



**HAL**  
open science

**It's good to talk! Changes in Coronary  
Revascularisation Practice In PCI Centres without  
Onsite Surgical Cover and the Impact of the  
Lifestream™ Angiography Video Conferencing System.**

Rick A Veasey, Jonathan Hyde, Michael Lewis, Uday Trivedi, Andrew Cohen,  
Guy Lloyd, Stephen Furniss, Nikhil Patel, Neil Sulke

► **To cite this version:**

Rick A Veasey, Jonathan Hyde, Michael Lewis, Uday Trivedi, Andrew Cohen, et al.. It's good to talk! Changes in Coronary Revascularisation Practice In PCI Centres without Onsite Surgical Cover and the Impact of the Lifestream™ Angiography Video Conferencing System.. International Journal of Clinical Practice, 2011, 65 (6), pp.658. 10.1111/j.1742-1241.2011.02672.x . hal-00640465

**HAL Id: hal-00640465**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00640465>**

Submitted on 12 Nov 2011

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

**It's good to talk! Changes in Coronary Revascularisation Practice In PCI Centres without Onsite Surgical Cover and the Impact of the Lifestream™ Angiography Video Conferencing System.**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Clinical Practice</i>
Manuscript ID:	IJCP-11-10-0588.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Original Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-Feb-2011
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Veasey, Rick; Eastbourne District General Hospital, Cardiac Department  Hyde, Jonathan; Royal Sussex County Hospital, Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery  Lewis, Michael; Royal Sussex County Hospital, Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery  Trivedi, Uday; Royal Sussex County Hospital, Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery  Cohen, Andrew; Royal Sussex County Hospital, Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery  Lloyd, Guy; Eastbourne General Hospital, Department of Cardiology  Furniss, Stephen; Eastbourne General Hospital, Department of Cardiology  Patel, Nikhil; Eastbourne General Hospital, Department of Cardiology  Sulke, Neil; Eastbourne General Hospital, Department of Cardiology</p>
Specialty area:	

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

**It's good to talk! Changes in Coronary Revascularisation Practice In  
PCI Centres without Onsite Surgical Cover and the Impact of the  
Lifestream™ Angiography Video Conferencing System.**

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

Veasey RA, Hyde JAJ<sup>+</sup>, Lewis ME<sup>+</sup>, Trivedi UH<sup>+</sup>, Cohen AC<sup>+</sup>, Lloyd GW, Furniss SS,  
Patel NR and Sulke AN.

Department of Cardiology, Eastbourne District General Hospital, Eastbourne, UK

<sup>+</sup>Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, Royal Sussex County Hospital, Brighton, UK

49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Address for correspondence:**

Dr A N Sulke

Department of Cardiology

Eastbourne District General Hospital

Kings Drive

Eastbourne

East Sussex BN21 2UD

Email: neil.sulke@esht.nhs.uk

Word count: 2,500

**Competing Interest:** None declared.

**Disclosures:** The authors state no current interests which might be perceived as posing a conflict or bias.

For Peer Review Only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ABSTRACT

### Introduction

Percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) activity has increased more than 6 fold in the last 15 years. Increased demand has been met by PCI centres without on-site surgical facilities. To improve communication between cardiologists and surgeons at a remote centre, we have developed a video conferencing system using standard internet links. The effect of this video data link (VDL) on referral pattern and patient selection for revascularisation was assessed prospectively after introduction of a joint cardiology conference (JCC) using the system.

### Methods

Between 1<sup>st</sup> October 2005 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2007, 1346 patients underwent diagnostic coronary angiography (CA). Of these, 114 patients were discussed at a cardiology conference (CC) attended by 3 consultant cardiologists (pre-VDL). In April 2007 the VDL system was introduced. Between 1<sup>st</sup> April 2007 and 30<sup>th</sup> September 2008, 1428 patients underwent diagnostic CA. Of these, 120 patients were discussed at a JCC attended by 4 consultant cardiologists and 2 consultant cardiothoracic surgeons (post-VDL). Following case-matching for patient demographics and coronary artery disease (CAD) severity and distribution, we assessed the effect upon management decisions arising from both the pre- and post-VDL JCC meetings.

