Instantaneous Wave-Free Ratio–Guided PCI Versus CABG for Distal Left Main Coronary Disease: A Contemporary Review

Ahmed Saed Eldamanhoury [1], Mohammed Hossam El-Din Elshaer [1], Mohammed Abdelnaby Elsayed Mohammed Emara [2] , Alaa Elsayed Salama [1]

1 Department of Cardiology, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University
2 Cardiovascular Specialist - National Heart Institute

Corresponding Author: Mohammed Abdelnaby Elsayed Mohammed Emara

Received: 28 October 2024, **Accepted:** 17 November 2024, **Published:** 20 November 2024

Abstract

Background: Distal left main coronary artery disease (LMCAD) represents one of the most challenging and prognostically significant subsets of coronary artery disease because of the large myocardial territory at risk and the frequent association with complex bifurcation anatomy. Coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) has historically been considered the standard revascularization strategy for significant unprotected left main disease, particularly in patients with complex coronary anatomy. However, substantial advances in percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI), including newer-generation drug-eluting stents, intracoronary imaging, bifurcation stenting techniques, and physiological lesion assessment, have significantly improved procedural safety and long-term clinical outcomes. Among physiological assessment modalities, instantaneous wave-free ratio (iFR) has emerged as an attractive adenosine-free alternative to fractional flow reserve (FFR) for evaluating the hemodynamic significance of coronary lesions and guiding revascularization decisions.

Contemporary evidence suggests that physiology-guided PCI may optimize patient selection, reduce unnecessary revascularization, improve stent deployment strategies, and enhance clinical outcomes in patients with distal unprotected left main disease and low-to-intermediate SYNTAX scores. In addition, major randomized clinical trials and observational registries comparing PCI and CABG have demonstrated comparable rates of mortality, myocardial infarction, and stroke in selected patient populations, although repeat revascularization remains more frequent following PCI. The integration of iFR with intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) and advanced bifurcation techniques has further strengthened the role of PCI in anatomically complex distal left main lesions.

This review discusses the contemporary role of iFR-guided PCI compared with CABG for distal left main coronary artery disease, with particular emphasis on pathophysiology, lesion complexity, coronary physiology, imaging-guided intervention, major randomized trials, and current guideline recommendations. Furthermore, the review highlights the evolving concept of precision revascularization and the importance of multidisciplinary heart team decision-making in selecting the optimal treatment strategy. Current evidence supports iFR-guided PCI as a safe and effective alternative to CABG in carefully selected patients with significant distal unprotected left main disease, especially those with low-to-intermediate anatomical complexity and favorable clinical profiles.

Keywords: Distal Left Main Disease; Instantaneous Wave-Free Ratio; Coronary Revascularization

Introduction

Left main coronary artery disease (LMCAD) remains one of the most clinically important manifestations of coronary atherosclerosis because the left main coronary artery supplies nearly 70%–75% of the left ventricular myocardium in right-dominant circulation and an even larger territory in left-dominant systems. Significant stenosis involving the distal left main bifurcation is particularly associated with high morbidity and mortality due to the complexity of the lesion anatomy and the large ischemic myocardial burden. Historically, untreated significant left main disease has been associated with poor long-term survival and a substantial risk of myocardial infarction, heart failure, malignant arrhythmias, and sudden cardiac death. Consequently, prompt and effective myocardial revascularization has long been considered the cornerstone of management for patients with significant unprotected distal left main coronary disease [1,2].

For decades, coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) has been regarded as the gold-standard revascularization strategy for left main disease because of its durable long-term patency and survival benefit over medical therapy alone. Earlier clinical trials and observational studies consistently demonstrated superior survival outcomes with surgical revascularization, particularly in patients with complex coronary anatomy and multivessel disease. However, advances in percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI), including newer-generation drug-eluting stents, improved antiplatelet therapy, intravascular imaging, and refined bifurcation stenting techniques, have substantially transformed the therapeutic landscape of left main revascularization. As a result, PCI has progressively emerged as a feasible and effective alternative to CABG in carefully selected patients with low-to-intermediate anatomical complexity [3,4].

Distal left main bifurcation lesions remain among the most technically demanding lesions in interventional cardiology because they frequently involve the ostium of both the left anterior descending artery and left circumflex artery. The anatomical complexity of these lesions contributes to increased risks of plaque shift, side-branch compromise, restenosis, and stent thrombosis. Consequently, procedural planning and lesion assessment are critical determinants of long-term success. Conventional angiographic assessment alone may be insufficient for evaluating the true functional significance of intermediate left main lesions, particularly in borderline stenosis, diffuse disease, or heavily calcified bifurcation anatomy. This limitation has led to growing interest in physiological assessment modalities capable of determining lesion-specific ischemia more accurately [5,6].

Fractional flow reserve (FFR) has historically served as the principal invasive physiological index for assessing coronary lesion significance. Nonetheless, the requirement for adenosine administration, patient discomfort, increased procedural time, and cost limitations have restricted its routine use in some catheterization laboratories. Instantaneous wave-free ratio (iFR), an adenosine-independent physiological index measured during the diastolic wave-free period, has emerged as an attractive alternative for functional coronary assessment. Major clinical trials such as DEFINE-FLAIR and iFR-SWEDEHEART demonstrated the noninferiority of iFR compared with FFR in guiding coronary revascularization decisions, while offering improved patient comfort and procedural efficiency [7,8].

The application of iFR in distal unprotected left main disease has generated increasing clinical interest because physiological guidance may optimize patient selection for PCI, reduce unnecessary interventions, and improve procedural outcomes. Furthermore, combining iFR with intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) and contemporary bifurcation stenting strategies may facilitate more individualized and precision-based revascularization approaches. Several recent observational studies, randomized trials, and meta-analyses have evaluated outcomes of PCI versus CABG in left main disease, particularly among patients with low-to-intermediate SYNTAX scores, demonstrating comparable mortality outcomes in selected populations despite higher repeat revascularization rates following PCI [9,10].

Despite these advances, important controversies remain regarding the optimal revascularization strategy for distal left main coronary disease, particularly in relation to lesion complexity, long-term durability, diabetes mellitus, physiological lesion assessment, and the role of the multidisciplinary heart team. In addition, data specifically evaluating iFR-guided PCI in distal left main bifurcation lesions remain relatively limited compared with broader left main PCI evidence, creating an important knowledge gap in contemporary clinical practice [11].

Accordingly, this review aims to provide a contemporary overview of instantaneous wave-free ratio–guided PCI versus CABG for distal left main coronary artery disease. Particular emphasis is placed on the pathophysiological basis of distal left main disease, coronary physiology, evolving PCI technologies, imaging-guided intervention, landmark clinical trials, comparative clinical outcomes, and current guideline recommendations. The review also explores the emerging role of precision physiology-guided revascularization in improving outcomes among patients with complex distal unprotected left main coronary disease.

Epidemiology and Clinical Significance of Distal Left Main Coronary Artery Disease

Left main coronary artery disease (LMCAD) is identified in approximately 4%–6% of patients undergoing coronary angiography and remains one of the most prognostically significant forms of coronary artery disease because of the extensive myocardial territory supplied by the left main coronary artery. Depending on coronary dominance, the left main artery supplies nearly three-quarters of the left ventricular myocardium through the left anterior descending (LAD) and left circumflex (LCx) arteries. Consequently, significant obstruction of the left main coronary artery can rapidly compromise myocardial perfusion, resulting in severe ischemia, ventricular dysfunction, cardiogenic shock, malignant arrhythmias, and sudden cardiac death. Distal left main disease, particularly involving bifurcation lesions, represents the most common and complex anatomical subset of LMCAD encountered in clinical practice [12,13].

The prevalence of distal bifurcation involvement among patients with left main disease exceeds 60% in many contemporary angiographic registries. Distal lesions are associated with greater anatomical complexity than ostial or shaft lesions because they frequently involve the ostia of both the LAD and LCx arteries. This anatomical configuration creates significant technical challenges during revascularization and increases the risks of plaque shift, carinal displacement, side-branch compromise, stent malapposition, and restenosis. Furthermore, bifurcation lesions often coexist with diffuse multivessel coronary disease, calcification, and high atherosclerotic burden, all of which contribute to adverse clinical outcomes and complicate decision-making regarding the optimal revascularization strategy [14,15].

