2015 ACC/AHA/SCAI Focused Update on Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention for Patients With ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction: An Update of the 2011 ACCF/AHA/SCAI Guideline for Percutaneous Coronary Intervention and the 2013 ACCF/AHA Guideline for the Management of ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction

A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions

Developed in Collaboration With the American College of Emergency Physicians

PCI WRITING COMMITTEE*

Glenn N. Levine, MD, FACC, FAHA, Chair† Eric R. Bates, MD, FACC, FAHA, FSCAI, Vice Chair*† James C. Blankenship, MD, FACC, FAHA, FSCAI, Vice Chair*: Steven R. Bailey, MD, FACC, FSCAI*: Umesh N. Khot, MD, FACC*† John A. Bittl, MD, FACC[†] Richard A. Lange, MD, FACC, FAHA[†] Bojan Cercek, MD, FACC, FAHA[†] Laura Mauri, MD, MSc, FACC, FSCAI*† Roxana Mehran, MD, FACC, FAHA, FSCAI*; Charles E. Chambers, MD, FACC, FSCAI‡ Stephen G. Ellis, MD, FACC*† Issam D. Moussa, MD, FACC, FAHA, FSCAI Robert A. Guyton, MD, FACC§ Debabrata Mukherjee, MD, FACC, FAHA, FSCAI⁺ Steven M. Hollenberg, MD, FACC*† Henry H. Ting, MD, FACC, FAHA[†]

Patrick T. O'Gara, MD, FACC, FAHA, Chair†

Frederick G. Kushner, MD Ralph G. Brindis, MD, MPH, MACC, FSCAI, FAHA§ Donald E. Casey, Jr, MD, MPH, MBA, FAHA∥ Mina K. Chung, MD, FACC, FAHA*† James A. de Lemos, MD, FACC*† Deborah B. Diercks, MD, MSc† James C. Fang, MD, FACC, FAHA*† Barry A. Franklin, PhD, FAHA† Christopher B. Granger, MD, FACC, FAHA*† Harlan M. Krumholz, MD, SM, FACC, FAHA*† Jane A. Linderbaum, MS, CNP-BC†

Frederick G. Kushner, MD, FACC, FAHA, FSCAI, Vice Chair†MACC, FSCAI, FAHA\$David A. Morrow, MD, MPH, FACC, FAHA*†PH, MBA, FAHA||L. Kristin Newby, MD, MHS, FACC, FAHA*†FAHA*†Joseph P. Ornato, MD, FACC, FAHA, FACP, FACEP*†CC*†Narith Ou, PharmD†Sc†Martha J. Radford, MD, FACC, FAHA†FAHA*†Jacqueline E. Tamis-Holland, MD, FACC, FSCAI†IA†Carl L. Tommaso, MD, FACC, FAHA, MSCAI‡YP-BC†David X. Zhao, MD, FACC, FAHA†

ACC/AHA TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Jonathan L. Halperin, MD, FACC, FAHA, Chair Glenn N. Levine, MD, FACC, FAHA, Chair-Elect Jeffrey L. Anderson, MD, FACC, FAHA, Immediate Past Chair Mark A. Hlatky, MD, FACC Nancy M. Albert, PhD, RN, FAHA¶ Sana M. Al-Khatib, MD, MHS, FACC, FAHA John Ikonomidis, MD, PhD, FAHA Kim K. Birtcher, PharmD, MS, AACC Jose Joglar, MD, FACC, FAHA Biykem Bozkurt, MD, PhD, FACC, FAHA Richard J. Kovacs, MD, FACC, FAHA¶ Ralph G. Brindis, MD, MPH, MACC E. Magnus Ohman, MD, FACC¶ Joaquin E. Cigarroa, MD, FACC Susan J. Pressler, PhD, RN, FAHA Lesley H. Curtis, PhD, FAHA Frank W. Sellke, MD, FACC, FAHA¶ Lee A. Fleisher, MD, FACC, FAHA Win-Kuang Shen, MD, FACC, FAHA¶ Duminda N. Wijeysundera, MD, PhD Federico Gentile, MD, FACC Samuel Gidding, MD, FAHA

*Writing committee members are required to recuse themselves from voting on sections to which their specific relationships with industry may apply; see Appendixes 1 and 2 for detailed information. †ACC/AHA Representative. ‡SCAI Representative.

\$ACC/AHA Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines Liaison.
 #ACP Representative.
 #Former Task Force member; current member during the writing effort.

This document was approved by the American College of Cardiology Board of Trustees and Executive Committee, the American Heart Association Science Advisory and Coordinating Committee, and the Society of Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions in September 2015, and the American Heart Association Executive Committee in October 2015.

The online-only Comprehensive RWI Data Supplement table is available with this article at

http://circ.ahajournals.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1161/CIR.000000000000336/-/DC1.

The online-only Data Supplement is available with this article at <u>http://circ.ahajournals.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1161/CIR.000000000000336/-/DC2.</u>

The American Heart Association requests that this document be cited as follows: Levine GN, O'Gara PT, Bates ER, Blankenship JC, Kushner FG, Bailey SR, Bittl JA, Brindis RG, Casey DE Jr, Cercek B, Chambers CE, Chung MK, de Lemos JA, Diercks DB, Ellis SG, Fang JC, Franklin BA, Granger CB, Guyton RA, Hollenberg SM, Khot UN, Krumholz HM, Lange RA, Linderbaum JA, Mauri L, Mehran R, Morrow DA, Moussa ID, Mukherjee D, Newby LK, Ornato JP, Ou N, Radford MJ, Tamis-Holland JE, Ting HH, Tommaso CL, Tracy CM, Woo YJ, Zhao DX. 2015 ACC/AHA/SCAI focused update on primary percutaneous coronary intervention for patients with ST-elevation myocardial infarction: an update of the 2011 ACCF/AHA/SCAI guideline for percutaneous coronary intervention and the 2013 ACCF/AHA guideline for the management of ST-elevation myocardial infarction: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions. *Circulation*. 2015.

This article has been copublished in *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* and *Catheterization and Cardiovascular Interventions*.

Copies: This document is available on the World Wide Web sites of the American College of Cardiology (www.acc.org), the American Heart Association (<u>my.americanheart.org</u>), and the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions (www.scai.org). A copy of the document is available at <u>http://my.americanheart.org/statements</u> by selecting either the "By Topic" link or the "By Publication Date" link. To purchase additional reprints, call 843-216-2533 or e-mail <u>kelle.ramsay@wolterskluwer.com</u>.

Expert peer review of AHA Scientific Statements is conducted by the AHA Office of Science Operations. For more on AHA statements and guidelines development, visit <u>http://my.americanheart.org/statements</u> and select the "Policies and Development" link.

Permissions: Multiple copies, modification, alteration, enhancement, and/or distribution of this document are not permitted without the express permission of the American Heart Association. Instructions for obtaining permission are located at http://www.heart.org/HEARTORG/General/Copyright-Permission-Guidelines_UCM_300404_Article.jsp. A link to the "Copyright-

Page 2 of 28

Permissions Request Form" appears on the right side of the page.

(Circulation. 2015;000:000-000.)

© 2015 by the American College of Cardiology Foundation, the American Heart Association, Inc., and the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions.

Circulation is available at http://circ.ahajournals.org

DOI: 10.1161/CIR.00000000000336





Table of Contents

Preamble	5
1. Introduction	8
1.1. Methodology and Evidence Review	8
1.2. Organization of the GWC	8
1.3. Review and Approval	8
2. Culprit Artery–Only Versus Multivessel PCI	9
3. Aspiration Thrombectomy	10
Appendix 1. Author Relationships With Industry and Other Entities (Relevant)	13
Appendix 2. Author Relationships With Industry and Other Entities (Relevant)	16
Appendix 3. Reviewer Relationships With Industry and Other Entities (Relevant)-2015 Focused Upda	ate on
Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention for Patients With ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction (Co	mbined
Peer Reviewers From 2011 PCI and 2013 STEMI Guidelines)	20
References	



Preamble

To ensure that guidelines reflect current knowledge, available treatment options, and optimum medical care, existing clinical practice guideline recommendations are modified and new recommendations are added in response to new data, medications or devices. To keep pace with evolving evidence, the American College of Cardiology (ACC) / American Heart Association (AHA) Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines ("Task Force") has issued this focused update to revise guideline recommendations on the basis of recently published data. This update is not based on a complete literature review from the date of previous guideline publications, but it has been subject to rigorous, multilevel review and approval, similar to the full guidelines. For specific focused update criteria and additional methodological details, please see the ACC/AHA guideline methodology manual (1).

Modernization

In response to published reports from the Institute of Medicine (2,3) and ACC/AHA mandates (4-7), processes have changed leading to adoption of a "knowledge byte" format. This entails delineation of recommendations addressing specific clinical questions, followed by concise text, with hyperlinks to supportive evidence. This approach better accommodates time constraints on busy clinicians, facilitates easier access to recommendations via electronic search engines and other evolving technology (e.g., smart phone apps), and supports the evolution of guidelines as "living documents" that can be dynamically updated as needed.

Intended Use

Practice guidelines provide recommendations applicable to patients with or at risk of developing cardiovascular disease. The focus is on medical practice in the United States, but guidelines developed in collaboration with other organizations may have a broader target. Although guidelines may inform regulatory or payer decisions, they are intended to improve quality of care in the interest of patients.

Class of Recommendation and Level of Evidence

The Class of Recommendation (COR) and Level of Evidence (LOE) are derived independently of one another according to established criteria. The COR indicates the strength of recommendation, encompassing the estimated magnitude and certainty of benefit of a clinical action in proportion to risk. The LOE rates the quality of scientific evidence supporting the intervention on the basis of the type, quantity, and consistency of data from clinical trials and other sources (Table 1) (1,7,8).

Relationships With Industry and Other Entities

The ACC and AHA sponsor the guidelines without commercial support, and members volunteer their time. The Task Force zealously avoids actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest that might arise through

relationships with industry or other entities (RWI). All Guideline Writing Committee (GWC) members and reviewers are required to disclose current industry relationships or personal interests from 12 months before initiation of the writing effort. Management of RWI involves selecting a balanced GWC and assuring that the chair and a majority of committee members have no relevant RWI (Appendixes 1 and 2). Members are restricted with regard to writing or voting on sections to which their RWI apply. For transparency, members' comprehensive disclosure information is available online

(http://circ.ahajournals.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1161/CIR.00000000000336/-/DC1). Comprehensive disclosure information for the Task Force is available at http://www.acc.org/guidelines/about-guidelines-and-clinicaldocuments/guidelines-and-documents-task-forces. The Task Force strives to avoid bias by selecting experts from a broad array of backgrounds representing different geographic regions, sexes, ethnicities, intellectual perspectives/biases, and scopes of clinical practice, and by inviting organizations and professional societies with related interests and expertise to participate as partners or collaborators.

Related Issues

For additional information pertaining to the methodology for grading evidence, assessment of benefit and harm, shared decision making between the patient and clinician, structure of evidence tables and summaries, standardized terminology for articulating recommendations, organizational involvement, peer review, and policies for periodic assessment and updating of guideline documents, we encourage readers to consult the ACC/AHA guideline methodology manual (1).

The recommendations in this focused update represent the official policy of the ACC and AHA until superseded by published addenda, statements of clarification, focused updates, or revised full-text guidelines. To ensure that guidelines remain current, new data are reviewed biannually to determine whether recommendations should be modified. In general, full revisions are posted in 5-year cycles (1).

