Sex differences in clinical outcomes following bioresorbable scaffold implantation: a paradigm shift?



Christos V. Bourantas^{1,2,3}*, MD, PhD; Retesh Bajaj^{1,3}, MRCP; Vincenzo Tufaro¹, MD; Yakup Kilic¹, MD; Patrick W. Serruys⁴, MD, PhD

1. Barts Heart Centre, Barts Health NHS Trust, London, United Kingdom; 2. Institute of Cardiovascular Sciences, University College London, London, United Kingdom; 3. William Harvey Research Institute, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom; 4. Faculty of Medicine, National Heart & Lung Institute, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom

The treatment of female patients with coronary artery disease has traditionally been associated with an increased periprocedural complication rate and worse outcomes compared to male patients. In the early days of plain old balloon angioplasty there was a lower angiographic success rate and a higher complication and mortality rate in women than in men1. The introduction of bare metal stents (BMS) created hopes that this therapy would improve prognosis in this vulnerable population; however, clinical studies and meta-analyses consistently showed worse shortterm outcomes in female patients and a higher incidence of death or myocardial infraction at 30-day follow-up2. The first-generation drug-eluting stents (DES) minimised neointimal proliferation and the incidence of restenosis and improved procedural outcomes in both genders. Studies comparing event rates in male and female patients implanted with paclitaxel- or sirolimus-eluting stents consistently showed improved short- and long-term prognosis compared to patients treated with BMS in both genders, highlighting the efficacy of these devices in the treatment of women^{3,4}. However, despite the improved prognosis noted with the introduction of DES, the target lesion revascularisation (TLR) rate was significantly higher in women in the TAXUS IV study at one-year follow-up (7.6% vs 3.2%, p=0.030); these differences disappeared

in studies with the second-generation DES where the incidence of TLR was similar in male and female patients (Figure 1)⁵.

Bioresorbable scaffolds were introduced in interventional cardiology to overcome the limitations of the metallic stents and improve long-term prognosis in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI). The mechanical properties, design, strut thickness and configuration as well as the bioresorption process occurring following their implantation impacted on vessel morphology, physiology and biology – in a different manner from the metallic stents – and influenced the outcomes in male and female patients undergoing treatment with these devices^{6,7}.

The first study that compared prognosis in male and female patients implanted with a bioresorbable scaffold (Absorb[™] bioresorbable vascular scaffold [BVS]; Abbott Vascular, Santa Clara, CA, USA) included 3,389 patients recruited in the ABSORB II, ABSORB III, ABSORB China and ABSORB Japan studies and showed similar outcomes in the two groups⁸. However, in the study of Baquet et al⁹, published in the current issue of EuroIntervention, the authors for the first time demonstrated a gender effect on clinical outcomes at two-year follow-up, with females having a better prognosis than male patients.

Article, see page 615

*Corresponding author: Barts Heart Centre, 1 St Martin's Le Grand, London, EC1A 7BE, United Kingdom. E-mail: Cbourantas@gmail.com

DOI: 10.4244/EIJV15I7A105



Figure 1. *Clinical outcomes after percutaneous coronary intervention with different devices. A) Procedural complications, major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE), TLR and (B) stent/scaffold thrombosis (ST) rates following plain old balloon angioplasty (POBA), bare metal stent (BMS), paclitaxel-eluting stent (PES), sirolimus-eluting stent (SES), everolimus-eluting stent (EES) and Absorb BVS implantation in patients recruited in the study of Baquet et al⁹ in the NHLBI PTCA registry¹, the TAXUS IV⁴ and AIDA¹⁵ randomised controlled studies and in the meta-analyses of Solinas et al⁸ and Shreenivas et al⁸.*

The authors analysed data from 1,032 patients (259 women) treated with an Absorb BVS and reported a lower, but not statistically significantly different, incidence of target lesion failure (13.2% vs 17.9%, p=0.12), TLR (12.4% vs 7.5%, p=0.051) and stent thrombosis (1.2% vs 2.7%, p=0.20) in women, while in multivariate analysis female gender was an independent predictor of a lower incidence of TLR. The reported findings should be interpreted with caution; the small number of events reported, the differences in the baseline demographics between the two groups and the marginal differences in the event rates between male and female patients do not allow us to draw firm conclusions.