Several cardiovascular risk factors contribute to the development and progression of distal left main disease, including diabetes mellitus, hypertension, dyslipidemia, smoking, chronic kidney disease, advanced age, and systemic inflammatory states. Diabetes mellitus is particularly important because diabetic patients tend to exhibit diffuse coronary atherosclerosis, accelerated endothelial dysfunction, enhanced inflammatory activation, and increased rates of restenosis and adverse cardiovascular events following PCI. Additionally, diabetic patients frequently present with multivessel coronary disease and higher SYNTAX scores, factors that historically favored CABG over PCI in many revascularization trials [16,17].

The natural history of untreated significant unprotected left main disease remains poor despite advances in medical therapy. Earlier observational studies demonstrated mortality rates exceeding 50% at five years among medically treated patients with severe left main stenosis. Although modern pharmacological management, including intensive lipid lowering, antiplatelet therapy, renin-angiotensin system blockade, and sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors, has improved overall cardiovascular outcomes, revascularization remains the standard of care for significant left main disease because medical therapy alone is insufficient to address the large ischemic burden associated with critical left main obstruction [18,19].

Distal left main disease may present clinically across a broad spectrum ranging from stable angina to acute coronary syndromes and cardiogenic shock. Patients commonly experience exertional chest pain, dyspnea, reduced exercise tolerance, or symptoms of heart failure due to extensive myocardial ischemia. Acute plaque rupture involving the distal left main bifurcation can result in catastrophic hemodynamic compromise because simultaneous ischemia may occur within both the LAD and LCx territories. Importantly, elderly individuals and diabetic patients may present atypically with fatigue, generalized weakness, or silent ischemia, potentially delaying diagnosis and increasing the risk of adverse outcomes

[20].

The distinction between protected and unprotected left main disease is clinically essential. Unprotected left main coronary artery disease refers to the absence of a patent bypass graft supplying the left coronary circulation and is associated with substantially higher ischemic risk and mortality compared with protected disease. In patients with unprotected distal left main stenosis, prompt evaluation by a multidisciplinary heart team is recommended to determine the most appropriate revascularization strategy. Factors influencing treatment selection include anatomical complexity, lesion location, SYNTAX score, left ventricular function, surgical risk, diabetes status, frailty, and patient preference [21,22].

Contemporary improvements in PCI technology, intracoronary imaging, physiological lesion assessment, and bifurcation stenting techniques have significantly altered the therapeutic landscape of distal left main disease. In selected patients with low-to-intermediate anatomical complexity, PCI outcomes have become increasingly comparable to CABG regarding mortality, myocardial infarction, and stroke, although repeat revascularization remains more frequent after PCI. The growing use of physiology-guided intervention, particularly with instantaneous wave-free ratio (iFR), reflects a broader shift toward precision-based coronary revascularization aimed at improving lesion selection and optimizing long-term outcomes [23].

Anatomical Complexity and Pathophysiology of Distal Left Main Bifurcation Disease

Distal left main coronary artery disease represents the most anatomically complex form of left main atherosclerosis because it involves the bifurcation of the left main coronary artery into the left anterior descending (LAD) and left circumflex (LCx) arteries. The unique geometric configuration of the distal left main bifurcation creates significant hemodynamic stress and turbulent blood flow, predisposing this region to endothelial dysfunction, plaque formation, calcification, and progressive atherosclerotic remodeling. Compared with ostial or mid-shaft lesions, distal bifurcation disease is associated with greater lesion length, larger plaque burden, and increased procedural complexity during both PCI and CABG [24,25].

The pathophysiological basis of distal left main disease is strongly influenced by local shear stress patterns. Regions exposed to low endothelial shear stress, particularly along the lateral walls of the bifurcation, demonstrate increased lipid accumulation, inflammatory activation, oxidative stress, and endothelial dysfunction. These pathological processes promote foam cell formation, necrotic core expansion, fibrous cap thinning, and progressive plaque instability. In contrast, the carinal region is generally exposed to higher shear stress and tends to be relatively spared from extensive atherosclerotic involvement. This asymmetric plaque distribution has important procedural implications during PCI because plaque shift following stent deployment may compromise the side branch and contribute to restenosis or adverse clinical outcomes [26,27].

Distal left main lesions frequently exhibit heavy calcification, diffuse disease extension, and involvement of both daughter vessels. Calcified bifurcation lesions are particularly challenging because they impair stent delivery, reduce stent expansion, and increase the risks of underexpansion, malapposition, stent thrombosis, and target lesion failure. Contemporary intracoronary imaging studies using intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) and optical coherence tomography (OCT) have demonstrated that calcified nodules, circumferential calcium arcs, and deep calcium deposits are highly prevalent in distal left main disease and strongly associated with procedural complications and long-term adverse events [28].

Anatomical classification systems play a critical role in procedural planning and revascularization strategy selection. The Medina classification remains the most widely used system for characterizing bifurcation lesions. This classification describes the presence or absence of significant disease within the proximal main vessel, distal main branch, and side branch using a binary coding system. Medina 1,1,1 lesions, which involve the distal left main, LAD ostium, and LCx ostium simultaneously, represent the most complex and technically demanding subset of bifurcation disease. These lesions are associated with higher rates of side-branch compromise, need for two-stent strategies, and repeat revascularization compared with simpler bifurcation patterns [29].

The angle between the LAD and LCx branches is another important determinant of procedural complexity and clinical outcome. Narrow bifurcation angles may increase the risk of carinal shift and side-branch occlusion during provisional stenting, whereas wide bifurcation angles may complicate final kissing balloon inflation and optimal stent apposition. Furthermore, lesion length extending beyond 10 mm into the side branch, diffuse plaque burden, thrombus formation, and severe calcification are all predictors of complex bifurcation anatomy requiring advanced two-stent techniques such as DK-crush, culotte, or T-and-protrusion stenting [30].

The SYNTAX score has become an essential tool for assessing anatomical complexity in patients with distal left main disease. This scoring system incorporates lesion location, bifurcation involvement, total occlusions, calcification, vessel tortuosity, thrombus burden, and diffuse disease extension to estimate procedural complexity and guide revascularization decisions. Patients with low-to-intermediate SYNTAX scores generally demonstrate favorable outcomes following PCI, whereas high SYNTAX scores are associated with increased rates of major adverse cardiovascular events and often favor surgical revascularization with CABG. Distal left main bifurcation lesions substantially contribute to elevated SYNTAX scores because of their anatomical intricacy and multivessel involvement [31,32].

Another important anatomical consideration is the frequent coexistence of distal left main disease with diffuse multivessel coronary artery disease. This association complicates the achievement of complete revascularization, which remains one of the strongest predictors of long-term survival regardless of the chosen revascularization modality. CABG traditionally offers more complete revascularization in diffuse multivessel disease by bypassing extensive atherosclerotic segments, whereas PCI success depends heavily on lesion accessibility, vessel size, physiological significance, and procedural expertise. Consequently, careful anatomical assessment remains fundamental when selecting between PCI and CABG in patients with distal unprotected left main disease [33].

Advances in intracoronary imaging and coronary physiology have significantly improved understanding of distal left main lesion morphology and functional significance. IVUS-derived minimal lumen area measurements, plaque characterization, calcium burden assessment, and stent optimization criteria now complement physiological indices such as iFR and FFR in guiding precision-based revascularization strategies. This integration of anatomy and physiology is increasingly recognized as essential for optimizing PCI outcomes in complex distal left main bifurcation lesions [34].

Coronary Physiology and the Role of Instantaneous Wave-Free Ratio in Left Main Coronary Artery Disease

Accurate physiological assessment of left main coronary artery disease is essential because angiographic evaluation alone frequently overestimates or underestimates the true hemodynamic severity of intermediate lesions. This limitation is particularly important in distal left main bifurcation disease, where vessel overlap, eccentric plaque distribution, diffuse atherosclerosis, and foreshortening can impair angiographic interpretation. Visual estimation of stenosis severity often demonstrates substantial interobserver variability, especially in lesions with 30%–70% diameter stenosis. Consequently, reliance solely on angiographic appearance may lead to unnecessary revascularization or inappropriate deferral of treatment, emphasizing the importance of physiological lesion assessment in contemporary practice [35,36].

Fractional flow reserve (FFR) has historically been considered the reference standard for invasive physiological evaluation of coronary stenosis severity. FFR measures the ratio of distal coronary pressure to aortic pressure during maximal hyperemia induced by adenosine administration. An FFR value ≤0.80 is generally considered indicative of hemodynamically significant ischemia requiring revascularization. Multiple studies have demonstrated that FFR-guided PCI improves clinical outcomes, reduces unnecessary stenting, and decreases healthcare costs compared with angiography-guided intervention alone. However, FFR assessment of left main lesions presents unique technical and physiological challenges because downstream disease in the LAD or LCx may artificially elevate FFR measurements and underestimate the true severity of left main stenosis [37,38].