Jonathan L. Halperin, MD, FACC, FAHA Chair, ACC/AHA Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines

Table 1. Applying Class of Recommendation and Level of Evidence to Clinical Strategies, Interventions, Treatments, or Diagnostic Testing in Patient Care* (Updated August 2015)

CLASS (STRENGTH) OF RECOMMENDATION CLASS I (STRONG) Benefit >>> Risk Suggested phrases for writing recommendations: Is recommended Is indicated/useful/effective/beneficial Should be performed/administered/other Comparative-Effectiveness Phrases†: • Treatment/strategy A is recommended/indicated in preference to treatment B • Treatment A should be chosen over treatment B Suggested phrases for writing recommendations: Is reasonable Can be useful/effective/beneficial Comparative-Effectiveness Phrases +: • Treatment/strategy A is probably recommended/indicated in preference to treatment B It is reasonable to choose treatment A over treatment B CLASS IIb (WEAK) Benefit ≥ Risk Suggested phrases for writing recommendations: May/might be reasonable May/might be considered Usefulness/effectiveness is unknown/unclear/uncertain or not well established CLASS III: No Benefit (MODERATE) Benefit = Risk (Generally, LOE A or B use only Suggested phrases for writing recommendations: Is not recommended Is not indicated/useful/effective/beneficial Should not be performed/administered/other CLASS III: Harm (STRONG) Risk > Benefit Suggested phrases for writing recommendations: Potentially harmful Causes harm

- Associated with excess morbidity/mortality
- Should not be performed/administered/other

LEVEL (QUALITY) OF EVIDENCE‡

LEVEL A

- High-quality evidence⁺ from more than 1 RCT
- Meta-analyses of high-quality RCTs
- One or more RCTs corroborated by high-quality registry studies

LEVEL B-R

- Moderate-guality evidence‡ from 1 or more RCTs
- Meta-analyses of moderate-quality RCTs

LEVEL B-NR

(Nonrandomized)

(Limited Data)

(Randomized)

- Moderate-quality evidence‡ from 1 or more well-designed, well-executed nonrandomized studies, observational studies, or registry studies
- Meta-analyses of such studies

LEVEL C-LD

- Randomized or nonrandomized observational or registry studies with limitations of design or execution
- Meta-analyses of such studies
- Physiological or mechanistic studies in human subjects

LEVEL C-EO

(Expert Opinion)

Consensus of expert opinion based on clinical experience

COR and LOE are determined independently (any COR may be paired with any LOE).

A recommendation with LOE C does not imply that the recommendation is weak. Many important clinical questions addressed in guidelines do not lend themselves to clinical trials. Although RCTs are unavailable, there may be a very clear clinical consensus that a particular test or therapy is useful or effective.

- * The outcome or result of the intervention should be specified (an improved clinical outcome or increased diagnostic accuracy or incremental prognostic information).
- † For comparative-effectiveness recommendations (COR I and IIa; LOE A and B only), studies that support the use of comparator verbs should involve direct comparisons of the treatments or strategies being evaluated.
- ‡ The method of assessing quality is evolving, including the application of standardized, widely used, and preferably validated evidence grading tools; and for systematic reviews, the incorporation of an Evidence Review Committee.

COR indicates Class of Recommendation; EO, expert opinion; LD, limited data; LOE, Level of Evidence; NR, nonrandomized; R, randomized; and RCT, randomized controlled trial.

1. Introduction

The scope of this focused update is limited to considerations relevant to multivessel percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) and thrombus aspiration in patients with ST-elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI) undergoing primary PCI.

1.1. Methodology and Evidence Review

Clinical trials presented at the major cardiology organizations' 2013 to 2015 annual scientific meetings and other selected reports published in a peer-reviewed format through August 2015 were reviewed by the 2011 PCI and 2013 STEMI GWCs and the Task Force to identify trials and other key data that might affect guideline recommendations. The information considered important enough to prompt updated recommendations is included in evidence tables in the <u>Online Data Supplement</u>

(http://circ.ahajournals.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1161/CIR.000000000000336/-/DC2).

Consult the full-text versions of the 2011 PCI and 2013 STEMI guidelines (9,10) for recommendations in clinical areas not addressed in the focused update. The individual recommendations in this focused update will be incorporated into future revisions or updates of the full-text guidelines.

1.2. Organization of the GWC

For this focused update, representative members of the 2011 PCI and 2013 STEMI GWCs were invited to participate. Members were required to disclose all RWI relevant to the topics under consideration. The entire membership of both GWCs voted on the revised recommendations and text. The latter group was composed of experts representing cardiovascular medicine, interventional cardiology, electrophysiology, heart failure, cardiac surgery, emergency medicine, internal medicine, cardiac rehabilitation, nursing, and pharmacy. The GWC included representatives from the ACC, AHA, American College of Physicians, American College of Emergency Physicians, and Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions (SCAI).

1.3. Review and Approval

This document was reviewed predominantly by the prior reviewers from the respective 2011 and 2013 guidelines. These included 8 official reviewers jointly nominated by the ACC and AHA, 4 official/organizational reviewers nominated by SCAI, and 25 individual content reviewers. Reviewers' RWI information was distributed to the GWC and is published in this document (Appendix 3).

This document was approved for publication by the governing bodies of the ACC, the AHA, and the SCAI and was endorsed by the (TBD).

2. Culprit Artery–Only Versus Multivessel PCI

(See Section 5.2.2.2 of 2011 PCI guideline and Section 4.1.1 of 2013 STEMI guideline for additional recommendations.)

2013 Recommendation	2015 Focused Update Recommendation	Comment		
Class III: Harm	<u>Class IIb</u>			
PCI should not be performed in a noninfarct artery at the time of primary PCI in patients with STEMI who are hemodynamically stable (11-13). (<i>Level of Evidence: B</i>)	PCI of a noninfarct artery may be considered in selected patients with STEMI and multivessel disease who are hemodynamically stable, either at the time of primary PCI or as a planned staged procedure (11-24). (Level of Evidence: B-R)	Modified recommendation (changed class from "III: Harm" to "IIb" and expanded time frame in which multivessel PCI could be performed).		

PCI indicates percutaneous coronary intervention; and STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction.

Approximately 50% of patients with STEMI have multivessel disease (25,26). PCI options for patients with STEMI and multivessel disease include: 1) culprit artery–only primary PCI, with PCI of nonculprit arteries only for spontaneous ischemia or intermediate- or high-risk findings on predischarge noninvasive testing; 2) multivessel PCI at the time of primary PCI; or 3) culprit artery–only primary PCI followed by staged PCI of nonculprit arteries. Observational studies, randomized controlled trials (RCTs), and meta-analyses comparing culprit artery–only PCI with multivessel PCI have reported conflicting results (11,12,14-24,27,28), likely because of differing inclusion criteria, study protocols, timing of multivessel PCI, statistical heterogeneity, and variable endpoints (Data Supplement).

Previous clinical practice guidelines recommended against PCI of nonculprit artery stenoses at the time of primary PCI in hemodynamically stable patients with STEMI (9,10). Planning for routine, staged PCI of noninfarct artery stenoses on the basis of the initial angiographic findings was not addressed in these previous guidelines, and noninfarct artery PCI was considered only in the limited context of spontaneous ischemia or high-risk findings on predischarge noninvasive testing. The earlier recommendations were based in part on safety concerns, which included increased risks for procedural complications, longer procedural time, contrast nephropathy, and stent thrombosis in a prothrombotic and proinflammatory state (9,10), and in part on the findings from many observational studies and meta-analyses of trends toward or statistically significant worse outcomes in those who underwent multivessel primary PCI (12-16,21-23).

Four RCTs have since suggested that a strategy of multivessel PCI, either at the time of primary PCI or as a planned, staged procedure, may be beneficial and safe in selected patients with STEMI (17,18,24,27) (Data Supplement). In the PRAMI (Preventive Angioplasty in Acute Myocardial Infarction) trial (n=465) (24), the composite primary outcome of cardiac death, nonfatal myocardial infarction (MI), or refractory angina occurred in 21 patients (9%) treated with multivessel primary PCI, compared with 53 patients (22%) treated with culprit artery–only PCI (HR: 0.35; 95% CI: 0.21 to 0.58; p<0.001). In the CvLPRIT (Complete Versus Culprit-Lesion

Only Primary PCI) trial (18), 296 patients were randomized to culprit artery–only or multivessel PCI during the index hospitalization (72% underwent multivessel primary PCI). The composite primary outcome of death, reinfarction, heart failure, and ischemia-driven revascularization at 12 months occurred in 15 patients (10%) who underwent multivessel PCI, compared with 31 patients (21%) receiving culprit artery–only PCI (HR: 0.49; 95% CI: 0.24 to 0.84; p=0.009). In the DANAMI 3 PRIMULTI (Third Danish Study of Optimal Acute Treatment of Patients with ST-segment Elevation Myocardial Infarction) trial (17), the composite primary outcome of all-cause death, nonfatal MI, or ischemia-driven revascularization of nonculprit artery disease occurred in 40 of 314 patients (13%) who underwent multivessel staged PCI guided by angiography and fractional flow reserve before discharge, versus 68 of 313 patients (22%) treated with culprit artery–only PCI (HR: 0.56; 95% CI: 0.38 to 0.83; p=0.004). In the PRAGUE-13 (Primary Angioplasty in Patients Transferred From General Community Hospitals to Specialized PTCA Units With or Without Emergency Thrombolysis) trial (27), 214 patients with STEMI were randomized to staged (3 to 40 days after the index procedure) revascularization of all ≥70% diameter stenosis noninfarct lesions or culprit-only PCI. Preliminary results at 38 months' mean follow-up showed no between-group differences in the composite primary endpoint of all-cause death, nonfatal MI, and stroke.

On the basis of these findings (17,18,24,27), the prior Class III (Harm) recommendation with regard to multivessel primary PCI in hemodynamically stable patients with STEMI has been upgraded and modified to a Class IIb recommendation to include consideration of multivessel PCI, either at the time of primary PCI or as a planned, staged procedure. The writing committee emphasizes that this change should not be interpreted as endorsing the *routine* performance of multivessel PCI in all patients with STEMI and multivessel disease. Rather, when considering the indications for and timing of multivessel PCI, physicians should integrate clinical data, lesion severity/complexity, and risk of contrast nephropathy to determine the optimal strategy.

The preceding discussion and recommendations apply to the strategy of *routine* PCI of noninfarct related arteries in hemodynamically stable patients. Recommendations in the 2013 STEMI guideline with regard to PCI of a non–infarct-related artery at a time separate from primary PCI in patients who have spontaneous symptoms and myocardial ischemia or who have intermediate- or high-risk findings on noninvasive testing (Section 6.3 of that guideline) remain operative.

Although several observational studies (19,20) and a network meta-analysis (13) have suggested that multivessel staged PCI may be associated with better outcome than multivessel primary PCI, there are insufficient observational data and no randomized data at this time to inform a recommendation with regard to the optimal timing of nonculprit vessel PCI. Additional trial data that will help further clarify this issue are awaited. Issues related to the optimal method of evaluating nonculprit lesions (e.g., percent diameter stenosis, fractional flow reserve) are beyond the scope of this focused update.

3. Aspiration Thrombectomy

(See Section 5.5.2 of the 2011 PCI guideline and Section 4.2 of the 2013 STEMI guideline for additional recommendations.)

2011/2013 Recommendation	2015 Focused Update Recommendations	Comments		
<u>Class IIa</u> Manual aspiration thrombectomy is reasonable for patients undergoing primary PCI (29-32). (<i>Level of</i> <i>Evidence: B</i>)	<u>Class IIb</u> The usefulness of selective and bailout aspiration thrombectomy in patients undergoing primary PCI is not well established (33-37). (<i>Level of</i> <i>Evidence: C-LD</i>)	Modified recommendation (Class changed from "IIa" to "IIb" for selective and bailout aspiration thrombectomy before PCI).		
	<u>Class III: No Benefit</u> <i>Routine</i> aspiration thrombectomy before primary PCI is not useful (33- 37). (<i>Level of Evidence: A</i>)	New recommendation ("Class III: No Benefit" added for <i>routine</i> aspiration thrombectomy before PCI).		