### Results

When comparing decision-making outcomes of post-VDL JCC with pre-VDL CC, significantly fewer patients were recommended for PCI (36.8% v 17.2% respectively,  $p=0.001$ ) and significantly more patients were recommended for surgery (21.1% v 48.4%

1  
2  
3 respectively,  $p < 0.001$ ). There were no significant differences in waiting times for PCI  
4  
5 following JCC discussion, however, waiting times for surgical revascularisation were  
6  
7 significantly reduced ( $140.9 \pm 71.8$  days vs  $99.4 \pm 56.6$  days respectively,  $p = 0.045$ ).  
8  
9

## 10 **Conclusions**

11  
12 The VDL system provides a highly practical method for PCI centres without onsite  
13  
14 surgical cover to discuss complex patients requiring coronary revascularisation and  
15  
16 significantly increases the number of patients referred for surgical revascularisation rather  
17  
18 than PCI.  
19  
20

## 21 **KEYWORDS**

22 Percutaneous coronary intervention

23  
24 Coronary artery bypass grafting

25  
26 JCC

27  
28 MDT

29  
30 Video conferencing

## 31 **What's known?**

32  
33 Percutaneous coronary intervention is increasingly performed in centres without onsite  
34  
35 cardiac surgery facilities. Frequently, cases require multidisciplinary input from  
36  
37 cardiologists and cardiac surgeons at remote sites.  
38  
39

## 40 **What's new?**

41  
42 Video-data link technology enables real-time case discussion between cardiologists and  
43  
44 cardiac surgeons at remote sites and introduction of this technology significantly  
45  
46 influences revascularisation strategy and reduces waiting list times.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INTRODUCTION

Percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) activity has increased more than 8 fold in the last 15 years throughout the United Kingdom.(1) This increased demand has been largely met by PCI centres without on-site cardiac surgical facilities. Because of this significant increase in PCI activity, the British Cardiovascular Intervention Society (BCIS) recognises the need for additional PCI centres and that the majority of these will necessarily be provided by hospitals without on-site surgical cover.(2)

Complicated and severe coronary artery disease has increasingly been treated with PCI as opposed to coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG), particularly since the advent of drug eluting stents. This is despite multiple trials demonstrating increased requirement for repeat revascularisation with PCI (3-7), as well as the fact that CABG has also shown long-term mortality benefits for certain categories of elective patients compared to PCI.(8-11) Well-defined groups of selected cases therefore warrant mandatory discussion between interventional cardiologists and cardiac surgeons before undertaking revascularisation procedures.(12) This has now been stated as a clear recommendation in a set of guidelines from the Society for Cardiothoracic Surgery in Great Britain & Ireland (SCTSGBI). With interventionalists and surgeons at remote centres such case discussion is both difficult and extremely time consuming to co-ordinate. Broadly speaking, the surgical 'hub' often provides cover to a variable number of PCI 'spokes'.

Veasey et al.

1  
2  
3 To improve communication between interventional cardiologists and surgical colleagues  
4 at a remote centre, and therefore, hopefully optimise case selection for both PCI and  
5 CABG, we have developed a high definition angiogram video conferencing system using  
6 standard hospital broadband internet links. The effect of this system on referral pattern,  
7 patient selection and speed of appropriate revascularisation was assessed prospectively  
8 after introduction of a fortnightly video joint cardiac conference (JCC) using this  
9 technology, and was compared to previous practice.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## METHODS

The study was undertaken at Eastbourne District General Hospital, an interventional cardiology centre without on-site cardiac surgery. The nearest cardiac surgical centre is Royal Sussex County Hospital in Brighton, 19 miles or 40 minutes by road. The database for this study was populated by unselected patients undergoing diagnostic coronary angiography and cardiac catheterisation. The study was supported by an unrestricted research grant from Lifestream Medical Systems Ltd. The study sponsor had no involvement in collection or analysis of the data, results interpretation or preparation of the manuscript.

### **Video-data link (VDL) Technology**

The Lifestream™ Video Conferencing System allows transfer of coronary cine-angiogram loops, in real time and at high definition image quality, over a secure standard hospital broadband (100mb) internet link. Bidirectional video/audio cameras enable live face-to-face case discussion between clinicians and their teams at both centres as 'picture-in-picture' technology, with no delay in image or sound transfer. The Lifestream™ system and user interface are shown in figure 1a and 1b.