Instantaneous wave-free ratio (iFR) has emerged as an attractive alternative physiological index because it does not require pharmacologically induced hyperemia. iFR is measured during a specific diastolic wave-free period in which microvascular resistance is naturally minimized and stable, allowing accurate pressure-derived assessment of lesion severity without adenosine administration. The avoidance of hyperemic agents reduces patient discomfort, procedural time, operator complexity, and costs while maintaining excellent diagnostic performance. An iFR value ≤0.89 is generally considered hemodynamically significant and supportive of revascularization [39].

Large randomized clinical trials have validated the safety and efficacy of iFR-guided coronary revascularization. The DEFINE-FLAIR and iFR SWEDEHEART trials demonstrated the noninferiority of iFR compared with FFR regarding major adverse cardiovascular events, including death, myocardial infarction, and unplanned revascularization. Importantly, patients undergoing iFR-guided assessment experienced fewer procedural symptoms and shorter procedure duration because adenosine administration was avoided. Long-term follow-up data extending to five years further confirmed comparable mortality and adverse cardiovascular outcomes between iFR- and FFR-guided revascularization strategies [40,41].

The application of iFR in distal left main disease has become increasingly important because physiological lesion assessment may improve decision-making in anatomically complex bifurcation lesions. Intermediate left main stenoses are particularly difficult to evaluate angiographically due to vessel size variability, bifurcation geometry, and diffuse plaque extension. In such settings, iFR may help determine whether revascularization is truly necessary, thereby reducing unnecessary PCI or CABG procedures. Furthermore, physiological assessment can identify ischemia-producing lesions more accurately than angiography alone and facilitate individualized treatment strategies [42].

An important advantage of iFR in distal left main bifurcation disease is its ability to evaluate both daughter vessels separately following PCI. Assessment of the jailed left circumflex artery after crossover stenting from the left main to the LAD is particularly valuable because angiographic narrowing may not necessarily correspond to functional ischemia. Lee and colleagues demonstrated that FFR assessment of jailed LCx lesions following left main crossover stenting correlated more accurately with long-term clinical outcomes than angiographic appearance alone. Similar physiological principles support the use of iFR in evaluating side-branch compromise after bifurcation PCI [43].

Despite its advantages, physiological assessment of left main disease remains technically complex and requires careful interpretation. Severe downstream stenoses in the LAD or LCx may influence pressure-derived indices and underestimate left main lesion severity. In addition, diffuse disease, microvascular dysfunction, severe left ventricular hypertrophy, and acute coronary syndromes may alter coronary flow dynamics and affect physiological measurements. Therefore, many experts recommend integrating physiological assessment with intracoronary imaging modalities such as IVUS or OCT to optimize diagnostic accuracy and procedural planning [44].

The combination of iFR and intravascular imaging reflects the evolving concept of precision-guided coronary revascularization. IVUS-derived minimal lumen area measurements, plaque burden assessment, calcium characterization, and stent optimization criteria provide detailed anatomical information that complements physiological lesion assessment. This integrated strategy may improve patient selection for PCI, optimize stent deployment, reduce procedural complications, and improve long-term outcomes in patients with distal unprotected left main coronary artery disease [45].

Emerging technologies such as quantitative flow ratio (QFR), angiography-derived computational physiology, and artificial intelligence-assisted lesion analysis may further refine physiological assessment in left main disease. These approaches aim to provide rapid, wire-free functional evaluation while minimizing procedural complexity. As coronary physiology continues to evolve, physiology-guided PCI is expected to play an increasingly central role in individualized decision-making for distal left main coronary revascularization [46].

Current Guideline Recommendations and the Heart Team Approach in Left Main Revascularization

The management of significant unprotected left main coronary artery disease has evolved substantially over the past two decades due to advancements in PCI technologies, intracoronary imaging, coronary physiology, and accumulating evidence from major randomized clinical trials. Contemporary international guidelines now recognize PCI as an acceptable alternative to CABG in selected patients with low-to-intermediate anatomical complexity, particularly when equivalent revascularization can be achieved. Nevertheless, CABG continues to maintain a central role in patients with extensive coronary disease, high SYNTAX scores, diabetes mellitus, or diffuse multivessel involvement because of its long-established durability and completeness of revascularization [47,48].

The 2018 European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS) guidelines on myocardial revascularization recommend CABG as a Class I indication for all patients with significant left main disease regardless of anatomical complexity. However, PCI is also strongly supported in selected patients according to SYNTAX score stratification. For patients with low SYNTAX scores (0–22), PCI carries a Class I recommendation, while patients with intermediate SYNTAX scores (23–32) receive a Class IIa recommendation. In contrast, PCI is generally discouraged in patients with high SYNTAX scores (>32), where CABG remains the preferred strategy because of superior long-term outcomes and lower rates of repeat revascularization [49].

Similarly, the 2021 American College of Cardiology (ACC), American Heart Association (AHA), and Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions (SCAI) coronary revascularization guidelines support PCI as a reasonable alternative to CABG in carefully selected patients with stable ischemic heart disease and significant left main stenosis when comparable revascularization can be achieved. These guidelines emphasize individualized patient assessment, integration of anatomical and clinical risk factors, and multidisciplinary heart team decision-making. Importantly, the updated American guidelines moved away from strict anatomical subclassifications and increasingly emphasize patient-centered individualized care [50].

One of the major drivers behind evolving guideline recommendations has been the publication of landmark randomized clinical trials comparing PCI with CABG for left main coronary disease. Trials such as SYNTAX, PRECOMBAT, EXCEL, and NOBLE demonstrated that contemporary PCI using drug-eluting stents may provide comparable rates of mortality, stroke, and myocardial infarction to CABG in selected patient populations, particularly those with low-to-intermediate anatomical complexity. However, repeat revascularization remains consistently more frequent following PCI, especially in distal bifurcation disease and diffuse multivessel involvement [51,52].

The concept of the multidisciplinary heart team has become central to contemporary left main revascularization decision-making. Current guidelines strongly recommend collaborative evaluation involving interventional cardiologists, cardiac surgeons, imaging specialists, anesthesiologists, and, when appropriate, heart failure specialists and intensivists. This multidisciplinary approach ensures comprehensive assessment of anatomical complexity, surgical risk, comorbid conditions, frailty, patient preference, and anticipated quality-of-life outcomes. Heart team discussions are particularly important in distal left main bifurcation disease, where procedural complexity and long-term durability must be carefully balanced [53].

Risk stratification tools play a major role during heart team discussions. The SYNTAX score remains the most widely used anatomical scoring system and helps estimate procedural complexity and long-term outcomes after PCI. However, clinical variables also significantly influence prognosis. Consequently, combined anatomical and clinical scoring systems such as SYNTAX Score II integrate age, renal function, left ventricular ejection fraction, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, peripheral vascular disease, and sex to facilitate individualized treatment recommendations between PCI and CABG. Additional surgical risk models including EuroSCORE II and the Society of Thoracic Surgeons (STS) score help estimate perioperative mortality and surgical complications [54,55].

Patient-specific factors increasingly influence revascularization decisions beyond traditional anatomical assessment. Frailty, advanced age, severe pulmonary disease, prior stroke, renal dysfunction, limited life expectancy, poor conduit availability, inability to tolerate prolonged dual antiplatelet therapy, and patient preference may favor PCI over surgery even in anatomically complex disease. Conversely, younger diabetic patients with diffuse multivessel disease and preserved surgical candidacy often derive greater long-term benefit from CABG because of superior durability and reduced need for repeat intervention [56].

Coronary physiology and intracoronary imaging are also increasingly integrated into guideline-directed decision-making. Physiological assessment using FFR or iFR can help determine the true ischemic significance of intermediate left main lesions and prevent unnecessary revascularization. Similarly, IVUS-guided PCI has become strongly recommended for left main interventions because imaging improves lesion characterization, optimizes stent sizing and expansion, and reduces major adverse cardiovascular events. The combination of coronary physiology and imaging reflects the broader transition toward precision-guided coronary intervention [57].

Although significant progress has been achieved, several unresolved controversies persist in contemporary left main revascularization. Long-term durability beyond 10 years, optimal treatment in diabetic populations, management of heavily calcified bifurcation lesions, and the role of physiology-guided PCI in distal left main disease continue to evolve. Consequently, individualized decision-making using a heart team approach remains essential for selecting the optimal revascularization strategy and improving patient-centered outcomes [58].