PCI indicates percutaneous coronary intervention; and LD, limited data.

The 2011 PCI and 2013 STEMI guidelines' (9,10) Class IIa recommendation for aspiration thrombectomy before primary PCI was based on the results of 2 RCTs (29,31,32) and 1 meta-analysis (30) and was driven in large measure by the results of TAPAS (Thrombus Aspiration During Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in Acute Myocardial Infarction Study), a single-center study that randomized 1,071 patients with STEMI to aspiration thrombectomy before primary PCI or primary PCI only (29,32). Three multicenter trials, 2 of which enrolled significantly more patients than prior aspiration thrombectomy trials, have prompted reevaluation of this recommendation. In the INFUSE-AMI (Intracoronary Abciximab and Aspiration Thrombectomy in Patients With Large Anterior Myocardial Infarction) trial (37) of 452 patients with anterior STEMI due to proximal or mid-left anterior descending occlusion, infarct size was not reduced by aspiration thrombectomy before primary PCI. The TASTE (Thrombus Aspiration During ST-Segment Elevation Myocardial Infarction) trial (n=7,244) incorporated a unique design that allowed randomization within an existing national registry, resulting in enrollment of a remarkably high proportion of eligible patients (34,36). No significant 30-day or 1-year differences were found between the group that received aspiration thrombectomy before primary PCI and the group that received primary PCI only with regard to death, reinfarction, stent thrombosis, target lesion revascularization, or a composite of major adverse cardiac events. The TOTAL (Trial of Routine Aspiration Thrombectomy With PCI Versus PCI Alone in Patients With STEMI) trial randomized 10,732 patients with STEMI to aspiration thrombectomy before primary PCI or primary PCI only (35). Bailout thrombectomy was performed in 7.1% of the primary PCI–only group, whereas the rate of crossover from aspiration thrombectomy before primary PCI to primary PCI only was 4.6%. There were no differences between the 2 treatment groups, either in the primary composite endpoint of cardiovascular death, recurrent MI, cardiogenic shock, or New York Heart Association class IV heart failure at 180 days, or in the individual components of the primary endpoint, stent thrombosis, or target-vessel revascularization. There was a small but statistically significant increase in the rate of stroke in the aspiration thrombectomy group. An updated meta-analysis that included these 3 trials among a total of 17 trials (n=20,960) found no significant reduction in death, reinfarction, or stent thrombosis with routine aspiration thrombectomy.

Aspiration thrombectomy was associated with a small but nonsignificant increase in the risk of stroke (33).

Several previous studies have found that higher thrombus burden in patients with STEMI is independently associated with higher risks of distal embolization, no-reflow phenomenon, transmural myocardial necrosis, major adverse cardiac events, stent thrombosis, and death (38-42). However, subgroup analyses from the TASTE and TOTAL trials did not suggest relative benefit from aspiration thrombectomy before primary PCI in patients with higher thrombus burden or in patients with initial Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction (TIMI) flow grade 0-1 or left anterior descending artery / anterior infarction (34,35).

On the basis of the results of these studies, the prior Class IIa recommendation for aspiration thrombectomy has been changed. *Routine* aspiration thrombectomy before primary PCI is now not recommended (Class III: No Benefit, LOE A). There are insufficient data to assess the potential benefit of a strategy of selective or bailout aspiration thrombectomy (Class IIb, LOE C-LD). "Bailout" aspiration thrombectomy is defined as thrombectomy that was initially unplanned but was later used during the procedure because of unsatisfactory initial result or procedural complication, analogous to the definition of "bailout" glycoprotein IIb/IIIa use.

It should be noted that the preceding recommendations and text apply only to aspiration thrombectomy; no clinical benefit for routine rheolytic thrombectomy has been demonstrated in patients with STEMI undergoing primary PCI (30,43,44).

Presidents and Staff

American College of Cardiology

Kim A. Williams, Sr, MD, FACC, FAHA, President Shalom Jacobovitz, Chief Executive Officer William J. Oetgen, MD, MBA, FACC, Executive Vice President, Science, Education, Quality, and Publications Amelia Scholtz, PhD, Publication Manager, Science, Education, and Quality

American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association

Lisa Bradfield, CAE, Director, Science and Clinical Policy Abdul R. Abdullah, MD, Associate Science and Medicine Advisor Allison Rabinowitz, Project Manager, Science and Clinical Policy

American Heart Association

Mark A. Creager, MD, FAHA, FACC, President Nancy Brown, Chief Executive Officer Rose Marie Robertson, MD, FAHA, Chief Science Officer Gayle R. Whitman, PhD, RN, FAHA, FAAN, Senior Vice President, Office of Science Operations Jody Hundley, Production Manager, Scientific Publications, Office of Science Operations

Key Words: AHA Scientific Statements, focused update, primary PCI, culprit vessel, multivessel, thrombectomy

Appendix 1. Author Relationships With Industry and Other Entities (Relevant)—2015 ACC/AHA/SCAI Focused Update on Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention for Patients With ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction (Percutaneous Coronary Intervention Writing Committee) (November 2014)

Committee Member	Employer/Title	Consultant	Speakers Bureau	Ownership/ Partnership /Principal	Personal Research	Institutional, Organizational or Other Financial Benefit	Expert Witness	Voting Recusals by Section*
Glenn N. Levine, Chair	Baylor College of Medicine— Professor of Medicine; Director, Cardiac Care Unit	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Eric R. Bates, Vice Chair	University of Michigan— Professor of Medicine	 Merck Sanofi-aventis	None	None	None	None	None	2 and 3
James C. Blankenship, Vice Chair	Geisinger Medical Center— Director of Cardiology and Cardiac Catheterization Laboratories	None	None	None	 Abbott Vascular† Abiomed† Boston Scientific† Volcano† 	None	None	2 and 3
Steven R. Bailey	University of Texas Medical Center—Professor of Medicine and Radiology	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
John A. Bittl	Munroe Heart—Interventional Cardiologist	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Bojan Cercek	Cedars-Sinai Medical Center— Director, Coronary Care Unit	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Charles E. Chambers	Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center—Professor of Medicine and Radiology	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Stephen G. Ellis	Cleveland Clinic Foundation— Section Head, Invasive and Interventional Cardiology	 Abbott Boston Scientific Medtronic	None	None	None	None	None	2 and 3
Robert A. Guyton	Emory Clinic, Inc.—Professor and Chief, Division of Cardiothoracic Surgery	●Medtronic‡	None	None	None	None	None	2 and 3
Steven M. Hollenberg	Cooper Medical School of Rowan University—Professor of Medicine	None	None	None	None	None	None	None

Committee Member	Employer/Title	Consultant	Speakers Bureau	Ownership/ Partnership /Principal	Personal Research	Institutional, Organizational or Other Financial Benefit	Expert Witness	Voting Recusals by Section*
Umesh N. Khot	Cleveland Clinic—Vice Chairman, Department of Cardiovascular Medicine	AstraZeneca	None	None	None	None	None	None
Richard A. Lange	Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center El Paso— President	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Laura Mauri	Brigham & Women's Hospital—Associate Professor of Medicine, Harvard Medical School	 Medtronic St. Jude Medical 	None	None	None	 Abbott‡ Boston Scientific‡ Bristol-Myers Squibb‡ Cordis‡ Medtronic Cardiovascular‡ Sanofi-aventis‡ 	None	2 and 3
Roxana Mehran	Columbia University Medical Center—Associate Professor of Medicine; Director, Data Coordinating Analysis Center	 Abbott Vascular Boston Scientific Janssen (Johnson & Johnson)‡ Merck Sanofi-aventis‡ 	None	None	 BMS/Sanofi- aventis‡ Regado STENTYS† 	None	None	2 and 3
Issam D. Moussa	University of Central Florida College of Medicine— Professor of Medicine; First Coast Cardiovascular Institute—Chief Medical Officer	None THE AM		None HEAR	None T Assoc	None	None	None
Debabrata Mukherjee	Texas Tech University—Chief, Cardiovascular Medicine	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Henry H. Ting	New York–Presbyterian Hospital, The University Hospital of Columbia and Cornell—Senior Vice President and Chief Quality Officer	None	None	None	None	None	None	None

This table represents the relationships of committee members with industry and other entities that were determined to be relevant to this document. These relationships were reviewed and updated in conjunction with all meetings and/or conference calls of the writing committee during the document development process. The table does not necessarily reflect relationships with industry at the time of publication. A person is deemed to have a significant interest in a business if the interest represents ownership of \geq 5% of the voting stock or share of the business entity, or ownership of \geq \$5,000 of the fair market value of the business entity; or if funds received by the person from the business entity exceed 5% of the person's gross income for the previous year. Relationships that exist with no financial benefit are also included for the purpose of transparency. Relationships in this table are modest unless otherwise noted.

According to the ACC/AHA, a person has a *relevant* relationship IF: a) the *relationship or interest* relates to the same or similar subject matter, intellectual property or asset, topic, or issue addressed in the *document*; or b) the *company/entity* (with whom the relationship exists) makes a drug, drug class, or device addressed in the *document*, or makes a competing drug or device addressed in the *document*; or c) the *person or a member of the person's household* has a reasonable potential for financial, professional, or other personal gain or loss as a result of the issues/content addressed in the *document*.

*Writing group members are required to recuse themselves from voting on sections to which their specific relationships with industry and other entities may apply.

†No financial benefit. ‡Significant relationship.

ACC indicates American College of Cardiology; AHA, American Heart Association; and SCAI, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions.

irculation

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION

Appendix 2. Author Relationships With Industry and Other Entities (Relevant)—2015 ACC/AHA/SCAI Focused Update on Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention for Patients With ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction (ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction Writing Committee) (February 2014)

Committee Member	Employment	Consultant	Speakers Bureau	Ownership/ Partnership/ Principal	Personal Research	Institutional, Organizational	Expert Witness	Voting Recusals
				Timeipai		Financial Benefit		Section*
Patrick T. O'Gara, Chair	Harvard Medical School— Professor of Medicine	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Frederick G. Kushner, Vice Chair	Tulane University School of Medicine—Clinical Professor of Medicine; Heart Clinic of Louisiana—Medical Director	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Ralph G. Brindis	UCSF Philip R. Lee Institute for Health Policy Studies— Clinical Professor of Medicine	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Donald E. Casey, Jr.	Thomas Jefferson College of Population Health—Adjunct Faculty; Alvarez & Marsal IPO4Health—Principal and Founder	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Mina K. Chung	Cleveland Clinic Foundation—Professor of Medicine	 Boston Scientific‡ Medtronic‡ St. Jude‡ 	None	None	 Biosense Webster‡ Boston Scientific‡ Medtronic‡ St. Jude† 	None	None	2 and 3
James A. de Lemos	UT Southwestern Medical Center—Professor of Medicine	 Abbott Diagnostics Novo Nordisc St. Jude Medical 	None	None	• Abbott Diagnostics†	None	None	2 and 3
Deborah B. Diercks	UT Southwestern Medical Center—Audre and Bernard Rapoport Distinguished Chair in Clinical Care and Research; Department of Emergency Medicine—	None	None	None	None	None	None	None