A possible explanation for the differences in the reported results of Baquet et al⁹ and Shreenivas et al⁸ is the differences in the baseline demographics and angiographic characteristics of the patients included in the two studies. Patients in the study of Baquet et al⁹ had more comorbidities and longer lesions than those included in the meta-analysis of Shreenivas et al⁸ in which the patients had a smaller reference vessel diameter. These differences should be attributed to the fact that high-risk patients are often underrepresented in randomised controlled studies but also to the bias reported by Baquet et al⁹ in the selection of patients who were implanted with an Absorb BVS, as in this study the interventional cardiologists preferred the use of scaffolds in large non-calcified vessels. Therefore, in contrast to previous reports, the reference vessel and minimum lumen diameter in this analysis were not different between male and female patients⁴, while the incidence of moderate/severe calcification which can affect procedural success and long-term outcomes has not been reported in the published results.

Intravascular imaging studies have demonstrated an increased calcific burden in female patients suffering from stable angina¹⁰ and, as a consequence, the incidence of severely calcified lesions is higher in female than in male patients recruited in clinical studies⁸. On the other hand, in acute coronary syndromes - a population that was underrepresented in the first stent studies - the calcific burden in culprit lesions is higher in males¹¹. Plaque composition, especially an increased calcific burden, is a well-known predictor of TLR in metallic stents¹² and is expected also to have prognostic implications in Absorb BVS, as the acute gain is smaller following implantation of this device¹³ that also has thicker struts which, in case of a fibrotic or calcific plaque, tend to protrude into the lumen, causing flow disturbances and a higher shear rate that predisposes to platelet activation and thrombus formation¹⁴. The differences in plaque composition between male and female patients may explain the numerically lower scaffold thrombosis rate noted in female patients in this study but also in the AIDA study in which 53.6% of the recruited patients were admitted with an acute coronary syndrome (Figure 1)¹⁵.

The above hypothesis, which is supported by the study of Baquet et al⁹, and suggests that there may be a possible prognostic benefit of the use of Absorb BVS in specific populations and clinical scenarios, requires confirmation by large-scale patientlevel meta-analyses of registries and randomised controlled trials. Whether this benefit is also sustained in the long term also needs to be confirmed from the long-term follow-up data of the ABSORB studies.

Conflict of interest statement

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

References

1. Cowley MJ, Mullin SM, Kelsey SF, Kent KM, Gruentzig AR, Detre KM, Passamani ER. Sex differences in early and long-term results of coronary angioplasty in the NHLBI PTCA Registry. *Circulation.* 1985;71:90-7.

 Mehilli J, Kastrati A, Dirschinger J, Bollwein H, Neumann FJ, Schömig A. Differences in prognostic factors and outcomes between women and men undergoing coronary artery stenting. *JAMA*. 2000;284:1799-805.

3. Solinas E, Nikolsky E, Lansky AJ, Kirtane AJ, Morice MC, Popma JJ, Schofer J, Schampaert E, Pucelikova T, Aoki J, Fahy M, Dangas GD, Moses JW, Cutlip DE, Leon MB, Mehran R. Gender-specific outcomes after sirolimuseluting stent implantation. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2007;50:2111-6.

4. Lansky AJ, Costa RA, Mooney M, Midei MG, Lui HK, Strickland W, Mehran R, Leon MB, Russell ME, Ellis SG, Stone GW; TAXUS-IV Investigators. Gender-based outcomes after paclitaxel-eluting stent implantation in patients with coronary artery disease. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2005;45:1180-5.

5. Grube E, Chevalier B, Smits P, Dzavik V, Patel TM, Mullasari AS, Wöhrle J, Stuteville M, Dorange C, Kaul U; SPIRIT V Investigators. The SPIRIT V

study: a clinical evaluation of the XIENCE V everolimus-eluting coronary stent system in the treatment of patients with de novo coronary artery lesions. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2011;4:168-75.