Percutaneous Coronary Intervention for Distal Left Main Coronary Artery Disease

Percutaneous coronary intervention has undergone remarkable evolution over the last two decades and has progressively emerged as a viable alternative to coronary artery bypass grafting for selected patients with distal unprotected left main coronary artery disease. Earlier experiences with balloon angioplasty and bare-metal stents were associated with high rates of restenosis, abrupt vessel closure, repeat revascularization, and mortality, limiting PCI use primarily to surgically ineligible patients or emergency salvage situations. However, advancements in stent platforms, dual antiplatelet therapy, intracoronary imaging, lesion preparation devices, and operator expertise have dramatically improved both procedural success and long-term outcomes in complex left main interventions [59,60].

The introduction of first-generation drug-eluting stents significantly reduced restenosis rates compared with bare-metal stents and represented a major milestone in left main PCI. Subsequent development of second- and newer-generation drug-eluting stents further improved procedural safety by reducing stent thrombosis, neointimal hyperplasia, and target lesion failure. Modern stent platforms provide thinner struts, enhanced radial strength, improved deliverability, and superior endothelial healing, making them particularly suitable for complex distal left main bifurcation lesions [61].

Distal left main bifurcation PCI remains technically challenging because of the large vessel caliber discrepancy between the proximal left main artery and the daughter vessels, combined with extensive plaque burden and bifurcation geometry. Procedural planning requires careful assessment of lesion morphology, side-branch involvement, calcium distribution, bifurcation angle, vessel diameter, and hemodynamic significance. Contemporary PCI strategies increasingly emphasize lesion-specific individualized approaches rather than routine use of complex stenting techniques [62].

The provisional one-stent technique is currently considered the preferred default strategy for most distal left main bifurcation lesions because of its procedural simplicity, lower stent burden, shorter procedure duration, and favorable long-term outcomes. In this approach, a stent is initially implanted from the left main artery into the main branch, usually the LAD, while preserving access to the side branch. Additional intervention on the side branch is performed only if significant compromise, ischemia, or impaired flow develops after main-vessel stenting. Multiple studies have demonstrated that provisional stenting is associated with reduced procedural complications and comparable long-term outcomes in appropriately selected bifurcation lesions [63].

Nevertheless, complex distal left main bifurcation lesions frequently require planned two-stent strategies, particularly in Medina 1,1,1 lesions with extensive side-branch disease. Several advanced bifurcation techniques have been developed, including culotte stenting, T-and-protrusion (TAP), crush stenting, mini-crush, and double-kissing (DK) crush techniques. Among these approaches, DK-crush has gained substantial attention because randomized studies demonstrated lower rates of target lesion failure, myocardial infarction, and stent thrombosis compared with provisional stenting in highly complex bifurcation lesions [64].

The DEFINITION trial and subsequent DKCRUSH studies significantly influenced contemporary bifurcation PCI practice. These studies showed that complex bifurcation lesions characterized by long side-branch involvement, severe calcification, diffuse disease, and unfavorable bifurcation angles may benefit from an upfront two-stent strategy using DK-crush techniques. The DK-crush approach improves side-branch scaffolding, minimizes plaque shift, optimizes final kissing balloon inflation, and enhances long-term vessel patency. However, these procedures require advanced technical expertise and longer procedural duration, underscoring the importance of operator experience in left main bifurcation intervention [65,66].

Intracoronary imaging has become fundamental during contemporary left main PCI. Intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) is strongly recommended because it provides accurate assessment of lesion length, vessel diameter, plaque burden, calcium distribution, and stent expansion. IVUS-guided PCI enables precise stent sizing, optimization of proximal optimization technique (POT), detection of stent malapposition, and confirmation of adequate minimal stent area. Multiple observational studies and meta-analyses have demonstrated that IVUS-guided left main PCI significantly reduces mortality, restenosis, and stent thrombosis compared with angiography-guided intervention alone [67].

Physiological guidance using iFR or FFR also plays an increasingly important role during left main PCI. Physiological lesion assessment may identify functionally significant stenoses requiring intervention while safely deferring nonischemic lesions. Furthermore, physiological evaluation of the jailed LCx following crossover stenting may help determine whether additional side-branch intervention is necessary. This physiology-guided strategy reduces unnecessary stenting and minimizes procedural complexity without compromising long-term outcomes [68].

Severe calcification remains one of the major challenges during distal left main PCI because inadequate lesion preparation contributes to stent underexpansion and adverse cardiovascular events. Contemporary calcium-modifying technologies such as rotational atherectomy, orbital atherectomy, intravascular lithotripsy, and specialty balloons have improved lesion preparation and procedural success in heavily calcified left main lesions. Adequate calcium modification before stent implantation is essential to ensure optimal stent expansion and reduce long-term complications [69].

Although PCI outcomes in distal left main disease have improved substantially, several limitations remain compared with CABG. Repeat revascularization rates remain consistently higher following PCI, particularly in patients with diffuse disease, diabetes mellitus, heavy calcification, and high SYNTAX scores. In addition, procedural complexity and operator dependency are considerably greater in distal left main bifurcation PCI compared with non-left-main interventions. Consequently, careful patient selection and heart team evaluation remain critical for achieving optimal outcomes [70].

Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting for Distal Left Main Coronary Artery Disease

Coronary artery bypass grafting has historically remained the gold-standard revascularization strategy for significant left main coronary artery disease because of its proven survival benefit, long-term durability, and ability to achieve complete myocardial revascularization. Earlier landmark surgical trials demonstrated substantial reductions in mortality among patients with significant left main stenosis undergoing CABG compared with medical therapy alone. Consequently, CABG became the preferred treatment modality for complex left main disease for several decades, particularly in patients with multivessel coronary artery disease, diabetes mellitus, reduced left ventricular function, or high anatomical complexity [71,72].

The principal advantage of CABG in distal left main disease lies in its ability to bypass extensive and diffuse coronary atherosclerosis beyond the culprit lesion itself. In contrast to PCI, which focuses on focal lesion treatment, surgical grafting restores myocardial perfusion distal to the diseased coronary segments and may provide protection against future plaque progression in native vessels. This advantage is particularly important in patients with diffuse multivessel disease, severe calcification, bifurcation involvement, and elevated SYNTAX scores, where achieving complete revascularization using PCI alone may be difficult [73].

The left internal mammary artery (LIMA) graft to the left anterior descending artery remains the cornerstone of surgical left main revascularization because of its excellent long-term patency and resistance to atherosclerosis. Additional grafts using saphenous vein conduits or radial arteries are commonly used to revascularize the circumflex and right coronary territories. The durability of arterial grafting contributes substantially to the superior long-term freedom from repeat revascularization observed after CABG compared with PCI [74].

Distal left main bifurcation disease often presents unique surgical considerations because of associated multivessel involvement and diffuse plaque burden. CABG avoids the technical challenges of bifurcation stenting, plaque shift, side-branch compromise, and stent restenosis that complicate PCI in complex bifurcation anatomy. Furthermore, the surgical approach is less dependent on lesion morphology, calcium distribution, and bifurcation angle, making CABG particularly advantageous in highly complex anatomical settings [75].

Several major randomized trials comparing PCI and CABG for left main coronary disease consistently demonstrated lower repeat revascularization rates following surgery. In the SYNTAX trial, CABG was associated with fewer major adverse cardiovascular and cerebrovascular events among patients with high anatomical complexity, largely driven by reduced repeat intervention. Similarly, long-term follow-up of the PRECOMBAT and NOBLE trials demonstrated that although mortality rates between PCI and CABG were often comparable in selected populations, repeat revascularization remained significantly more common following PCI [76,77].

Diabetes mellitus strongly influences the choice between PCI and CABG in left main disease. Diabetic patients often exhibit diffuse atherosclerosis, accelerated restenosis, endothelial dysfunction, and multivessel involvement, factors that may compromise PCI durability. Several studies and pooled analyses demonstrated superior long-term outcomes with CABG in diabetic populations, particularly regarding repeat revascularization and composite major adverse cardiovascular events. Consequently, CABG remains strongly favored in many diabetic patients with distal left main and multivessel coronary artery disease [78].

Despite its advantages, CABG is associated with important perioperative risks and limitations. Surgical revascularization carries increased risks of stroke, bleeding, atrial fibrillation, wound infection, renal dysfunction, prolonged hospitalization, and delayed recovery compared with PCI. Elderly patients, frail individuals, and patients with severe pulmonary disease, advanced renal dysfunction, or previous cardiac surgery may face substantially elevated surgical risk. In such patients, PCI may offer a less invasive alternative with faster recovery and lower early morbidity [79].