Committee Member	Employment	Consultant	Speakers Bureau	Ownership/ Partnership/ Principal	Personal Research	Institutional, Organizational or Other Financial Benefit	Expert Witness	Voting Recusals by Section*
	Professor and Chair							
James C. Fang	University of Utah— Cardiovascular Division	• Boston Scientific	None	None	None	None	None	2 and 3
Barry A. Franklin	William Beaumont Hospital—Director, Cardiac Rehabilitation and Exercise Laboratories	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Christopher B. Granger	Duke Clinical Research Institute—Director, Cardiac Care Unit; Professor of Medicine	None	None	None	 Medtronic Foundation† Merck† 	None 🗍	None	2 and 3
Harlan M. Krumholz	Yale University School of Medicine—Professor of Epidemiology and Public Health	None	None	None	 Johnson & Johnson† Medtronic† 	None	None	2 and 3
Jane A. Linderbaum	Mayo Clinic—Assistant Professor of Medicine	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
David A. Morrow	Harvard Medical School— Professor of Medicine	• Abbott • Merck	None	None	 Abbott† GlaxoSmith- Kline† Johnson & Johnson† Merck† 	None	None	2 and 3
L. Kristin Newby	Duke University Medical Center, Division of Cardiology—Professor of Medicine	Philips	None	None	• Merck†	None	None	2 and 3
Joseph P. Ornato	Department of Emergency Medicine Virginia Commonwealth University— Professor and Chairman	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Narith Ou	Mayo Clinic— Pharmacotherapy Coordinator, Cardiology_	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Martha J. Radford	NYU Langone Medical Center—Chief Quality	None	None	None	None	None	None	None

Committee Member	Employment	Consultant	Speakers Bureau	Ownership/ Partnership/ Principal	Personal Research	Institutional, Organizational or Other Financial Benefit	Expert Witness	Voting Recusals by Section*
	Officer; NYU School of Medicine—Professor of Medicine (Cardiology)							
Jacqueline E. Tamis-Holland	Mount Sinai Saint Luke's Hospital and The Icahn School of Medicine— Program Director, Interventional Cardiology Fellowship Program	None	None	None	None	None	None Immen	None
Carl L. Tommaso	Skokie Hospital—Director of Catheterization Laboratory; NorthShore University HealthSystems—Partner	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Cynthia M. Tracy	George Washington University Medical Center— Associate Director, Division of Cardiology	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Y. Joseph Woo	Stanford University— Professor and Chair, Cardiothoracic Surgery	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
David X. Zhao	Wake Forest Baptist Health— Professor of Medicine, Heart and Vascular Center of Excellence Director	None	None	None	 St. Jude‡ Medtronic‡ 	None	None	2 and 3

This table represents the relationships of committee members with industry and other entities that were determined to be relevant to this document. These relationships were reviewed and updated in conjunction with all meetings and/or conference calls of the writing committee during the document development process. The table does not necessarily reflect relationships with industry at the time of publication. A person is deemed to have a significant interest in a business if the interest represents ownership of \geq 5% of the voting stock or share of the business entity, or ownership of \geq \$5,000 of the fair market value of the business entity; or if funds received by the person from the business entity exceed 5% of the person's gross income for the previous year. Relationships that exist with no financial benefit are also included for the purpose of transparency. Relationships in this table are modest unless otherwise noted.

According to the ACC/AHA, a person has a *relevant* relationship IF: a) the *relationship or interest* relates to the same or similar subject matter, intellectual property or asset, topic, or issue addressed in the *document*; or b) the *company/entity* (with whom the relationship exists) makes a drug, drug class, or device addressed in the *document*, or makes a competing drug or device addressed in the *document*; or c) the *person or a member of the person's household* has a reasonable potential for financial, professional, or other personal gain or loss as a result of the issues/content addressed in the *document*.

Dr. Deborah D. Ascheim was not eligible to continue on the writing committee due to her employment by Capricor Therapeutics effective August 2015.

*Writing group members are required to recuse themselves from voting on sections to which their specific relationships with industry and other entities may apply. †Significant relationship. ‡No financial benefit.

ACC indicates American College of Cardiology; AHA, American Heart Association; NYU, New York University; UCSF, University of California San Francisco; and UT, Utah.





JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION

Reviewer	Representation	Employment	Consultant	Speakers Bureau	Ownership/ Partnership/ Principal	Personal Research	Institutional, Organizational or Other Financial Benefit	Expert Witness
Elliott M. Antman	Official Reviewer—AHA	Harvard Medical School— Professor of Medicine, Associate Dean for Clinical and Translational Research	None	None	None	None	None	None
Deepak L. Bhatt	Official Reviewer—AHA	Harvard Medical School— Professor; Interventional Cardiovascular Programs—Executive Director	None	None	None	 Bristol-Myers Squibb* Ischemix* Medtronic* St. Jude Medical 	• Regado Biosciences†	None
Christopher P. Cannon	Official Reviewer—AHA	Harvard Medical School— Professor of Medicine; Brigham and Women's Hospital—Senior Investigator, TIMI Study Group, Cardiovascular Division	 Bristol-Myers Squibb Merck Regeneron/ Sanofi- aventis* 	None	None	Merck*	None	None
Joaquin E. Cigarroa	Official Reviewer— ACC/AHA Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines	Oregon Health & Science University—Clinical Professor of Medicine		None	None	None	None	None
George Dangas	Official Reviewer—ACC Board of Trustees	Icahn School of Medicine—Professor of Cardiology and Vascular Surgery; Mount Sinai Medical Center—Director, Cardiovascular Innovation	 Abbott Biosensors Boston Scientific Johnson & Johnson* Merck Osprey Medical* 	None	None	None	AbbottMedtronicOsprey	None

Appendix 3. Reviewer Relationships With Industry and Other Entities (Relevant)—2015 Focused Update on Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention for Patients With ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction (Combined Peer Reviewers From 2011 PCI and 2013 STEMI Guidelines)

Reviewer	Representation	Employment	Consultant	Speakers Bureau	Ownership/ Partnership/ Principal	Personal Research	Institutional, Organizational or Other Financial Benefit	Expert Witness
			 Regado Biosciences 					
Charles J. Davidson	Official Reviewer— SCAI	Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine—Professor of Medicine, Director of Cardiac Catheterization Lab	None	None	None	• Baxter International†	None	None
Kirk N. Garratt	Official Reviewer— SCAI	Hofstra University Medical School—Associate Chair of Quality and Research; Professor of Medicine	 Abbott Boston Scientific The Medicines Company Daiichi- Sankyo/Eli Lilly AstraZeneca 	None	 LifeCuff Technologies Global Delivery Systems 	None	• Boston Scientific	None
Steven L. Goldberg	Official Reviewer— SCAI	University of Washington Medical Center—Cath Lab Director	• Terumo†	None	None	None	None	None
G. B. John Mancini	Official Reviewer—ACC Board of Governors	Vancouver Hospital Research Pavilion— Professor of Medicine	 Merck Sanofi-aventis/ Regeneron 	None	None	None	None	None
Jonathan M. Tobis	Official Reviewer— SCAI	University of California Los Angeles—Professor of Medicine and Cardiology	• St. Jude Medical	None	None	None	None	None
Jeffrey L. Anderson	Content Reviewer— ACC/AHA Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines	Intermountain Medical Center—Associate Chief of Cardiology	None	None	None	None	None	None
Thomas M. Bashore	Content Reviewer	Duke University— Professor of Medicine	None	None	None	None	None	None
James A. Burke	Content Reviewer—ACC	Lehigh Valley Heart Specialists—Associate	None	None	None	None	None	None

Reviewer	Representation	Employment	Consultant	Speakers Bureau	Ownership/ Partnership/ Principal	Personal Research	Institutional, Organizational or Other Financial Benefit	Expert Witness
	Interventional Scientific Council	Chief, Division of Cardiology						
Jeffrey J. Cavendish	Content Reviewer—ACC Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease Committee	Kaiser Permanente Cardiology— Interventional Cardiologist	None	None	None	None	• Abbott	None
Gregory J. Dehmer	Content Reviewer—ACC Appropriate Use Criteria	Texas A&M College of Medicine—Professor of Medicine; Scott & White Healthcare	None	None	None	None	None	None
John S. Douglas, Jr.	Content Reviewer	Emory University Hospital—Professor of Medicine	None	None	None	AbbottMedtronic	None	None
John P. Erwin III	Content Reviewer— ACC/AHA Task Force on Performance Measures	Texas A&M College of Medicine—Associate Professor; Scott & White Healthcare—Vice-Chair of the Department of Medicine	None	None	None	None	None	None
T. Bruce Ferguson	Content Reviewer—ACC Surgeons' Scientific Council	East Carolina Institute Brody School of Medicine—Professor of Surgery and Physiology	None	None	None	None	None	None
Anthony Gershlick	Content Reviewer	University Hospitals of Leicester, Department of Cardiology	 Abbott Boston Scientific Cordis Medtronic 	• Abbott†	None	None	None	None
Jonathan L. Halperin	Content Reviewer— ACC/AHA Task Force on Clinical	Mt. Sinai Medical— Professor of Medicine	 Bayer Healthcare Boston Scientific 	None	None	None	None	None

Reviewer	Representation	Employment	Consultant	Speakers Bureau	Ownership/ Partnership/ Principal	Personal Research	Institutional, Organizational or Other Financial Benefit	Expert Witness
	Practice Guidelines		 Johnson & Johnson Medtronic 					
Howard C. Herrmann	Content Reviewer	University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine—Professor of Medicine, Director of Interventional Cardiology Program	 Seimens Medical St. Jude Medical 	None	None	 Abbott* Medtronic Siemens Medical* St. Jude Medical 	None	None
Morton J. Kern	Content Reviewer	University of California Irvine—Professor of Medicine, Associate Chief of the Division of Cardiology	 Acist Medical Merit Medical* 	• St. Jude Medical*	None	None	None	None
Fred M. Kosumoto	Content Reviewer	Mayo Clinic—Director, Pacing and Electrophysiology Service	None	None	None	None	None	None
David J. Maron	Content Reviewer	Stanford University School of Medicine—Professor of Medicine and Emergency Medicine	None	None	None	None	None	None
Douglass A. Morrison	Content Reviewer	University of Arizona— Professor of Medicine; Southern Arizona VA Health Care System— Cardiac Catheterization Laboratories, Director	None	None	None	None	None	None
Manesh R. Patel	Content Reviewer—ACC Appropriate Use Criteria	Duke University Medical Center—Associate Professor of Medicine	 Bayer Healthcare* Janssen Pharmaceutica ls* 	None	None	• Johnson & Johnson*	None	None
M. Eugene Sherman	Content Reviewer—ACC Board of Governors	Aurora Denver Cardiology	None	None	None	None	 Bristol-Myers Squibb* Hospira* 	None

Reviewer	Representation	Employment	Consultant	Speakers Bureau	Ownership/ Partnership/ Principal	Personal Research	Institutional, Organizational or Other Financial Benefit	Expert Witness
Daniel I. Simon	Content Reviewer	University Hospitals Case Medical Center—Professor of Cardiovascular Research	 Cordis/Johnson & Johnson* Janssen Pharmaceutica ls/Johnson & Johnson Medtronic Vascular Merck 	• Abbott	None	None	None	None
Richard W. Snyder	Content Reviewer—ACC Board of Governors	HeartPlace	None	None	None	None	None	None
William A. Tansey III	Content Reviewer	Summit Medical Group— Cardiologist	None	None	None	None	None	None
David D. Waters	Content Reviewer	San Francisco General Hospital—Chief, Division of Cardiology	None	None	None	None	Merck	None
Patrick L. Whitlow	Content Reviewer	Cleveland Clinic Foundation—Director, Interventional Cardiology	None	None	None	• Abbott	Medtronic*	
David O. Williams	Content Reviewer	Harvard Medical School— Professor of Medicine; Brigham and Women's Hospital	None	None	None	None	None	None
Clyde W. Yancy	Content Reviewer— ACC/AHA Task Force on Practice Guidelines	Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine—Vice Dean for Diversity and Inclusion, Chief of Medicine- Cardiology, Professor	None	None	None	None	None	None
Yerem Yeghiazarians	Content Reviewer	University of California San Francisco—Associate Professor	None	None	None	None	None	None

This table represents the relationships of reviewers with industry and other entities that were disclosed at the time of peer review and determined to be relevant to this document. It does not necessarily reflect relationships with industry at the time of publication. A person is deemed to have a significant interest in a business if the interest represents ownership of \geq 5% of the voting stock or share of the business entity, or ownership of \geq \$5,000 of the fair market value of the business entity; or if funds received by the person from the business entity exceed 5% of the person's gross income for the previous year. A relationship is considered to be modest if it is less than significant under the preceding definition. Relationships that exist with no financial benefit are also included for the purpose of transparency. Relationships in this table are modest unless otherwise noted. Names are listed in alphabetical order within each category of review.