### **Study population**

Between 1<sup>st</sup> October 2005 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2007, 1346 patients underwent coronary angiography (CA). Of these 114 patients were referred for case discussion at a cardiology case conference (CC) attended by 3 consultant cardiologists (Pre-VDL cohort). In April

1  
2  
3 2007 the Lifestream™ video data-link (VDL) was introduced. Between 1<sup>st</sup> April 2007  
4 and 30<sup>th</sup> September 2008, 1428 patients underwent CA. Of these 120 patients were  
5  
6 discussed at a JCC (Post-VDL cohort) attended by 4 consultant cardiologists and at least  
7  
8 2 consultant cardiothoracic surgeons at a remote site (Royal Sussex County Hospital,  
9  
10 Brighton).

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 For all patients included in the study, baseline demographics, cardiac risk factor profile  
18 and past medical history were recorded by case note review. Cardiac catheterisation  
19  
20 procedures were reviewed and the number of diseased vessels documented as were the  
21  
22 presence of disease of the proximal left anterior descending artery and left main stem.  
23  
24 Significant disease was defined as a luminal narrowing of greater than 50%.(9;13)  
25  
26 Outcome decisions with regards patient management and revascularisation strategy from  
27  
28 the JCC meetings for both patient cohorts (Pre-VDL and Post-VDL) were recorded. For  
29  
30 the Pre-VDL patient cohort data were gathered retrospectively whereas data were  
31  
32 gathered prospectively for the post-VDL patient cohort. Data were gathered from all  
33  
34 patients undergoing diagnostic cardiac catheterisation and not just cases discussed at the  
35  
36 JCC meetings, to investigate any changes in referral patterns for CA over the study time  
37  
38 period. Time from the JCC meetings to percutaneous or surgical revascularisation was  
39  
40 recorded, as well as mortality data.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 **Statistical analysis and study endpoints**

52  
53 The primary purpose of the data analyses was to determine whether there was a  
54  
55 significant difference in revascularisation strategies between cases discussed before the  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 introduction of the video data link and those discussed subsequently, controlling for  
4  
5 patient demographics and coronary disease patterns. This was performed by first  
6  
7 identifying factors that were associated with percutaneous or surgical revascularisation in  
8  
9 univariate analyses and then using a multivariate model that controlled for significant risk  
10  
11 factors while testing for significant differences in revascularisation strategy. Factors  
12  
13 assessed as independent predictors included use of the video data link, baseline  
14  
15 demographics and coronary artery disease patterns.  
16  
17  
18

19  
20 Descriptive data were described using standard methods. Continuous variables are  
21  
22 expressed as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation. Comparison of groups was done using the  
23  
24 independent samples t-test and the Mann-Whitney U-test depending on data distribution.  
25

26  
27 Categorical variables were compared using the Chi squared test or Fisher's exact test. A p  
28  
29 value  $< 0.05$  was considered statistically significant.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## RESULTS

In total, 2774 patients were included in the study, with mean age  $67.1 \pm 10.9$ . Sex distribution included 60.8% males. Past medical history included hypertension (37.0%), diabetes mellitus (11.4%), cerebrovascular disease (3.8%), current or past smoking history (48.8%), myocardial infarction (18.0%), previous PCI (10.0%) and previous CABG (5.9%). There were no significant differences in these baseline demographics for the patient cohorts before and after introduction of the VDL (figure 2a).

Coronary angiography in the pre- and post-VDL patient cohorts demonstrated the following disease patterns: left main stem disease 5.0% v 6.7%,  $p=0.193$ ; proximal left anterior descending artery disease 39.8% v 42.4%,  $p=0.357$ ; three vessel disease 14.9% v 12.8%,  $p=0.275$ ; two vessel disease 17.4% v 19.7%,  $p=0.279$ ; impaired left ventricular function 29.9% v 35.5%,  $p=0.064$  (figure 2b).

### Cases referred to joint cardiac conference (JCC)

Two hundred and thirty-four cases were referred to JCC meetings. Of these, 114 of 1346 cases were from the pre-VDL group, and 120 of 1428 cases were from the post-VDL group. Patient demographics of these two cohorts are demonstrated in figure 3a, with no significant differences between the two groups.

Coronary angiography in the pre-VDL and post-VDL patient cohorts demonstrated the following disease patterns: left main stem disease 12.8% v 23.7%,  $p=0.096$ ; proximal left anterior descending artery disease 69.6% v 67.8%,  $p=0.819$ ; three vessel disease 25.3% v

1  
2  
3 19.7%,  $p=0.43$ ; two vessel disease 30.4% v 29.5%,  $p=0.911$ ; impaired left ventricular  
4  
5 function 34.5% v 38.0%,  $p=0.704$  (figure 3b).