Stroke risk remains one of the major concerns associated with CABG. Manipulation of the ascending aorta during surgery, cardiopulmonary bypass, postoperative atrial fibrillation, and embolic phenomena contribute to the higher incidence of cerebrovascular complications compared with PCI. Although contemporary surgical techniques and off-pump CABG strategies have reduced perioperative stroke rates, this complication continues to influence patient preference and heart team discussions [80].

Advances in surgical techniques, perioperative care, and conduit selection have improved CABG outcomes substantially over recent decades. Contemporary surgical practice increasingly incorporates multiple arterial grafting, minimally invasive approaches, hybrid revascularization, enhanced perioperative imaging, and optimized medical therapy to improve long-term survival and graft patency. Nevertheless, patient-centered decision-making remains essential because the balance between surgical durability and procedural invasiveness varies considerably according to individual anatomical and clinical profiles [81].

In contemporary practice, CABG continues to play a dominant role in patients with complex distal left main bifurcation disease, extensive multivessel involvement, high SYNTAX scores, diabetes mellitus, and diffuse calcified atherosclerosis. However, the rapid evolution of physiology-guided PCI, intracoronary imaging, and bifurcation intervention techniques has narrowed the outcome gap between PCI and surgery in selected low-to-intermediate risk patients. Consequently, optimal treatment selection increasingly depends on individualized heart team evaluation integrating anatomy, physiology, comorbidity burden, procedural feasibility, and patient preference [82].

Major Randomized Trials Comparing PCI and CABG in Left Main Coronary Artery Disease

Over the past two decades, multiple landmark randomized clinical trials have compared percutaneous coronary intervention and coronary artery bypass grafting in patients with significant unprotected left main coronary artery disease. These trials fundamentally reshaped contemporary revascularization strategies and contributed substantially to current guideline recommendations supporting PCI as a reasonable alternative to CABG in selected patients. Nevertheless, interpretation of these studies requires careful consideration of patient selection, lesion complexity, stent technology, endpoint definitions, and duration of follow-up [83].

The SYNTAX trial was among the earliest pivotal studies evaluating PCI versus CABG in patients with complex coronary artery disease, including a substantial subgroup with left main stenosis. Patients undergoing PCI received first-generation paclitaxel-eluting stents, while the surgical arm underwent conventional CABG. Early results demonstrated comparable mortality rates between PCI and CABG among patients with low-to-intermediate SYNTAX scores; however, repeat revascularization was significantly more frequent following PCI. Importantly, long-term outcomes demonstrated that anatomical complexity strongly influenced prognosis, with CABG showing superior outcomes in patients with high SYNTAX scores and extensive multivessel disease [84].

The PRECOMBAT trial further evaluated PCI using sirolimus-eluting stents compared with CABG in patients with unprotected left main disease. At long-term follow-up extending to 10 years, mortality, myocardial infarction, and stroke rates remained similar between PCI and CABG, although ischemia-driven target vessel revascularization was consistently higher in the PCI group. These findings reinforced the concept that PCI may provide acceptable long-term outcomes in selected low-to-intermediate complexity patients while emphasizing the tradeoff of increased repeat intervention [85].

The EXCEL trial represented a major milestone in contemporary left main revascularization. This large multicenter randomized study compared PCI using fluoropolymer-based cobalt-chromium everolimus-eluting stents with CABG in patients with left main disease and low-to-intermediate anatomical complexity. At three years, PCI was found to be noninferior to CABG for the composite primary endpoint of death, stroke, or myocardial infarction. Five-year follow-up continued to demonstrate similar overall mortality rates between the two strategies, although controversy emerged regarding endpoint definitions and late event trends favoring CABG in some analyses. Despite these debates, EXCEL significantly expanded acceptance of PCI for appropriately selected left main patients [86].

In contrast, the NOBLE trial demonstrated somewhat different findings. This study compared PCI using contemporary drug-eluting stents with CABG in patients with unprotected left main disease. Although mortality rates remained similar between treatment groups, PCI failed to demonstrate noninferiority because of significantly higher rates of repeat revascularization and nonprocedural myocardial infarction. Long-term follow-up suggested gradual divergence of event curves favoring CABG over time, raising concerns regarding the durability of PCI in more complex left main anatomy [87].

Meta-analyses incorporating SYNTAX, PRECOMBAT, EXCEL, NOBLE, and additional randomized studies have provided important insights into comparative outcomes between PCI and CABG. Most pooled analyses demonstrated no significant difference in all-cause mortality between PCI and CABG among patients with low-to-intermediate anatomical complexity. Similarly, rates of stroke were often lower after PCI, particularly during the perioperative period, while repeat revascularization consistently remained more frequent following PCI. These findings highlight the fundamental tradeoff between the less invasive nature of PCI and the greater long-term durability of surgical revascularization [88,89].

Anatomical complexity remains one of the strongest determinants of outcome after left main revascularization. Patients with low SYNTAX scores generally demonstrate favorable PCI outcomes comparable to CABG, whereas patients with high SYNTAX scores exhibit increased major adverse cardiovascular events following PCI. Distal bifurcation lesions, severe calcification, diffuse multivessel disease, and diabetes mellitus are particularly important predictors of adverse PCI outcomes and often favor surgical revascularization [90].

Diabetes mellitus has received special attention in subgroup analyses of left main trials. Diabetic patients typically exhibit more diffuse coronary disease, greater inflammatory burden, accelerated restenosis, and impaired endothelial healing. Pooled analyses suggest that although mortality rates may remain similar between PCI and CABG in some diabetic populations, CABG continues to provide superior freedom from repeat revascularization and composite adverse cardiovascular events in many diabetic patients with complex anatomy [91].

Importantly, most landmark trials evaluating left main revascularization primarily relied on angiographic lesion assessment rather than routine physiology-guided intervention. Consequently, contemporary application of iFR-guided PCI may potentially improve patient selection and procedural optimization beyond the outcomes observed in earlier studies. Physiological lesion assessment may help avoid unnecessary interventions, identify truly ischemic lesions, and optimize bifurcation treatment strategies, thereby potentially narrowing the outcome gap between PCI and CABG in distal left main disease [92].

Despite remarkable advancements in PCI technology and physiology-guided intervention, long-term durability remains an important consideration. CABG continues to provide superior freedom from repeat revascularization, particularly in anatomically complex distal left main bifurcation disease. However, improvements in stent design, intravascular imaging, calcium modification techniques, and physiological guidance continue to enhance PCI outcomes and support its expanding role in carefully selected patients with distal unprotected left main coronary artery disease [93].

Clinical Outcomes of iFR-Guided PCI Versus CABG in Distal Left Main Coronary Artery Disease

Clinical outcomes following revascularization of distal unprotected left main coronary artery disease depend on multiple interacting factors, including anatomical complexity, lesion location, physiological significance, patient comorbidities, completeness of revascularization, and procedural optimization. Contemporary studies increasingly demonstrate that physiology-guided PCI using instantaneous wave-free ratio (iFR) may improve patient selection and procedural decision-making, potentially narrowing the outcome gap between PCI and CABG in selected low-to-intermediate risk patients. Nevertheless, differences persist regarding repeat revascularization rates, long-term durability, and outcomes in anatomically complex disease [94].

One of the most important advantages of physiology-guided PCI is the reduction of unnecessary coronary intervention. Angiographic assessment alone frequently overestimates the severity of intermediate left main lesions, particularly in distal bifurcation anatomy with overlapping branches and diffuse plaque burden. Physiological indices such as iFR help identify truly ischemia-producing lesions, allowing safe deferral of revascularization in hemodynamically insignificant stenoses. This selective strategy reduces procedural complexity, unnecessary stent implantation, contrast exposure, and periprocedural complications while maintaining favorable long-term outcomes [95].

Randomized studies comparing iFR-guided and FFR-guided revascularization demonstrated similar rates of death, myocardial infarction, and unplanned revascularization over long-term follow-up. The DEFINE-FLAIR and iFR SWEDEHEART trials collectively established the noninferiority of iFR compared with FFR while offering improved patient comfort and shorter procedural duration due to avoidance of adenosine administration. Importantly, five-year follow-up analyses confirmed sustained safety and efficacy of iFR-guided intervention, supporting its use in complex coronary lesions including left main disease [96,97].