According to the ACC/AHA, a person has a *relevant* relationship IF: a) the *relationship or interest* relates to the same or similar subject matter, intellectual property or asset, topic, or issue addressed in the *document*; or b) the *company/entity* (with whom the relationship exists) makes a drug, drug class, or device addressed in the *document*, or makes a competing drug or device addressed in the *document*; or c) the *person or a member of the person's household* has a reasonable potential for financial, professional, or other personal gain or loss as a result of the issues/content addressed in the *document*.

*Significant relationship. †No financial benefit.



ACC indicates American College of Cardiology; AHA, American Heart Association; HF, heart failure; SCAI, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; PCI, percutaneous coronary interventions; TIMI, Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction; and VA, Veteran's Affairs.

Circulation

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION

References

- 1. ACCF/AHA Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *Methodology Manual and Policies From the ACCF/AHA Task Force on Practice Guidelines*. American College of Cardiology and American Heart Association. 2010. Available at: http://assets.cardiosource.com/Methodology_Manual_for_ACC_AHA_Writing_Committees.pdf and http://my.americanheart.org/idc/groups/ahamah-public/@wcm/@sop/documents/downloadable/ucm_319826.pdf. Accessed January 23, 2015.
- 2. Committee on Standards for Developing Trustworthy Clinical Practice Guidelines, Institute of Medicine (U.S.). *Clinical Practice Guidelines We Can Trust*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2011.
- 3. Committee on Standards for Systematic Reviews of Comparative Effectiveness Research, Institute of Medicine (U.S.). *Finding What Works in Health Care: Standards for Systematic Reviews*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2011.
- Anderson JL, Heidenreich PA, Barnett PG, et al. ACC/AHA statement on cost/value methodology in clinical practice guidelines and performance measures: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Performance Measures and Task Force on Practice Guidelines. Circulation. 2014;129:2329–45.
- Arnett DK, Goodman RA, Halperin JL, et al. AHA/ACC/HHS strategies to enhance application of clinical practice guidelines in patients with cardiovascular disease and comorbid conditions: from the American Heart Association, American College of Cardiology, and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Circulation. 2014;130:1662–7.
- 6. Jacobs AK, Kushner FG, Ettinger SM, et al. ACCF/AHA clinical practice guideline methodology summit report: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. Circulation. 2013;127:268-310.
- 7. Jacobs AK, Anderson JL, Halperin JL. The evolution and future of ACC/AHA clinical practice guidelines: a 30year journey: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. Circulation. 2014;130:1208–17.
- 8. Halperin JL, Levine GN, Al-Khatib SM, et al. Further evolution of the ACC/AHA clinical practice guideline recommendation classification system: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. Circulation. 2015; IN PRESS
- Levine GN, Bates ER, Blankenship JC, et al. 2011 ACCF/AHA/SCAI guideline for percutaneous coronary intervention: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines and the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions. Circulation. 2011;124:e574-651.
- 10. O'Gara PT, Kushner FG, Ascheim DD, et al. 2013 ACCF/AHA guideline for the management of ST-elevation myocardial infarction: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. Circulation. 2013;127:529-55.
- 11. Hannan EL, Samadashvili Z, Walford G, et al. Culprit vessel percutaneous coronary intervention versus multivessel and staged percutaneous coronary intervention for ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction patients with multivessel disease. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2010;3:22-31.
- Toma M, Buller CE, Westerhout CM, et al. Non-culprit coronary artery percutaneous coronary intervention during acute ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: insights from the APEX-AMI trial. Eur Heart J. 2010;31:1701-7.
- 13. Vlaar PJ, Mahmoud KD, Holmes DR Jr, et al. Culprit vessel only versus multivessel and staged percutaneous coronary intervention for multivessel disease in patients presenting with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: a pairwise and network meta-analysis. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2011;58:692-703.
- 14. Cavender MA, Milford-Beland S, Roe MT, et al. Prevalence, predictors, and in-hospital outcomes of non-infarct artery intervention during primary percutaneous coronary intervention for ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (from the National Cardiovascular Data Registry). Am J Cardiol. 2009;104:507-13.
- 15. Corpus RA, House JA, Marso SP, et al. Multivessel percutaneous coronary intervention in patients with multivessel disease and acute myocardial infarction. Am Heart J. 2004;148:493-500.
- 16. Dziewierz A, Siudak Z, Rakowski T, et al. Impact of multivessel coronary artery disease and noninfarct-related artery revascularization on outcome of patients with ST-elevation myocardial infarction transferred for primary percutaneous coronary intervention (from the EUROTRANSFER Registry). Am J Cardiol. 2010;106:342-7.
- 17. Engstrøm T, Kelbæk H, Helqvist S, et al. Complete revascularisation versus treatment of the culprit lesion only in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction and multivessel disease (DANAMI 3-PRIMULTI): an

Page 26 of 28

open-label, randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2015;386:665-71.

- 18. Gershlick AH, Khan JN, Kelly DJ, et al. Randomized trial of complete versus lesion-only revascularization in patients undergoing primary percutaneous coronary intervention for STEMI and multivessel Disease: the CvLPRIT trial. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2015;65:963-72.
- 19. Kornowski R, Mehran R, Dangas G, et al. Prognostic impact of staged versus "one-time" multivessel percutaneous intervention in acute myocardial infarction: analysis from the HORIZONS-AMI (harmonizing outcomes with revascularization and stents in acute myocardial infarction) trial. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2011;58:704-11.
- 20. Manari A, Varani E, Guastaroba P, et al. Long-term outcome in patients with ST segment elevation myocardial infarction and multivessel disease treated with culprit-only, immediate, or staged multivessel percutaneous revascularization strategies: insights from the REAL registry. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. 2014;84:912-22.
- 21. Politi L, Sgura F, Rossi R, et al. A randomised trial of target-vessel versus multi-vessel revascularisation in STelevation myocardial infarction: major adverse cardiac events during long-term follow-up. Heart. 2010;96:662-7.
- 22. Roe MT, Cura FA, Joski PS, et al. Initial experience with multivessel percutaneous coronary intervention during mechanical reperfusion for acute myocardial infarction. Am J Cardiol. 2001;88:170-3, A6.
- 23. Varani E, Balducelli M, Aquilina M, et al. Single or multivessel percutaneous coronary intervention in STelevation myocardial infarction patients. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. 2008;72:927-33.
- 24. Wald DS, Morris JK, Wald NJ, et al. Randomized trial of preventive angioplasty in myocardial infarction. N Engl J Med. 2013;369:1115-23.
- 25. Sorajja P, Gersh BJ, Cox DA, et al. Impact of multivessel disease on reperfusion success and clinical outcomes in patients undergoing primary percutaneous coronary intervention for acute myocardial infarction. Eur Heart J. 2007;28:1709-16.
- 26. Park D-W, Clare RM, Schulte PJ, et al. Extent, location, and clinical significance of non-infarct-related coronary artery disease among patients with ST-elevation myocardial infarction. JAMA. 2014;312:2019-27.
- 27. Hlinomaz O. Multivessel coronary disease diagnosed at the time of primary PCI for STEMI: complete revascularization versus conservative strategy. PRAGUE 13 trial. Available at: <u>http://sbhci.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/PRAGUE-13-Trial.pdf</u>. Accessed September 10, 2015.
- 28. Vlaar PJ, Mahmoud KD, Holmes DR, Jr., et al. Culprit vessel only versus multivessel and staged percutaneous coronary intervention for multivessel disease in patients presenting with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: a pairwise and network meta-analysis. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2011;58:692-703.
- 29. Vlaar PJ, Svilaas T, van der Horst IC, et al. Cardiac death and reinfarction after 1 year in the Thrombus Aspiration during Percutaneous coronary intervention in Acute myocardial infarction Study (TAPAS): a 1-year follow-up study. Lancet. 2008;371:1915-20.
- 30. Bavry AA, Kumbhani DJ, Bhatt DL. Role of adjunctive thrombectomy and embolic protection devices in acute myocardial infarction: a comprehensive meta-analysis of randomized trials. Eur Heart J. 2008;29:2989-3001.
- 31. Sardella G, Mancone M, Bucciarelli-Ducci C, et al. Thrombus aspiration during primary percutaneous coronary intervention improves myocardial reperfusion and reduces infarct size: the EXPIRA (thrombectomy with export catheter in infarct-related artery during primary percutaneous coronary intervention) prospective, randomized trial. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2009;53:309-15.
- 32. Svilaas T, Vlaar PJ, van der Horst IC, et al. Thrombus aspiration during primary percutaneous coronary intervention. N Engl J Med. 2008;358:557-67.
- 33. Elgendy IY, Huo T, Bhatt DL, et al. Is aspiration thrombectomy beneficial in patients undergoing primary percutaneous coronary intervention? Meta-analysis of randomized trials. Circ Cardiovasc Interv. 2015;8:e002258.
- 34. Fröbert O, Lagerqvist B, Olivecrona GK, et al. Thrombus aspiration during ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction. N Engl J Med. 2013;369:1587-97.
- 35. Jolly SS, Cairns JA, Yusuf S, et al. Randomized trial of primary PCI with or without routine manual thrombectomy. N Engl J Med. 2015;372:1389-98.
- 36. Lagerqvist B, Fröbert O, Olivecrona GK, et al. Outcomes 1 year after thrombus aspiration for myocardial infarction. N Engl J Med. 2014;371:1111-20.
- 37. Stone GW, Maehara A, Witzenbichler B, et al. Intracoronary abciximab and aspiration thrombectomy in patients with large anterior myocardial infarction: the INFUSE-AMI randomized trial. JAMA. 2012;307:1817-26.
- 38. Napodano M, Dariol G, Al Mamary AH, et al. Thrombus burden and myocardial damage during primary percutaneous coronary intervention. Am J Cardiol. 2014;113:1449-56.
- Sianos G, Papafaklis MI, Daemen J, et al. Angiographic stent thrombosis after routine use of drug-eluting stents in ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: the importance of thrombus burden. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2007;50:573-83.
- 40. Yip HK, Chen M-C, Chang H-W, et al. Angiographic morphologic features of infarct-related arteries and timely reperfusion in acute myocardial infarction: predictors of slow-flow and no-reflow phenomenon. Chest.

Page 27 of 28

2002;122:1322-32.

- 41. Brener SJ, Dambrink J-H, Maehara A, et al. Benefits of optimising coronary flow before stenting in primary percutaneous coronary intervention for ST-elevation myocardial infarction: insights from INFUSE-AMI. EuroIntervention. 2014;9:1195-201.
- 42. Costa RA, Abizaid A, Lotan C, et al. Impact of thrombus burden on outcomes after standard versus mesh-covered stents in acute myocardial infarction (from the MGuard for acute ST elevation reperfusion trial). Am J Cardiol. 2015;115:161-6.
- 43. Ali A, Cox D, Dib N, et al. Rheolytic thrombectomy with percutaneous coronary intervention for infarct size reduction in acute myocardial infarction: 30-day results from a multicenter randomized study. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2006;48:244-52.
- 44. Migliorini A, Stabile A, Rodriguez AE, et al. Comparison of AngioJet rheolytic thrombectomy before direct infarct artery stenting with direct stenting alone in patients with acute myocardial infarction. The JETSTENT trial. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2010;56:1298-306.