6  
7  
8 Following case discussion at the pre-VDL JCC and post-VDL JCC meetings patient  
9  
10 management decisions were as follows: medical management 15.8% v 18.8%,  $p=0.15$ ;  
11  
12 PCI 36.8% v 17.2%,  $p=0.001$ ; surgical revascularisation 21.1% v 48.4%,  $p<0.001$ ; other  
13  
14 26.3% v 21.4%,  $p=0.09$  (figure 4).

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 Multivariate analysis demonstrated that baseline demographics and coronary artery  
21  
22 disease patterns were not independent predictors of percutaneous or surgical  
23  
24 revascularisation, whereas discussion of cases at the VJCC as opposed to the CC was the  
25  
26 only independent predictor of surgical revascularisation as a recommended management  
27  
28 decision.  
29  
30

31  
32  
33  
34 There were no significant differences in waiting times for PCI following JCC discussion  
35  
36 between the pre-VDL and post-VDL patient cohorts ( $73.0 \pm 44.6$  days vs  $76.4 \pm 70.8$   
37  
38 days respectively,  $p=0.849$ ). However, there were significant differences in waiting times  
39  
40 for surgical revascularisation following JCC discussion between the pre-VDL and post-  
41  
42 VDL ( $140.9 \pm 71.8$  days vs  $99.4 \pm 56.6$  days respectively,  $p=0.045$ ).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DISCUSSION

Our study demonstrates the feasibility of conducting multidisciplinary team meetings between interventional cardiologists and cardiac surgeons at remote sites (the 'hub and spoke' concept). Over the time course of this study there were no significant differences in baseline characteristics of patients undergoing diagnostic coronary angiography. As would be expected, more severe disease patterns were discussed at the JCC meetings compared to the general study population of patients undergoing diagnostic coronary angiography. There were, however, no significant differences between the pre-VDL and post-VDL cohorts. The introduction of the video data link system, however, significantly changed revascularisation strategies and was an independent predictor of the requirement for surgical revascularisation. Use of the video data link, therefore, not only enables patients to have the most appropriate revascularisation strategy planned but our study also demonstrated that immediate multi-disciplinary case discussion significantly reduced waiting times to surgical intervention.

The guidelines of the SCTSGBI regarding the roles of multidisciplinary teams (MDT) when discussing all cases for coronary revascularisation should not be underestimated, particularly with guidelines from BCIS to the same end. (2;12) As such, case discussion by MDTs is advocated to improve quality and consensus and additionally is recommended by guidelines from the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS).(14)

### Relevance to clinical practice

The boundaries between surgical and interventional disease patterns are progressively (and possibly controversially) changing. Historically, surgical revascularisation has been the recommended treatment option for severe coronary artery disease patterns, including multi-vessel and left main-stem disease).

The recently published Syntax trial is indicative of the increasingly complex coronary disease that is deemed suitable for either percutaneous or surgical revascularisation management strategies.<sup>(15)</sup> This trial randomised patients with left main stem disease and/or three vessel disease to PCI or CABG. This trial showed higher levels of repeat revascularisation for PCI but similar other major adverse clinical event (MACE) rates. A pre-requisite for this study was that coronary angiogram results were reviewed by both an interventional cardiologist and cardiac surgeon together to assess whether revascularisation could be adequately achieved by either PCI or CABG. However, approximately 25% of patients screened for this study had disease patterns or co-morbidities that the cardiac surgeon and interventional cardiologist agreed should only be managed by a particular revascularisation strategy.