Short-term outcomes after contemporary distal left main PCI have improved markedly with advances in stent technology, intravascular imaging, lesion preparation, and bifurcation techniques. In selected low-to-intermediate SYNTAX score patients, rates of procedural success now exceed 95% in experienced centers. Contemporary studies report low incidences of periprocedural myocardial infarction, acute stent thrombosis, emergency CABG, and cardiovascular mortality following physiology-guided PCI. Furthermore, PCI is associated with shorter hospitalization, faster recovery, earlier ambulation, and lower early stroke risk compared with surgical revascularization [98].

CABG, however, continues to demonstrate superior long-term freedom from repeat revascularization. Surgical grafting bypasses extensive atherosclerotic segments and provides durable myocardial perfusion even in diffuse disease. In contrast, PCI outcomes remain influenced by restenosis, neoatherosclerosis, stent failure, side-branch compromise, and progressive native vessel disease. Distal left main bifurcation lesions, particularly Medina 1,1,1 lesions with diffuse LCx involvement, remain especially vulnerable to restenosis and target lesion failure after PCI despite contemporary techniques [99].

Repeat revascularization remains the most consistent limitation of PCI across major left main trials and meta-analyses. Although mortality rates between PCI and CABG are often comparable in low-to-intermediate complexity patients, repeat intervention occurs more frequently following PCI, particularly during extended follow-up beyond five years. This difference is largely attributable to restenosis, progression of untreated diffuse disease, and bifurcation-related complications. Nevertheless, many repeat PCI procedures are less invasive and associated with lower morbidity than repeat surgical intervention [100].

Stroke risk represents an important outcome difference favoring PCI. Most randomized studies demonstrated lower early cerebrovascular event rates following PCI compared with CABG, primarily because PCI avoids cardiopulmonary bypass, aortic manipulation, and perioperative atrial fibrillation. This advantage may be particularly relevant in elderly patients, individuals with carotid artery disease, prior cerebrovascular events, or severe aortic calcification [100].

Diabetes mellitus significantly influences comparative clinical outcomes between PCI and CABG. Diabetic patients undergoing PCI often experience higher rates of restenosis, diffuse disease progression, repeat revascularization, and adverse cardiovascular events compared with nondiabetic populations. CABG frequently provides superior long-term outcomes in diabetic patients because bypass grafting offers more complete revascularization and greater protection against progressive multivessel disease. Nonetheless, selected diabetic patients with low anatomical complexity and favorable physiological assessment may still achieve acceptable outcomes with physiology-guided PCI [100].

The integration of iFR with intravascular ultrasound has become increasingly important for optimizing PCI outcomes in distal left main disease. IVUS-guided stent sizing, lesion preparation, calcium assessment, and post-stenting optimization significantly reduce stent underexpansion and target lesion failure. Physiological evaluation after PCI may also identify residual ischemia or functionally significant side-branch compromise requiring additional intervention. This combined anatomy-physiology strategy represents a central component of modern precision-guided coronary intervention [100].

Emerging evidence suggests that physiology-guided PCI may be particularly beneficial in patients with low-to-intermediate SYNTAX scores, preserved ventricular function, focal distal bifurcation lesions, and favorable side-branch anatomy. In such carefully selected populations, contemporary PCI outcomes increasingly approach those of CABG regarding mortality and myocardial infarction while preserving the advantages of less invasiveness and faster recovery. However, long-term comparative data specifically focused on iFR-guided distal left main PCI remain limited, and additional randomized trials are needed to clarify the optimal role of physiology-guided intervention in this complex patient population [100].

Conclusion

Distal unprotected left main coronary artery disease remains one of the most complex and high-risk subsets of coronary artery disease, requiring careful individualized revascularization strategies. Although coronary artery bypass grafting continues to provide excellent long-term durability and lower repeat revascularization rates, contemporary advances in percutaneous coronary intervention—including newer-generation drug-eluting stents, intracoronary imaging, complex bifurcation techniques, and physiology-guided assessment—have significantly improved PCI outcomes in selected patients. Instantaneous wave-free ratio has emerged as a valuable physiological tool that enhances lesion assessment, optimizes procedural decision-making, and reduces unnecessary revascularization without the need for hyperemic agents. Current evidence supports iFR-guided PCI as a safe and effective alternative to CABG in carefully selected patients with distal left main disease and low-to-intermediate anatomical complexity, particularly when combined with intravascular imaging and heart team-guided decision-making. Nevertheless, CABG remains the preferred strategy in patients with diffuse multivessel disease, severe anatomical complexity, diabetes mellitus, and high SYNTAX scores. Future large-scale randomized trials focusing specifically on physiology-guided distal left main intervention are warranted to further define the optimal role of iFR-guided PCI in contemporary coronary revascularization.

References

1. Collet C, Capodanno D, Onuma Y, et al. Left main coronary artery disease: pathophysiology, diagnosis, and treatment. Nat Rev Cardiol. 2018;15(6):321-331.
2. Dąbrowski EJ, Kożuch M, Dobrzycki S. Left Main Coronary Artery Disease-Current Management and Future Perspectives. J Clin Med. 2022;11(21):6515.
3. Park DW, Park SJ. Percutaneous Coronary Intervention of Left Main Disease: Pre- and Post-EXCEL and NOBLE Era. Circ Cardiovasc Interv. 2017;10(3):e004792.
4. Davidson LJ, Cleveland JC Jr, Welt FG, et al. A Practical Approach to Left Main Coronary Artery Disease: JACC State-of-the-Art Review. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2022;80(22):2119-2134.
5. Burzotta F, Lassen JF, Louvard Y, et al. European Bifurcation Club white paper on stenting techniques for patients with bifurcated coronary artery lesions. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. 2020;96(5):1067-1079.
6. Almoghairi A, Al-Asiri N, Aljohani K, et al. Left Main Percutaneous Coronary Revascularization. US Cardiol. 2023;17:e09.
7. Götberg M, Christiansen EH, Gudmundsdottir IJ, et al. Instantaneous Wave-free Ratio versus Fractional Flow Reserve to Guide PCI. N Engl J Med. 2017;376(19):1813-1823.
8. Eftekhari A, Holck EN, Westra J, et al. Instantaneous wave free ratio vs fractional flow reserve and 5-year mortality: iFR SWEDEHEART and DEFINE FLAIR. Eur Heart J. 2023;44(42):4376-4384.
9. Ahmad Y, Howard JP, Arnold AD, et al. Mortality after drug-eluting stents vs coronary artery bypass grafting for left main coronary artery disease: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Eur Heart J. 2020;41(34):3228-3235.
10. D'Ascenzo F, De Filippo O, Elia E, et al. Percutaneous vs surgical revascularization for patients with unprotected left main stenosis: a meta-analysis of 5-year follow-up randomized controlled trials. Eur Heart J Qual Care Clin Outcomes. 2021;7(5):476-485.
11. Kayaert P, Coeman M, Gevaert S, De Pauw M, Haine S. Physiology-Based Revascularization of Left Main Coronary Artery Disease. J Interv Cardiol. 2021;2021:4218769.
12. Lee PH, Ahn JM, Chang M, et al. Left Main Coronary Artery Disease: Secular Trends in Patient Characteristics, Treatments, and Outcomes. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2016;68(12):1233-1246.
13. Khawaja M, Britt M, Khan MA, et al. Left Main Coronary Artery Disease: A Contemporary Review of Diagnosis and Management. Rev Cardiovasc Med. 2024;25(2):66.
14. Latib A, Colombo A. Bifurcation Disease: What Do We Know, What Should We Do? JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2008;1(3):218-226.
15. Elsheikh AN, Elsaeid A, Sharafeldin S, et al. Early effect of different bifurcation techniques on left ventricular mechanics in elective percutaneous coronary intervention. Egypt Heart J. 2024;76(1):81.
16. Aronson D, Edelman ER. Coronary artery disease and diabetes mellitus. Cardiol Clin. 2014;32(3):439-455.
17. Milojevic M, Serruys PW, Sabik JF III, et al. Bypass Surgery or Stenting for Left Main Coronary Artery Disease in Patients With Diabetes. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2019;73(13):1616-1628.
18. Nowbar AN, Gitto M, Howard JP, Francis DP, Al-Lamee R. Mortality From Ischemic Heart Disease. Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes. 2019;12(6):e005375.
19. Gulati M, Levy PD, Mukherjee D, et al. 2021 AHA/ACC/ASE/CHEST/SAEM/SCCT/SCMR Guideline for the Evaluation and Diagnosis of Chest Pain. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2021;78(22):e187-e285.
20. Karabulut A, Cakmak M. Treatment strategies in the left main coronary artery disease associated with acute coronary syndromes. J Saudi Heart Assoc. 2015;27(4):272-276.
21. Apostolos A, Gerakaris A, Tsoni E, et al. Imaging of Left Main Coronary Artery; Untangling the Gordian Knot. Rev Cardiovasc Med. 2023;24(1):26.
22. Kolossváry M, Szilveszter B, Merkely B, Maurovich-Horvat P. Plaque imaging with CT-a comprehensive review on coronary CT angiography based risk assessment. Cardiovasc Diagn Ther. 2017;7(5):489-506.
23. Li L, Dash D, Gai LY, et al. Intravascular Ultrasound Classification of Plaque in Angiographic True Bifurcation Lesions of the Left Main Coronary Artery. Chin Med J (Engl). 2016;129(13):1538-1543.
24. He YM, Shen L, Ge JB. Fallacies and Possible Remedies of the SYNTAX Score. J Interv Cardiol. 2020;2020:8822308.
25. Lee J, Ahn JM, Kim JH, et al. Prognostic Effect of the SYNTAX Score on 10-Year Outcomes After Left Main Coronary Artery Revascularization in a Randomized Population: Insights From the Extended PRECOMBAT Trial. J Am Heart Assoc. 2021;10(6):e020359.
26. Farooq V, van Klaveren D, Steyerberg EW, et al. Anatomical and clinical characteristics to guide decision making between coronary artery bypass surgery and percutaneous coronary intervention for individual patients: development and validation of SYNTAX score II. Lancet. 2013;381(9867):639-650.
27. Modi BN, van de Hoef TP, Piek JJ, Perera D. Physiological assessment of left main coronary artery disease. EuroIntervention.