2015 ACC/AHA/SCAI Focused Update on Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention for Patients With ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction: An Update of the 2011 ACCF/AHA/SCAI Guideline for Percutaneous Coronary Intervention and the 2013 ACCF/AHA Guideline for the Management of ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions

Glenn N. Levine, Eric R. Bates, James C. Blankenship, Steven R. Bailey, John A. Bittl, Bojan Cercek, Charles E. Chambers, Stephen G. Ellis, Robert A. Guyton, Steven M. Hollenberg, Umesh N. Khot, Richard A. Lange, Laura Mauri, Roxana Mehran, Issam D. Moussa, Debabrata Mukherjee, Henry H. Ting, Patrick T. O'Gara, Frederick G. Kushner, Ralph G. Brindis, Donald E. Casey, Jr, Mina K. Chung, James A. de Lemos, Deborah B. Diercks, James C. Fang, Barry A. Franklin, Christopher B. Granger, Harlan M. Krumholz, Jane A. Linderbaum, David A. Morrow, L. Kristin Newby, Joseph P. Ornato, Narith Ou, Martha J. Radford, Jacqueline E. Tamis-Holland, Carl L. Tommaso, Cynthia M. Tracy, Y. Joseph Woo and David X. Zhao

Circulation. published online October 21, 2015; *Circulation* is published by the American Heart Association, 7272 Greenville Avenue, Dallas, TX 75231 Copyright © 2015 American Heart Association, Inc. All rights reserved. Print ISSN: 0009-7322. Online ISSN: 1524-4539

The online version of this article, along with updated information and services, is located on the World Wide Web at:

http://circ.ahajournals.org/content/early/2015/10/20/CIR.00000000000336.citation

Data Supplement (unedited) at:

http://circ.ahajournals.org/content/suppl/2015/10/20/CIR.00000000000336.DC1.html http://circ.ahajournals.org/content/suppl/2015/10/20/CIR.0000000000336.DC2.html

Permissions: Requests for permissions to reproduce figures, tables, or portions of articles originally published in *Circulation* can be obtained via RightsLink, a service of the Copyright Clearance Center, not the Editorial Office. Once the online version of the published article for which permission is being requested is located, click Request Permissions in the middle column of the Web page under Services. Further information about this process is available in the Permissions and Rights Question and Answer document.

Reprints: Information about reprints can be found online at: http://www.lww.com/reprints

Subscriptions: Information about subscribing to *Circulation* is online at: http://circ.ahajournals.org//subscriptions/

Ownership/ **Personal Research** Institutional, Expert **Committee Member Employer/Title** Consultant **Speakers** Partnership/ **Organizational** or Witness Bureau Principal **Other Financial** Benefit Glenn N. Levine Baylor College of None None None None None • Defendant, Medicine—Professor of (Chair) ECG Medicine: Director. interpretation, Cardiac Care Unit 2014 University of Michigan-Eric R. Bates None None None • AstraZeneca None • ABIM Professor of Medicine (Vice Chair) • AHA* • Daiichi-Sankyo Harvard Clinical • Eli Lilly **Research** Institute • Merck (DSMB) • Sanofi-aventis Geisinger Medical James C. Blankenship None None None None Abbott Vascular* AMA Relative (Vice Chair) Center—Director, Value Update Abiomed* Cardiology and Cardiac Committee* AstraZeneca* Catheterization • SCAI* Boston Scientific* Laboratories Regado Biosciences* Tryton Medical* Volcano* Steven R. Bailey University of Texas None • Edwards—PARTNER None None • Biotronix (DSMB) None Medical Center-Professor II trial of Medicine and Radiology John A. Bittl Munroe Heart-None None None None None None Interventional Cardiologist Cedars-Sinai Medical None None **Bojan** Cercek None None None None Center-Director, Coronary Care Unit Charles E Chambers Penn State Milton S. None None None None None None Hershey Medical Center-Professor of Medicine and Radiology Stephen G. Ellis Cleveland Clinic • Abbott None None None None None Foundation-Section Head, • Boston Scientific Invasive and Interventional • Medtronic Cardiology Emory Clinic, Inc.-Robert A. Guyton • Medtronic† None None • NIH* None None

Author Relationships With Industry and Other Entities (Comprehensive)—2015 ACC/AHA/SCAI Focused Update on Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention for Patients With ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction (Percutaneous Coronary Intervention Writing Committee) (November 2014)

	Professor and Chief,						
	Surgery						
Steven M. Hollenberg	Cooper University Hospital—Director, Coronary Care Unit	None	None	None	None	None	None
Umesh N. Khot	Cleveland Clinic—Vice Chairman, Robert and Suzanne Tomsich Department of Cardiovascular Medicine	• AstraZeneca	None	None	None	None	None
Richard A. Lange	Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center El Paso—President; Paul L. Foster School of Medicine, Dean	None	None	None	• NIH*	None Heart Heart	None
Laura Mauri	Brigham & Women's Hospital—Associate Professor of Medicine, Harvard Medical School	 Biotronik Medtronic St. Jude Medical 	None	None	None	 Abbott† ABIM Boston Scientific† Bristol-Myers Squibb† Cordis† Daiichi-Sankyo† Eli Lilly† Medtronic Cardiovascular† Sanofi-aventis† 	None
Roxana Mehran	Columbia University Medical Center—Associate Professor of Medicine; Director, Data Coordinating Analysis Center	 Abbott Vascular AstraZeneca Boston Scientific Covidien CSL Behring Janssen (Johnson & Johnson)† Maya Medical† Merck Sanofi-aventis† 	None	None	 Bristol-Myers Squibb/Sanofi- aventis† Eli Lilly† Daiichi-Sankyo† Regado Stentys* The Medicines Company† 	 ACC Interventional Council* ACC NCDR CathPCI Committee* NHLBI SCAI* 	None
Issam D. Moussa	Mayo Clinic—Chair,	None	None	None	None	None	None

	Division of Cardiovascular Diseases						
Debabrata Mukherjee	Texas Tech University— Chief, Cardiovascular Medicine	None	None	None	None	• ACC	None
Henry H. Ting	Mayo Clinic—Professor of Medicine; Assistant Dean for Quality	None	None	None	None	None	None

This table represents all relationships of committee members with industry and other entities that were reported by authors, including those not deemed to be relevant to this document, at the time this document was under development. The table does not necessarily reflect relationships with industry at the time of publication. A person is deemed to have a significant interest in a business if the interest represents ownership of $\geq 5\%$ of the voting stock or share of the business entity, or ownership of $\geq 55,000$ of the fair market value of the business entity; or if funds received by the person from the business entity exceed 5% of the person's gross income for the previous year. Relationships that exist with no financial benefit are also included for the purpose of transparency. Relationships in this table are modest unless otherwise noted. Please refer to http://www.acc.org/guidelines/about-guidelines/about-guidelines-and-clinical-documents/relationships-with-industry-policy for definitions of disclosure categories or additional information about the ACC/AHA Disclosure Policy for Writing Committees.

*No financial benefit.

†Significant relationship.

ABIM indicates American Board of Internal Medicine; ACC, American College of Cardiology; AHA, American Heart Association; AMA, American Medical Association; CathPCI, catheterization and/or percutaneous intervention; DSMB, Data Safety Monitoring Board; ECG, electrocardiogram; NCDR, National Cardiovascular Data Registry; NHLBI, National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; NIH, National Institutes of Health; PARTNER II trial, Placement of Aortic Transcatheter Valves; and SCAI, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions.

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION

Author Relationships With Industry and Other Entities (Comprehensive)—2015 ACC/AHA/SCAI Focused Update on Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention for Patients With ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction (ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction Writing Committee) (February 2014)

Committee Member	Employment	Consultant	Speakers Bureau	Ownership/ Partnership/ Principal	Personal Research	Institutional, Organizational or Other Financial Benefit	Expert Witness
Patrick T. O'Gara (<i>Chair</i>)	Harvard Medical School—Professor of Medicine	None	None	None	None	 Lantheus Medical Imaging (DSMB) NIH Steering Committee Co-Chair* 	None
Frederick G. Kushner (Vice Chair)	Tulane University School of Medicine— Clinical Professor of Medicine; Heart Clinic of Louisiana—Medical Director	None	None	None	None	• FDA Science Board†	 Defendant, use of clopidogrel (for BMS), 2014 Defendant, 2014
Ralph G. Brindis	UCSF Phillip R. Lee Institute for Health Policy—Clinical Professor of Medicine	Ivivi Health Sciences	Volcano Corp.	None	None	 California State Elective PCI Project Advisory Board (DSMB)[†] C-PORT Elective RCT (DSMB)[†] DAPT Trial Advisory Board (DSMB)[†] FDA Cardiovascular Device Panel State of California OSHPD (DSMB)[†] 	None
Donald E. Casey, Jr.	Thomas Jefferson College of Population Health—Adjunct Faculty; Alvarez & Marsal IPO4Health— Principal and Founder	None	None	None	None	None	None
Mina K. Chung	Cleveland Clinic Foundation—Professor of Medicine	 ACCF Biotronik† Boston Scientific† 	None	• Jones & Bartlett authorship royalties	 AliveCor† Biosense Webster† Biotronik† Boston Scientific† 	 Amarin (DSMB)[†] HRS Scientific and Clinical Documents Committee Chair[†] 	None

		 Medtronic† Nexcura† NIH/NHLBI St. Jude Medical† 		UpToDate authorship royalties	 CardioInsight† Gilead† Janssen† Medtronic† NIH* St. Jude Medical† Zoll† 		
James A. de Lemos	UT Southwestern Medical School— Professor of Medicine	 Abbott Diagnostics Amgen Diadexus Janssen Pharmaceuticals Novo Nordisc Roche Diagnostics[†] St. Jude Medical 	• AstraZeneca	None	Abbott Diagnostics*	Daiichi-Sankyo Endpoint Committee†	None
Deborah B. Diercks	UT Southwestern Medical Center—Audre and Bernard Rapoport Distinguished Chair in Clinical Care and Research; Department of Emergency Medicine— Professor and Chair	 Daiichi-Sankyo Janssen Pharmaceuticals Novartis 	None	None	 Beckman Coulter† Cardiorentis† Otsuko† Radiometer† 	 Emergencies in Medicine† Society of Academic Emergency Medicine† Society of Chest Pain Centers and Providers† 	None
James C. Fang	University of Utah— Cardiovascular Division	 Abiomed Boston Scientific Maquet 	None	None GANHE	None	• NIH† • Pfizer†	None
Barry A. Franklin	William Beaumont Hospital—Director, Cardiac Rehabilitation and Exercise Laboratories	None	None	None	None	None	None
Christopher B. Granger	Duke Clinical Research Institute—Director, Cardiac Care Unit; Professor of Medicine	 AstraZeneca Boehringer Ingelheim Bristol-Myers 	None	None	 AstraZeneca* Bayer* Boehringer Ingelheim* 	• Duke Advisory Committee (telemetry and monitoring equipment purchases)*	None

