

Stenting of bifurcation lesions

Citation for published version (APA):

Pijls, N. H. J., Leus, S. J. L., Zimmermann, F. M., van Nunen, L. X., van't Veer, M., Koolen, J., & van Hagen, E. (2017). Stenting of bifurcation lesions. *Netherlands Heart Journal*, 25(4), 290-291.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12471-017-0973-4>

DOI:

[10.1007/s12471-017-0973-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12471-017-0973-4)

Document status and date:

Published: 01/04/2017

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.tue.nl/taverne

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

openaccess@tue.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

Stenting of bifurcation lesions

N. H. J. Pijls¹ · S. J. L. Leus¹ · F. M. Zimmermann¹ · L. X. van Nunen¹ · M. van't Veer¹ · J. Koolen¹ · E. van Hagen¹

Published online: 6 March 2017

© The Author(s) 2017. This article is available at SpringerLink with Open Access.

To the Editor,

We appreciate the positive comments of Dr Stella and Dr Wykrzykowska [1] on our paper on bifurcation stenting in the Catharina Hospital, Eindhoven [2] and would like to react as follows:

1. RCT versus our retrospective analysis.

We agree that an RCT cannot be compared with a retrospective analysis. However, we do not agree on the note of natural selection bias. On the contrary, we believe that our analysis is completely unbiased because literally all patients admitted for bifurcation stenting in the year 2013 were included.

In a randomised controlled trial with strict inclusion and exclusion criteria, the population is more selected.

2. Baseline characteristics.

The baseline characteristics as presented in Table 1 of our paper refer to patient characteristics. The angiographic characteristics are mentioned separately and of course these are different between the two groups. That is also what we emphasise in our paper and in the discussion we suggest that the angiographic complexity might be one of the reasons to grade up from a provisional stent strategy to a more complex stent strategy.

3. Medina classification.

We choose for the Medina classification because this is the most commonly used classification and most well-known to general interventionalists.

4. Clinical restenosis rates.

We do not agree that the MACE rates at one year are relatively high. As presented in Table 3 of our paper, the mortality was 5.5% and 7.3% in the two groups at one year. Thanks to the 'Meetbaar Beter' project, which is a joint registry for all Dutch heart centres, [3] we know that in patients with a comparable age the 1-year mortality for all PCIs in that age group for all Dutch heart centres with surgical back-up (including Maastricht UMC and AMC Amsterdam) ranges from 4 to 7%. Therefore, when taking into account that bifurcation stenting will be at least not less complex than the average PCI and considering that in 44 patients an LM/LAD/LCX bifurcation was present, these mortality data are exactly in line with the averages of all Dutch heart centres. A similar note can be made for MI rates and TVR rates.

This does not take away the fact that a bifurcation PCI is a 'different animal' as stated by Stella and Wykrzykowska. And we agree completely about what they call the KISS approach (keep it safe and simple). That was the bottom line of our paper and our message would be: 'Start simple, grade up if mandatory'.

Reply to the letter: 'Bifurcation PCI: keep it safe and simple!'

✉ N. H. J. Pijls
nico.pijls@inter.nl.net

¹ Department of Cardiology, Catharina Hospital Eindhoven, Eindhoven, The Netherlands



Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made.

References

1. Stella P, Wykrzykowska J. Bifurcation PCI: keep it safe and simple. *Neth Heart J*. 2017. DOI:[10.1007/s12471-017-0972-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12471-017-0972-5).
2. Leus SJL, Van Hagen E, Zimmermann FM, et al. Evaluation of bifurcation stenting techniques at Catharina Hospital, Eindhoven in 2013. *Neth Heart J*. 2017;25:40–6.
3. Van Veghel HPA. et al. Meetbaar Beter Boek. Meetbaar Beter Foundation; 2016, <http://www.meetbaarbeter.com/documents/meetbaar-beter-boek-2016/> (Dutch), <http://www.meetbaarbeter.com/english> (English).