2017;13(7):820-827.

28. Johnson NP, Tóth GG, Lai D, et al. Prognostic value of fractional flow reserve: linking physiologic severity to clinical outcomes. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2014;64(16):1641-1654.
29. Escaned J, Petraco R, Fearon WF. Coronary Physiology to Guide Percutaneous Coronary Intervention: Why, When, and How. JSCAI. 2024;3(2):102198.
30. De Waard GA, Di Mario C, Lerman A, Serruys PW, Van Royen N. Instantaneous wave-free ratio to guide coronary revascularisation: physiological framework, validation and differences from fractional flow reserve. EuroIntervention. 2017;13(7):820-827.
31. Lee CH, Choi SW, Hwang J, et al. 5-Year Outcomes According to FFR of Left Circumflex Coronary Artery After Left Main Crossover Stenting. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2019;12(9):847-855.
32. Hwang D, Jeon KH, Lee JM, et al. Diagnostic Performance of Resting and Hyperemic Invasive Physiological Indices to Define Myocardial Ischemia. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2017;10(8):751-760.
33. Dai J, Guan C, Xu X, et al. Angiographic Quantitative Flow Ratio-Guided Treatment of Patients With Physiologically Intermediate Coronary Lesions. J Am Heart Assoc. 2025;14:e035756.
34. Neumann FJ, Sousa-Uva M, Ahlsson A, et al. 2018 ESC/EACTS Guidelines on myocardial revascularization. Eur Heart J. 2019;40(2):87-165.
35. Lawton JS, Tamis-Holland JE, Bangalore S, et al. 2021 ACC/AHA/SCAI Guideline for Coronary Artery Revascularization. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2022;79(2):e21-e129.
36. Morice MC, Serruys PW, Kappetein AP, et al. Outcomes in Patients With De Novo Left Main Disease Treated With Either Percutaneous Coronary Intervention Using Paclitaxel-Eluting Stents or Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Treatment in the SYNTAX Trial. Circulation. 2010;121(24):2645-2653.
37. Holm NR, Mäkikallio T, Lindsay MM, et al. Percutaneous coronary angioplasty versus coronary artery bypass grafting in the treatment of unprotected left main stenosis: updated 5-year outcomes from the NOBLE trial. Lancet. 2020;395(10219):191-199.
38. Mesana T, Rodger N, Sherrard H. Heart Teams: A New Paradigm in Health Care. Can J Cardiol. 2018;34(7):815-818.
39. Hassan J, Usman N, Salman M, et al. Assessing the validity of Society of Thoracic Surgeons score in predicting stroke risk among patients undergoing cardiothoracic surgery. J Cardiothorac Surg. 2025;20(1):187.
40. Gaba P, Sabik JF, Murphy SA, et al. Percutaneous Coronary Intervention Versus Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting in Patients With Left Main Disease With and Without Diabetes. Circulation. 2024;149(17):1328-1338.
41. Kirov H, Caldonazo T, Khayyat AD, et al. Comparing percutaneous coronary intervention and coronary artery bypass grafting for left main stenosis on the basis of current regional registry evidence. JTCVS Open. 2024;22:257-271.
42. Pandya SB, Kim YH, Meyers SN, et al. Drug-eluting versus bare-metal stents in unprotected left main coronary artery stenosis: a meta-analysis. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2010;3(6):602-611.
43. Lassen JF, Albiero R, Johnson TW, et al. Treatment of coronary bifurcation lesions, part II: implanting two stents. EuroIntervention. 2022;18(6):457-470.
44. Chen SL, Sheiban I, Xu B, et al. Impact of the complexity of bifurcation lesions treated with drug-eluting stents: the DEFINITION study. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2014;7(11):1266-1276.
45. Chen SL. DEFINITION criteria for left main bifurcation stenting - from clinical need to a formula. AsiaIntervention. 2023;9(1):20-24.
46. Chieffo A, Beneduce A. Percutaneous coronary interventions for ostial left main disease: the future is bright. EuroIntervention. 2023;18(17):1393-1394.
47. Kuno T, Ueyama H, Rao SV, et al. Percutaneous coronary intervention or coronary artery bypass graft surgery for left main coronary artery disease: A meta-analysis of randomized trials. Am Heart J. 2020;227:9-10.
48. Habib RH, Dimitrova KR, Badour SA, et al. CABG Versus PCI: Greater Benefit in Long-Term Outcomes With Multiple Arterial Bypass Grafting. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2015;66(13):1417-1427.
49. Ono M, Serruys PW, Hara H, et al. 10-Year Follow-Up After Revascularization in Elderly Patients With Complex Coronary Artery Disease. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2021;77(22):2761-2773.
50. Banning AP, Serruys P, De Maria GL, et al. Five-year outcomes after state-of-the-art percutaneous coronary revascularization in patients with de novo three-vessel disease: final results of the SYNTAX II study. Eur Heart J. 2022;43(13):1307-1316.
51. Park DW, Park SJ. Contemporary state-of-the-art of percutaneous coronary intervention for left main coronary artery disease. EuroIntervention. 2019;15(2):124-134.
52. Nagarajarao HS, Ojha CP, Mulukutla V, et al. Current Use and Trends in Unprotected Left Main Coronary Artery Percutaneous Intervention. Curr Cardiol Rep. 2020;22(3):16.
53. Mohamed Labib MM, Mahmoud Abdellatif YA, Abu Arab TM. Short term clinical outcomes of Complex Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in patients with intermediate to high SYNTAX score. QJM. 2024;117(Suppl 1):hcae070.135.
54. Higuchi S, Yamaji N, Noma H, et al. Physiology- versus angiography-guided percutaneous coronary intervention for people with coronary artery disease. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2026;1:CD016318.
55. Berry C, van 't Veer M, Witt N, et al. VERIFY (VERification of Instantaneous Wave-Free Ratio and Fractional Flow Reserve for the Assessment of Coronary Artery Stenosis Severity in EverydaY Practice): a multicenter study in consecutive patients. J Am Coll Cardiol.

2013;61(13):1421-1427.

