	0.457
Superficial wound	142 (1.07%)	44 (0.98%)	1.012, 0.718-1.426	0.9445
Deep wound	2 (0.02%)	16 (0.35%)	0.042, 0.010-0.182	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Sepsis	5 (0.04%)	4 (0.09%)	0.412, 0.110-1.537	0.1866
Shock	29 (0.22%)	43 (0.95%)	0.228, 0.142-0.365	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Length of stay>7 days	3277 (24.75%)	3317 (73.52%)	0.106, 0.098-0.115	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Transfer	2065 (15.59%)	1723 (38.19%)	0.270, 0.250-0.292	<b>&lt;.0001</b>