6. Tenekecioglu E, Torii R, Bourantas C, Sotomi Y, Cavalcante R, Zeng Y, Collet C, Crake T, Suwannasom P, Onuma Y, Serruys PW. Difference in haemodynamic microenvironment in vessels scaffolded with Absorb BVS and Mirage BRMS: insights from a preclinical endothelial shear stress study. *EuroIntervention*. 2017;13:1327-35.

7. Serruys PW, Garcia-Garcia HM, Onuma Y. From metallic cages to transient bioresorbable scaffolds: change in paradigm of coronary revascularization in the upcoming decade? *Eur Heart J.* 2012;33:16-25b.

8. Shreenivas S, Kereiakes DJ, Ellis SG, Gao R, Kimura T, Onuma Y, Piard-Ruster K, Zhang Y, Koo K, Vu MT, Serruys PW, Stone GW. Efficacy and Safety of the Absorb Bioresorbable Vascular Scaffold in Females and Males: Results of an Individual Patient-Level Pooled Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2017;10:1881-90.

9. Baquet M, Hoppmann P, Grundmann D, Schmidt W, Kufner S, Theiss HD, Brunner S, Wiebe J, Eickhoff M, Jochheim D, Byrne RA, Laugwitz KL, Schunkert H, Massberg S, Kastrati A, Mehilli J. Sex and long-term outcomes after implantation of the Absorb bioresorbable vascular scaffold for treatment of coronary artery disease. *EuroIntervention*. 2019;15:615-22.

10. Inoue F, Yamaguchi S, Ueshima K, Fujimoto T, Kagoshima T, Uemura S, Saito Y. Gender differences in coronary plaque characteristics in patients with stable angina: a virtual histology intravascular ultrasound study. *Cardiovasc Interv Ther.* 2010;25:40-5.

11. Schoenenberger AW, Urbanek N, Toggweiler S, Stuck AE, Resink TJ, Erne P. Ultrasound-assessed non-culprit and culprit coronary vessels differ by age and gender. *World J Cardiol.* 2013;5:42-8.

12. Bourantas CV, Zhang YJ, Garg S, Iqbal J, Valgimigli M, Windecker S, Mohr FW, Silber S, Vries Td, Onuma Y, Garcia-Garcia HM, Morel MA, Serruys PW. Prognostic implications of coronary calcification in patients with obstructive coronary artery disease treated by percutaneous coronary intervention: a patient-level pooled analysis of 7 contemporary stent trials. *Heart.* 2014;100:1158-64.

13. Serruys PW, Chevalier B, Dudek D, Cequier A, Carrié D, Iniguez A, Dominici M, van der Schaaf RJ, Haude M, Wasungu L, Veldhof S, Peng L, Staehr P, Grundeken MJ, Ishibashi Y, Garcia-Garcia HM, Onuma Y. A bioresorbable everolimus-eluting scaffold versus a metallic everolimus-eluting stent for ischaemic heart disease caused by de-novo native coronary artery lesions (ABSORB II): an interim 1-year analysis of clinical and procedural secondary outcomes from a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.* 2015;385: 43-54.

14. Torii R, Tenekecioglu E, Katagiri Y, Chichareon P, Sotomi Y, Dijkstra J, Asano T, Modolo R, Takahashi K, Jonker H, van Geuns R, Onuma Y, Pekkan K, Bourantas CV, Serruys PW. The impact of plaque type on strut embedment/ protrusion and shear stress distribution in bioresorbable scaffold. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2019 Jun 19. [Epub ahead of print].

15. Wykrzykowska JJ, Kraak RP, Hofma SH, van der Schaaf RJ, Arkenbout EK, IJsselmuiden AJ, Elias J, van Dongen IM, Tijssen RYG, Koch KT, Baan J Jr, Vis MM, de Winter RJ, Piek JJ, Tijssen JGP, Henriques JPS; AIDA Investigators. Bioresorbable Scaffolds versus Metallic Stents in Routine PCI. *N Engl J Med.* 2017;376:2319-28.