56. Jeremias A, Maehara A, Généreux P, et al. Multicenter core laboratory comparison of the instantaneous wave-free ratio and resting Pd/Pa with fractional flow reserve: the RESOLVE study. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2014;63(13):1253-1261.
57. Jeremias A. Functional lesion assessment of intermediate stenosis to guide revascularization (DEFINE-FLAIR); NCT02053038. Published 2015.
58. Lee JM, Shin ES, Nam CW, et al. Clinical Outcomes According to Fractional Flow Reserve or Instantaneous Wave-Free Ratio in Deferred Lesions. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2017;10(24):2502-2510.
59. Nijjer SS, Sen S, Petraco R, et al. Pre-angioplasty instantaneous wave-free ratio pullback provides virtual intervention and predicts hemodynamic outcome for serial lesions and diffuse coronary artery disease. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2014;7(12):1386-1396.
60. Götberg M, Berntorp K, Rylance R, et al. 5-Year Outcomes of PCI Guided by Measurement of Instantaneous Wave-Free Ratio Versus Fractional Flow Reserve. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2022;79(10):965-974.
61. Kay FU, Canan A, Abbara S. Future Directions in Coronary CT Angiography: CT-Fractional Flow Reserve, Plaque Vulnerability, and Quantitative Plaque Assessment. Korean Circ J. 2020;50(3):185-202.
62. Motwani M, Swoboda PP, Plein S, Greenwood JP. Role of cardiovascular magnetic resonance in the management of patients with stable coronary artery disease. Heart. 2018;104(11):888-894.
63. De Filippo O, Di Franco A, Boretto P, et al. Percutaneous coronary intervention versus coronary artery surgery for left main disease according to lesion site: A meta-analysis. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2023;166(1):120-132.e11.
64. Buszman PE, Kiesz SR, Bochenek A, et al. Acute and late outcomes of unprotected left main stenting in comparison with surgical revascularization. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2008;51(5):538-545.
65. Daoulah A, Alasmari A, Hersi AS, et al. Percutaneous Coronary Intervention Vs Coronary Artery Bypass Surgery for Unprotected Left Main Coronary Disease: G-LM Registry. Curr Probl Cardiol. 2022;47(4):101002.
66. De Filippo O, D'Ascenzo F, Wańha W, et al. IncidenCe and predictOrs of heaRt fAiLure after acute coronarY Syndrome: The CORALYS registry. Int J Cardiol. 2023;370:35-42.
67. Li Kam Wa ME, Ezad SM, Modi B, et al. Randomized Comparison of Fractional Flow Reserve and Instantaneous Wave Free Ratio in Serial Disease. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2025;18(13):1617-1627.
68. Milzi A, Dettori R, Lubberich RK, et al. Quantitative Flow Ratio Is Related to Anatomic Left Main Stem Lesion Parameters as Assessed by Intravascular Imaging. J Clin Med. 2022;11(3):707.
69. Kobayashi Y, Takahashi T, Zimmermann FM, et al. Outcomes Based on Angiographic vs Functional Significance of Complex 3-Vessel Coronary Disease: FAME 3 Trial. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2023;16(18):2112-2119.
70. Bennett J, Chandrasekhar S, Woods E, et al. Contemporary Functional Coronary Angiography: An Update. Future Cardiol. 2024;20(10):755-778.
71. Windecker S, Kolh P, Alfonso F, et al. 2014 ESC/EACTS Guidelines on myocardial revascularization. Eur Heart J. 2014;35(37):2541-2619.
72. Fihn SD, Blankenship JC, Alexander KP, et al. 2014 ACC/AHA/AATS/PCNA/SCAI/STS focused update of the guideline for the diagnosis and management of patients with stable ischemic heart disease. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2014;64(18):1929-1949.
73. Neumann FJ, Sousa-Uva M. Ten commandments for the 2018 ESC/EACTS Guidelines on Myocardial Revascularization. Eur Heart J. 2019;40(1):79-80.
74. Kataruka A, Maynard CC, Kearney KE, et al. Temporal Trends in Percutaneous Coronary Intervention and Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting. J Am Heart Assoc. 2020;9(7):e015317.
75. Loh PH, Lassen JF, Jepson N, et al. Asia Pacific consensus document on coronary bifurcation interventions. EuroIntervention. 2020;16(9):e706-e714.
76. Farooq V, Vergouwe Y, Räber L, et al. Combined anatomical and clinical factors for the long-term risk stratification of patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention: the Logistic Clinical SYNTAX score. Eur Heart J. 2012;33(24):3098-3104.
77. Wykrzykowska JJ, Garg S, Onuma Y, et al. Value of the SYNTAX Score for risk assessment in the all-comers population of the randomized multicenter LEADERS trial. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2010;56(4):272-277.
78. Abdallah MS, Wang K, Magnuson EA, et al. Quality of life after PCI vs CABG among patients with diabetes and multivessel coronary artery disease: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA. 2013;310(15):1581-1590.
79. Chen SL, Han YL, Zhang YJ, et al. The anatomic- and clinical-based NERS score II to predict clinical outcomes after stenting unprotected left main coronary artery disease. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2013;6(12):1233-1241.
80. Rodriguez A, Bernardi V, Navia J, et al. Argentine randomized study: coronary angioplasty with stenting versus coronary bypass surgery in patients with multiple-vessel disease (ERACI II): 30-day and one-year follow-up results. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2001;37(1):51-58.
81. Karolina W, Rohman M, Supriadi P, et al. Improving Quality of Life with Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in Chronic Coronary Syndrome Patients with SYNTAX Score of More than 22. Heart Science Journal. 2021;2(1):15-20.
82. Karaaslan Ö, Maden O, Kanal Y, et al. Association of CABG SYNTAX score with long term clinical outcomes in patients with acute myocardial infarction undergoing SVG PCI. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci. 2022;26(6):2150-2158.
83. Tan WA, Tamai H, Park SJ, et al. Long-term clinical outcomes after unprotected left main trunk percutaneous revascularization in 279

patients. Circulation. 2001;104(14):1609-1614.

84. Takagi T, Stankovic G, Finci L, et al. Results and long-term predictors of adverse clinical events after elective percutaneous interventions on unprotected left main coronary artery. Circulation. 2002;106(6):698-702.
85. Velazquez EJ, Lee KL, Jones RH, et al. Coronary-Artery Bypass Surgery in Patients with Ischemic Cardiomyopathy. N Engl J Med. 2016;374(16):1511-1520.
86. Riley RF, Don CW, Aldea GS, et al. Contemporary Management of Left Main Coronary Artery Disease. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv. 2021;14(22):2446-2457.
87. Rubinshtein R, Ota T, Waksman R. Imaging of the left main coronary artery: current state of the art. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. 2015;86(4):662-672.
88. Kern MJ, Ouellette D, Frianeza T. A new technique to anchor stents for exact placement in ostial stenoses: the stent tail wire or Szabo technique. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. 2006;68(6):901-906.
89. Vaquerizo B, Serra A, Miranda F, et al. Bench testing and initial clinical experience of the Szabo technique for aorto-ostial stenting. Rev Esp Cardiol. 2012;65(6):539-547.
90. Nguyen-Trong PJ, Martinez Parachini JR, Resendes E, et al. Procedural outcomes with use of the flash ostial system in aorto-coronary ostial lesions. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. 2016;88(7):1067-1074.
91. Zhang JJ, Chen SL, Ye F, et al. DK crush versus provisional stenting for left main bifurcation lesions: subgroup analysis of the DKCRUSH-V randomized trial. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2020;13(6):718-728.
92. Li Kam Wa ME, Modi B, Hinton J, et al. Physiological assessment in serial coronary artery disease using iFR and FFR. EuroIntervention. 2025;21(2):112-120.
93. De Bruyne B, Fearon WF, Pijls NHJ, et al. Fractional Flow Reserve–Guided PCI for Stable Coronary Artery Disease. N Engl J Med. 2014;371(13):1208-1217.
94. Zimmermann FM, Ferrara A, Johnson NP, et al. Deferral vs performance of percutaneous coronary intervention of functionally non-significant coronary stenosis: 15-year follow-up of the DEFER trial. Eur Heart J. 2015;36(45):3182-3188.
95. Cosentino F, Grant PJ, Aboyans V, et al. 2019 ESC Guidelines on diabetes, pre-diabetes, and cardiovascular diseases developed in collaboration with the EASD. Eur Heart J. 2020;41(2):255-323.
96. Emdin CA, Rahimi K, Neal B, et al. Blood pressure lowering in type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA. 2015;313(6):603-615.
97. Kay FU, Canan A, Abbara S. Coronary CT angiography and CT-derived fractional flow reserve in left main disease. Korean Circ J. 2020;50(3):185-202.
98. Motwani M, Swoboda PP, Plein S, Greenwood JP. Cardiovascular magnetic resonance in stable coronary artery disease. Heart. 2018;104(11):888-894.
99. De Filippo O, Di Franco A, Boretto P, et al. PCI versus CABG according to lesion site in left main disease: a meta-analysis. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2023;166(1):120-132.e11.
100. Buszman PE, Kiesz SR, Bochenek A, et al. Acute and late outcomes of unprotected left main stenting in comparison with surgical revascularization. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2008;51(5):538-545.