		Squibb* • Daiichi-Sankyo • Eli Lilly • GlaxoSmithKlin e • Hoffman LaRoche • Janssen Pharmaceuticals • Pfizer • Ross Medical • Salix Pharmaceuticals • Sanofi-aventis • Takeda • The Medicines Company			 Bristol-Myers Squibb* Daiichi-Sankyo* GlaxoSmithKline* Janssen Pharmaceuticals* Medtronic Foundation* Merck* Pfizer* Sanofi-aventis* Takeda* 	Site research for clinical trials*	0.2-
Harlan M. Krumholz	Yale University School of Medicine—Professor of Epidemiology and Public Health	 Institute for Healthcare Improvement Scientific Advisory Group Premier* UnitedHealth Cardiac Scientific Advisory Board* VHA, Inc.* 	None	None	 AHRQ* Catherine and Patrick Weldon Donaghue Medical Research Foundation * Johnson & Johnson* Medtronic* National Cancer Institute* NHLBI* Robert Wood Johnson Foundation* The Commonwealth Fund* U.S. FDA, medical device post-market surveillance* 	 ABIM AHA editor* ImageCOR† Massachusetts Medical Society– Editor* PCORI Board of Governors† 	None
Jane A.	Mayo Clinic—Assistant	None	None	None	None	None	None

Linderbaum	Professor of Medicine						
David A.	Harvard Medical	• Abbott	None	None	 Abbott* 	None	None
Morrow	School—Professor of	• Beckman-			 Amgen* 		
	Medicine	Coulter			 AstraZeneca* 		
		BG Medicine			• Athera*		
		 Daiichi-Sankyo 			 Beckman-Coulter* 		
		• diaDexus			 BG Medicine* 		
		• Eli Lilly			Bristol-Myers		
		• Gilead			Squibb*		
		 Instrumentation 			• Buhlmann*		
		Laboratory			 Daichii-Sankvo* 	100 Lat 100 100 100	
		Konica Minolta			• Eli Lillv*	American	
		Merck			• GlaxoSmithKline*	Heart	l.
		• Novartis			Johnson &	Associat	0.0-
		 OrthoClinical 			Johnson*		
		Diagnostics/Joh			Merck*		
		nson & Johnson			 Novartis* 		
		 Radiometer 		-	Roche		
		Servier			Diagnostics*		
		• Roche			 Sanofi-aventis* 		
		Diagnostics			• Singulex*	$\sim \sim$	
L. Kristin	Duke University	 AstraZeneca 	None	None	Amylin	AHA Immediate Past	None
Newby	Medical Center,	MedScape/The			Bristol-Myers	Chair Council on	
	Division of	Heart.org			Squibb*	Clinical Cardiology*	
	Cardiology—Professor	• BioKier		A. V.	 GlaxoSmithKline* 	• AstraZeneca	
	of Medicine	 Daiichi-Sankyo 			 Merck* 	HealthCare	
		• Janssen			• NIH–MURDOCK	Foundation [†]	
	JOURN	Pharmaceuticals	S AMERI	GAN HE	Study*	 AHA Journal–Senior 	
		 Philips 			PCORI*	Associate Editor	
		• Roche				 Society of 	
		Diagnostics				Cardiovascular Patient	
						Care	
Joseph P. Ornato	Department of	None	None	None	 NIH Resuscitation 	 Henrico County 	None
	Emergency Medicine				Outcomes	Division of Fire,	
	Virginia Commonwealth				Consortium*	Operational Medical	
	University—Protessor				NIH/NINDS	Director*	
	and Chairman				Neurological	 Resuscitation Editor* 	
					Emergency	 Richmond Ambulance 	
					Treatment Trials		

					Consortium–PI*	Authority, Operational Medical Director*	
Narith Ou	Mayo Clinic— Pharmacotherapy Coordinator, Cardiology	None	None	None	None	None	None
Martha J. Radford	NYU Langone Medical Center—Chief Quality Officer; NYU School of Medicine—Professor of Medicine (Cardiology)	None	None	None	None	None	None
Jacqueline E. Tamis-Holland	Mount Sinai Saint Luke's Hospital and The Icahn School of Medicine—Program Director, Interventional Cardiology Fellowship Program	None	None	None	 Impact of English Comprehension on Delays to Presentation and Treatment of Patients with an Acute ST- Elevation Infarction† ISCHEMIA trial* PIGLET-PCI study† 	 Interventional Cardiology Fellowship Program Director† Women's Health New York* 	None
Carl L. Tommaso	Skokie Hospital— Director of Catheterization Laboratory; NorthShore University HealthSystems—Partner	None	None	None	None	• SCAI Treasurer†	None
Cynthia M. Tracy	George Washington University Medical Center—Associate Director, Division of Cardiology	None	None	None	• NIH	• George Washington Heart and Vascular†	None
Y. Joseph Woo	Stanford University— Professor and Chair, Cardiothoracic Surgery	None	None	None	• NIH	None	None
David X. Zhao	Wake Forest Baptist Health—Professor of Medicine, Heart and Vascular Center of	None	None	None	 St. Jude Medical† Medtronic† 	None	None

Excellence Director			

This table represents all relationships of committee members with industry and other entities that were reported by authors, including those not deemed to be relevant to this document, at the time this document was under development. The table does not necessarily reflect relationships with industry at the time of publication. A person is deemed to have a significant interest in a business if the interest represents ownership of $\geq 5\%$ of the voting stock or share of the business entity, or ownership of $\geq 5,000$ of the fair market value of the business entity; or if funds received by the person from the business entity exceed 5% of the person's gross income for the previous year. Relationships that exist with no financial benefit are also included for the purpose of transparency. Relationships in this table are modest unless otherwise noted. Please refer to http://www.acc.org/guidelines/about-guidelines-and-clinical-documents/relationships-with-industry-policy for definitions of disclosure categories or additional information about the ACC/AHA Disclosure Policy for Writing Committees.

Dr. Deborah D. Ascheim was not eligible to continue on the writing committee due to her employment by Capricor Therapeutics effective August 2015.

*Significant relationship. †No financial benefit.



Circulation

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION

Data Supplements: 2015 Focused Update on Primary PCI for Patients With STEMI

Data Supplement 1-A. Observational Studies Comparing Culprit Artery-Only Revascularization Versus Multivessel PCI (Section 2)
Data Supplement 1-B. RCTs Comparing Culprit Artery-Only Revascularization Versus Multivessel PCI (Section 2)
Data Supplement 2. RCTs for Aspiration Thrombectomy (Section 3)
References

Data Supplement 1-A. Observational Studies Comparing Culprit Artery-Only Revascularization Versus Multivessel PCI (Section 2)

Study Acronym Author Year	Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)	Patient Population	Primary Endpoint and Results	Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events and Summary
Iqbal MB, et al., 2014 (1) <u>25371542</u>	Aim: To investigate mortality for COR vs. MV PCI at the time of PPCI for patients presenting with STEMI Study type: Observational. Used multivariate analysis and propensity matching Size: 3984 (MV PCI at time of PPCI=555; COR=3429)	Inclusion criteria: • STEMI and PPCI • MVD defined as >50% stenosis in ≥2 epicardial coronary arteries Exclusion criteria: • LM >50% stenosis • Cardiogenic shock	 <u>1° endpoint</u>: 1-y mortality Total study population: 7.4% (COR) vs.10.1% (MV) (p=0.031) Adjusted HR Total population: 0.65 (95% CI: 0.47-0.91; p=0.011) Propensity matched cohort: 164/2418 (6.8%) vs. 41/403 (10.2%) , p=0.059 Adjusted propensity matched cohort HR: 0.64 (95% CI: 0.45-0.90; p=0.010) 	 Inverse probability treatment weighted analyses also confirmed COR as an independent predictor for reduced in- hospital MACE (odds ratio, 0.38; 95% CI, 0.15–0.96; p=0.040) and survival at 1 year (hazard ratio, 0.44; 95% CI, 0.21– 0.93; p=0.033).
Santos AR, et al., 2014 (2) <u>24502933</u>	Aim: To assess the impact of a MV PCI at the time of PPCI on in-hospital morbidity and mortality in patients with STEMI undergoing PPCI Study type: Observational: Portuguese Society of Cardiology's Registry of Acute Coronary Syndromes (ACS) Size: 257 (MV PCI at time of PPCI 77 vs. COR 180)	Inclusion criteria: STEMI Enrolled in Portuguese Society of Cardiology Registry MVD defined as ≥50% Exclusion criteria: Staged MV PCI History of prior CABG	 <u>1° endpoint</u>: In-hospital mortality <u>COR vs. MV PCI at time of PPCI:</u> In-hospital Mortality: 14/180 (7.8%) vs. 2/77 (2.6%), p=NS Adjusted mortality OR: 12.92, 95% CI 0.67-248.4, p=0.09 	ATION
Jeger R, et al., 2014 (3) <u>24461983</u>	Aim: To assess whether MV PCI at time of PPCI vs. COR in patients with STEMI and MVD influences 1-y outcome Study type: Observational: Swiss Nationwide Acute Myocardial Infarction in Switzerland Plus Registry (AMIS)	 Inclusion criteria: STEMI or new LBBB MVD defined as a ≥50% in ≥2 different major epicardial coronary arteries and/or involving the LM. Written informed consent to enroll 	<u>1° endpoint</u> : 1-y all-cause mortality MV PCI 12/442 (2.7%) vs COR: 40/1467 (2.7%), p>0.99	 MACCE at 1 y (all-cause death, re-MI, any cardiac re- intervention, re- hospitalization due to any cardiovascular diagnosis, and CVA): Adjusted OR for MV PCI vs COR=0.69, 95% CI 0.51– 0.93, p=0.017

Manari A et al 2014	Size: 1909 (MV PCI at time of PPCI 442 vs. COR 1467)	in registry. <u>Exclusion criteria</u> : Absence of follow-up data Inclusion criteria:	1º and noint: Mortality at 30 d and 2 y	Study looked at timing of MV PCI and
(4) <u>24403174</u>	<u>Size</u> : 2061 (MV PCI at time of PPCI 367, Staged MV PCI within 60 d 988, COR 706)	 STEMI and MVD enrolled in REAL registry <u>Exclusion criteria</u>: N/A 	COR vs. staged MV PCI • 30-d mortality: adjusted HR: 2.81 (95% CI: 1.34-5.89; p=0.006) • 2-y mortality: adjusted HR: 1.93 (95% CI: 1.35-2.74; p=0.0002) MV PCI at time of PPCI vs. staged MV PCI: • 30-d mortality adjusted HR: 2.58 (95 % CI: 1.06-6.26; p=0.03) • 2-y adjusted HR: 1.08 (95% CI: 0.64-1.82; p=0.76) COR vs. MV PCI at time of PPCI • 2-y unadjusted mortality:127/706 (18.0%) vs. 26/367 (7.1%), p=0.0002	 Study tooked at timing of MV PCI and showed that staged MV PCI was associated with better outcomes than either COR or MV PCI at the time of PPCI
Jaguszewski M, et al., 2013 (5) <u>24384288</u>	Aim: To compare the outcomes with MV PCI at the time of PPCI with COR Study type: Observational: Swiss Nationwide Acute Myocardial Infarction in Switzerland Plus Registry (AMIS) Size: 4941 (MV PCI at time of PPCI-1108 vs. COR-3833)	Inclusion criteria: • STEMI • MVD: stenosis ≥50% in at least two of three major coronary arteries and/or involving the LM (in pts with prior CABG) Exclusion criteria: • N/A	<u>1° endpoint</u> : In-hospital mortality <u>MV PCI at time of PPCI vs. COR:</u> • 81/1108 (7.3%) vs. 168/3833 (4.4%), p<0.001 • Low risk pts: 2.0% vs.2.0% (p=1.00) • High risk pts: 22.2% vs. 21.7% (p=1.00)	0n
Bauer T, et al., 2013 (6) <u>22192297</u>	Aim: To evaluate the impact of MV-PCI during a single procedure on in-hospital outcomes of patients with MVD presenting with ACS Study type: Observational: Euro Heart Survey Registry with STEMI Size: 2537 (MV PCI during a single procedure 419 vs. COR 2118)	Inclusion criteria: • Hemodynamically stable patients with ACS • MVD defined as ≥2 vessels with ≥70% stenosis • Undergoing PCI Exclusion criteria: • N/A	<u>1° endpoint</u> : In-hospital mortality <u>MV PCI during single procedure vs. COR:</u> • 6/419 (1.4%) vs. 72/2118 (3.4%), p=0.03• In-hospital mortality adjusted OR: 0.48 (95% CI: 0.21-1.13; p=0.73)	Non-fatal MI: higher with MV PCI (8.8% vs.1.6%, p<0.0001)
Dziewierz A, et al., 2010 (7) <u>20643243</u>	Aim: To assess the impact of MV PCI at time of PPCI vs COR in pts with STEMI and MVD Study type: Observational: Euro-Transfer Registry	Inclusion criteria: Patients with STEMI included in Euro-transfer registry MVD on cath Exclusion criteria: N/A	<u>1° endpoint</u> : 1-y mortality <u>MV PCI at time of PPCI vs. COR</u> • 11/70 (15.7%) vs. 57/707 (8.1%), p=0.043 • Adjusted OR: 2.04 (95% CI: 0.89– 4.66; p=0.09)	 30-d mortality: 12.9% vs.5.9% (p=0.039) Adjusted 30-d mortality: OR: 2.42 (95% CI: 0.96-6.06; p=0.06)