Not concluded by the authors, but perhaps of highest importance, is the definite need for multi-disciplinary discussion on a case-by-case basis. It is clear for logistical and practical reasons that this would be greatly facilitated by the use of video data links such as Lifestream<sup>TM</sup>. Multi-disciplinary case discussion could theoretically be achieved by other means but would undoubtedly require either interventional cardiologists or cardiac surgeons travelling to remote sites with considerable waste of senior clinicians' time and significant expense to the NHS.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Of particular note for UK practice, BCIS guidelines recommend that 'PCI centres remote  
7  
8 from surgical or tertiary centres should have facilities for real time image transfer to  
9  
10 facilitate discussion and advice in individual cases'.(2) Formal cardiac surgical standby  
11  
12 was a prerequisite for PCI when the technique of coronary angioplasty was first  
13  
14 introduced.(16) However, data from the annual BCIS reports demonstrate that the need  
15  
16 for emergency surgery fell from 2% in 1992 to 0.08% in 2007 (1;17), reflecting  
17  
18 increasing technical expertise and safety regulation. With the consistent reductions in the  
19  
20 need for emergency surgery, surgical cover is now provided by means of 'first available  
21  
22 operating room', and cover is frequently provided by surgeons on standby at remote  
23  
24 centres (15% of cases in 2004). The video data link utilised in this study also enables not  
25  
26 only scheduled case conferences but also real time case discussion for emergency and  
27  
28 complicated cases during the procedure itself.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 **Additional implications**

37  
38 The use of telecommunications to provide and facilitate medical care has been long  
39  
40 acknowledged.(18) The utilisation of telemedicine to improve patient care within the  
41  
42 NHS is recognised and encouraged in Lord Darzi's NHS Next Stage Review Report.(19)  
43  
44 The Lifestream™ system and its utilisation as described in this study is one example of  
45  
46 the vast number of ways in which patient care can be improved. The system can also be  
47  
48 employed for a variety of other uses. In an era of significant time constraints on junior  
49  
50 doctors' hours, education can be provided by live case demonstration of any case  
51  
52 undertaken in the lab from cardiac catheterisation and complex intervention to  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 electrophysiological studies and ablation cases. Any electronically based information or  
4  
5  
6 imagery, including echocardiography, computed tomography imaging or magnetic  
7  
8 resonance imaging can be communicated to remote sites by this method.  
9  
10

### 11 12 13 **Study Limitations**

14  
15 This study involves comparison between two different patient populations, and whilst  
16  
17 demographics between the groups are similar, there is the unavoidable potential of not  
18  
19 controlling entirely for differences in patient demography and coronary artery disease  
20  
21 patterns. There were no set criteria for referral to JCC meetings and it is possible that  
22  
23 introduction of the video-data link changed patterns of patient referral to the JCC not  
24  
25 accounted for in the described demographics.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## CONCLUSIONS

The VDL system provides a highly practical method for PCI centres without onsite surgical cover to discuss complex patients requiring coronary revascularisation and significantly changes interventional practice patterns without hard-pressed surgeons or interventionalists being required to travel from their main work base. With the emergence of increasing numbers of PCI centres without onsite surgical cover, the routine use of the VDL system will ensure patients have adequate, early, and appropriate multidisciplinary discussion guiding revascularisation management. It is now recommended that it should be mandatory for all cases fulfilling certain basic criteria for revascularisation to be discussed at a MDT/JCC. Video systems such as the one discussed here (Lifestream™) surely must represent the only real and efficient option for delivery of these requirements.

**FIGURE LEGENDS**

Figure 1.

- (a) The Lifestream Hub
- (b) The Lifestream user interface.

Figure 2. Patients undergoing diagnostic coronary angiography (n=2774)

- (a) Patient demographics (p=ns for all comparisons).
- (b) Coronary disease patterns (p = 0.193, 0.357, 0.275, 0.279, 0.064 respectively).

Figure 3.

- (a) Demographics of patients presented at JCC meetings.
- (b) Coronary disease patterns of patients discussed at pre- and post-VDL JCC meetings (p = 0.096, 0.819, 0.430, 0.911, 0.704 respectively).

Figure 4. Management decision following JCC meetings.

**AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

RA Veasey – conception and design and analysis and interpretation of data and drafting of the manuscript.

JAJ Hyde – critical revision of article and approval of article.

ME Lewis – critical revision of article and approval of article.

UH Trivedi – critical revision of article and approval of article.

AC Cohen – critical revision of article and approval of article.

GW Lloyd – critical revision of article and approval of article.

SS Furniss – critical revision of article and approval of article.

NR Patel – critical revision of article and approval of article.

N Sulke – critical revision of article and final approval of the manuscript submitted.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The study was supported by an unrestricted research grant from Lifestream Medical Systems Ltd.

For Peer Review Only

## Reference List

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- (1) Ludman PF. BCIS audit returns. Adult intervention procedures. January 2007 to December 2007. 2009. 30-5-2009.

Ref Type: Online Source

- (2) Dawkins KD, Gershlick T, de Belder M, Chauhan A, Venn G, Schofield P, et al. Percutaneous coronary intervention: recommendations for good practice and training. *Heart* 2005 Dec;91 Suppl 6:vi1-27.
- (3) Serruys PW, Unger F, van Hout BA, van den Brand MJ, van Herwerden LA, van Es GA, et al. The ARTS study (Arterial Revascularization Therapies Study). *Semin Interv Cardiol* 1999 Dec;4(4):209-19.
- (4) Coronary artery bypass surgery versus percutaneous coronary intervention with stent implantation in patients with multivessel coronary artery disease (the Stent or Surgery trial): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2002 Sep 28;360(9338):965-70.
- (5) Goy JJ, Kaufmann U, Goy-Eggenberger D, Garachemani A, Hurni M, Carrel T, et al. A prospective randomized trial comparing stenting to internal mammary artery grafting for proximal, isolated de novo left anterior coronary artery stenosis: the SIMA trial. *Stenting vs Internal Mammary Artery*. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2000 Nov;75(11):1116-23.
- (6) Serruys PW, Unger F, Sousa JE, Jatene A, Bonnier HJ, Schonberger JP, et al. Comparison of coronary-artery bypass surgery and stenting for the treatment of multivessel disease. *N Engl J Med* 2001 Apr 12;344(15):1117-24.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- (7) Carrie D, Elbaz M, Puel J, Fourcade J, Karouny E, Fournial G, et al. Five-year outcome after coronary angioplasty versus bypass surgery in multivessel coronary artery disease: results from the French Monocentric Study. *Circulation* 1997 Nov 4;96(9 Suppl):II-6.
- (8) Hannan EL, Racz MJ, Walford G, Jones RH, Ryan TJ, Bennett E, et al. Long-term outcomes of coronary-artery bypass grafting versus stent implantation. *N Engl J Med* 2005 May 26;352(21):2174-83.
- (9) Comparison of coronary bypass surgery with angioplasty in patients with multivessel disease. The Bypass Angioplasty Revascularization Investigation (BARI) Investigators. *N Engl J Med* 1996 Jul 25;335(4):217-25.
- (10) Taggart DP, Kaul S, Boden WE, Ferguson TB, Jr., Guyton RA, Mack MJ, et al. Revascularization for unprotected left main stem coronary artery stenosis stenting or surgery. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2008 Mar 4;51(9):885-92.
- (11) Hlatky MA, Boothroyd DB, Bravata DM, Boersma E, Booth J, Brooks MM, et al. Coronary artery bypass surgery compared with percutaneous coronary interventions for multivessel disease: a collaborative analysis of individual patient data from ten randomised trials. *Lancet* 2009 Apr 4;373(9670):1190-7.
- (12) Taggart DP. Coronary revascularization--2009: state of the art. *Semin Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2009;21(3):196-8.
- (13) Coronary angioplasty versus coronary artery bypass surgery: the Randomized Intervention Treatment of Angina (RITA) trial. *Lancet* 1993 Mar 6;341(8845):573-80.

Veasey et al.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- (14) Wijns W, Kolh P, Danchin N, Di MC, Falk V, Folliguet T, et al. Guidelines on myocardial revascularization: The Task Force on Myocardial Revascularization of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS). *Eur Heart J* 2010 Oct;31(20):2501-55.
- (15) Serruys PW, Morice MC, Kappetein AP, Colombo A, Holmes DR, Mack MJ, et al. Percutaneous Coronary Intervention versus Coronary-Artery Bypass Grafting for Severe Coronary Artery Disease. *N Engl J Med* 2009 Feb 18.
- (16) Angelini P. Guidelines for surgical standby for coronary angioplasty: should they be changed? *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1999 Apr;33(5):1266-8.
- (17) de Belder MA. On-site surgical standby for percutaneous coronary intervention: a thing of the past? *Heart* 2007 Mar;93(3):281-3.
- (18) Perednia DA, Allen A. Telemedicine technology and clinical applications. *JAMA* 1995 Feb 8;273(6):483-8.
- (19) Lord Darzi. *High Quality Care For All*. Crown Copyright; 2008.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Figure 1a  
90x119mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 1b  
89x65mm (300 x 300 DPI)

View Only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Figure 2a  
89x53mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Review Only




Figure 2b  
89x53mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Figure 3a  
88x53mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Review Only




Figure 3b  
88x53mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Figure 4  
88x53mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Review Only