	Size: 777(MV PCI at time of PPCI 70 vs. COR 707)			
APEX-AMI Toma M, et al., 2010 (8) 20530505	Aim: To evaluate the 90-d outcomes for MV PCI performed at the time of PPCI Study type: Observational: APEX AMI Size: 2201(MV PCI at time of PPCI 217 vs. COR 1984)	Inclusion criteria: ● ≥18 y ● Ischemic symptoms <6 h	 <u>1° endpoint</u>: 90-d mortality and composite of death, CHF, and cardiogenic shock <u>MV PCI at time of PPCI vs. COR:</u> 90-d mortality: 27/217 (12.4%) vs. 111/1984 (5.6%) , p<0.001; Adjusted HR: 2.44, 95% CI 1.55–3.83, P <0.001 Unadjusted 90-d death/CHF/shock 18.9% vs.13.1% (p=0.011); Adjusted HR 1.39 (95% CI: 0.96-2.01; p=0.083) 	Limited inclusion of only STEMI pts that met the APEX-AMI trial criteria.
Hannan EL, et al., 2010 (9) 20129564	Aim: To examine the differences in in- hospital and longer-term mortality for patients with STEMI and MVD as a function of whether they underwent COR or MV PCI, either at the time of PPCI or as a staged procedure <u>Study type</u> : Observational; NY State Registry <u>Size</u> : 4,024 (MV PCI at time of PPCI=503; Staged MV PCI =259; COR=3,521) JOURNAL OF	Inclusion criteria: • STEMI within 24 h undergoing PPCI • MVD • NY State resident Exclusion criteria: • Missing data on EF • Thrombolytic therapy • Shock • Prior CABG • Prior CABG • THE AMERICAT	1° endpoint: In hospital, 12-, 24-, and 42- mo mortality For MV PCI at time of PPCI vs. COR: In-hospital mortality: 3.4% vs.2.0% (p=0.14) 12-mo mortality: 7.1% vs.5.5%, (p=0.23) 24-mo mortality: 7.1% vs.5.5%, (p=0.23) 24-mo mortality: 11.7% vs. 10.7% (p=0.23) Propensity matched 42-mo mortality: 59/503 vs. 54/503 Staged MV PCI during index admission vs. COR: In-hospital mortality: 1.2% vs.1.9% (p=0.48) 12-mo mortality: 3.9% vs.5.5% (p=0.53) 24-mo mortality: 6.3% vs.7.4% (p=0.71) 42-mo mortality: 6.3% vs.7.4% (p=0.72) For Staged MV PCI within 60 d vs. COR: 12-mo mortality: 1.3% vs.3.3% (p=0.04) 24-mo mortality: 3.7% vs.4.3% (p=0.21)	 Used propensity matched data to evaluate the outcome of MV PCI at various time points compared with COR. Of note, for the subgroup of patients without shock, low EF or arrhythmias, MV PCI at the time of PPCI as compared with COR resulted in a higher in hospital mortality (2.4% vs.0.9%,p=0.04) and trends toward higher 24-mo (7.2% vs.4.9%, p=0.07) and 42-mo (10.4% vs.6.7%, p=0.08) mortality
Cavender MA et al.,	Aim: To examine the outcomes of patients	Inclusion criteria:	1° endpoint: In-hospital mortality.	Bleeding (non-shock patients): 6.71%

2009 (10) <u>19660603</u>	with STEMI undergoing MV PCI at time of PPCI vs. patients undergoing COR <u>Study type</u> : Observational: NCDR Registry <u>Size</u> : 28,936 (MV PCI at time of PPCI 3,134 vs. COR 25,802)	 STEMI treated with PPCI ≥1 additional major artery with significant stenosis. Exclusion criteria: PCI of LM Staged PCI in hospital Recent thrombolytics 	MV PCI at time of PPCI vs. COR: In hospital mortality: 246/3134 (7.85%) vs. 1321/25802 (5.12%), p<0.01 Patients without shock: 3.26% vs.2.53% (p=0.09); Adjusted mortality: OR=1.23 (95% CI: 0.94- 1.61; p=1.23) Patients with shock: 36.49% vs.27.77% (p≤0.01); Adjusted mortality: OR=1.54 (95% CI: 1.22- 1.95; p<0.01)	 (MV at time of PPCI) vs.5.30% (COR), p<0.01 Trend towards more renal failure with MV PCI at time of PPCI 2.31% vs.1.81% (p=0.09) Very large registry also analyzed outcomes according to presence or absence of shock.
Varani E, et al., 2008 (11) <u>18798239</u>	Aim: To examine a strategy of COR vs.MV- PCI on clinical outcomes in a cohort of patients with STEMI treated with PPCI and compare the outcomes of MVD patients according to the type of revascularization (MV PCI at the time of PPCI vs. staged MV PCI vs. COR) <u>Study type</u> : Observational: single center <u>Size</u> : Total=399. MV PCI before discharge 243 (divided into groups: MV PCI at time of PPCI= 147; MV PCI within 24 h =48; and MV PCI after 24 h but before before discharge=48); COR=156	 Inclusion criteria: Ongoing symptoms within 24 h STEMI MVD (≥2 major epicardial coronary arteries or their major branches with stenosis ≥70%) Exclusion criteria: PCI for acute occlusion after angiography 	Endpoints: Death from any cause and any revascularization. Time point not specified. In-hospital mortality for COR vs. MV PCI at time of PPCI: 8/156 (5.1%) vs. 12/147 (8.2%), p<0.05 COR vs. MV PCI at time of PPCI vs. MV PCI within 24 h vs. MV PCI before discharge • 6.6% vs. 9.9% vs. 2.1% vs. 2.1% (p=0.066 for overall comparison) • excluding pts with shock or CHF: 6.3% vs.3.3% vs.2.1% vs.2.1% (p=0.257)	Complete revascularization in 46% of patients with MVD
Qarawani D, et al., 2008 (12) <u>17428557</u>	Aim: To compare outcomes with two strategies used for treating MVD and acute MI <u>Study type</u> : Observational: Single center <u>Size</u> : 120 (MV PCI at time of PPCI 95 vs. COR 25)	Inclusion criteria: Prolonged >30 min ischemic chest pain Symptom onset <12 h	1° endpoint: In-hospital MACE (re-ischemia, re-MI, acute CHF and mortality) MV PCI vs. COR: • • 16.7% vs. 52%, p=0.0001. • Adjusted OR for In-hospital MACE:14.68, 95% CI: 3.03–71.12, p=0.001	 In-hospital mortality: 4.2% vs.4.0%, p=NS 1-year mortality for MV PCI vs. COR: 9/95 (9.5%) vs. 2/25 (8.0%), p=0.06 MV PCI associated with improved hospital survival when compared with COR even after adjusting for other factors MV PCI had higher rates of transient renal failure (8.4% vs.4.0%, p=0.01) and trend toward higher 1-y mortality (9.4% vs.8.0%, p=0.06)
Corpus RA, et al., 2004 (13) <u>15389238</u>	Aim: To compare outcomes between an aggressive MV PCI strategy either at time of PPCI or before hospital discharge and COR <u>Study type</u> : Observational: Single Center <u>Size</u> : 506 (MV PCI 152 [Divided into 2 groups: MV PCI at the time of PPCI=26; staged in hospital PCI=126] vs.	Inclusion criteria: • STEMI • Symptom onset ≤ 12 h • MVD defined as ≥70% stenosis of ≥2 epicardial coronary arteries or their major branches Exclusion criteria: • PCI of vein graft or LM	1° endpoint: Numerous endpoints at 1 yearMV PCI (either at time of PPCI or staged) vs COR: Death 11% vs 12 %, p=0.82 Re-infarction: 13.0% vs 2.8%, p<0.001 Revascularization: 25% vs 15%, p=0.007 MACE: 40% vs 28%, p=0.006	 Multivessel PCI was an independent predictor of MACE at 1 year (odds ratio=1.67, 95% CI 1.10-2.54, p=01).

	COR 354)	 PCI for acute occlusion after coronary angioplasty or arteriography; MVD and staged revascularization procedures of the non-IRA after discharge from the bospital 	<u>1-yr mortality MV PCI at time of PPCI vs</u> staged MV PCI vs COR: 5/26 (19.2%) vs. 12/126 (9.5%) vs. 42/354 (11.9%), p=0.36	
Roe MT, et al., 2001 (14) <u>11448417</u>	<u>Aim</u> : To determine the feasibility and safety of MV PCI at the time of PPCI	Inclusion Criteria: ● Patients with AMI undergoing PCI ● ≥1 coronary stenosis ≥50% in a	<u>1° endpoint</u> : Death, re-MI, repeat PCI or CABG at 6 mo	 Study found higher mortality for MV PCI vs. COR in the primary PCI group at 30 d but no difference in events at 6 mo
	Study type: Case Controlled	non-culprit vessel)	MV PCI at time of PPCI vs. COR: 35.3% vs 27.9% p=NS	 Study involved a mix of POBA and stents 6-mo mortality for MV PCI at time of PPCI
	Size: 158 (MV PCI at the time of PPCI 79			vs. COR: 19/79 (24.1%) vs.13/79
	[Divided into 2 Groups: MV PCI at time of	Exclusion criteria:		(16.1%), p=NS
	PPCI=68; Rescue PCI=11] vs.	PCI of branch vessels of IRA		
	COR 79 ([PPCI 61,Rescue PCI=18])	PCI of LM		American
(14) <u>11448417</u>	of MV PCI at the time of PPCI <u>Study type</u> : Case Controlled <u>Size</u> : 158 (MV PCI at the time of PPCI 79 [Divided into 2 Groups: MV PCI at time of PPCI=68; Rescue PCI=11] vs. COR 79 ([PPCI 61,Rescue PCI=18])	 Patients with AMI undergoing PCI ≥1 coronary stenosis ≥50% in a non-culprit vessel) Exclusion criteria: PCI of branch vessels of IRA PCI of LM 	<u>MV PCI at time of PPCI vs. COR:</u> 35.3% vs 27.9% p=NS	 vs. COR in the primary PCI group at 30 d but no difference in events at 6 mo Study involved a mix of POBA and stents <u>6-mo mortality for MV PCI at time of PPCI vs. COR</u>: 19/79 (24.1%) vs.13/79 (16.1%), p=NS

Data Supplement 1-B. RCTs Comparing Culprit Artery-Only Revascularization Versus Multivessel PCI (Section 2)

Study Acronym	Aim of Study;	Patient Population	Study Intervention	Primary Endpoint and Results	Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any);
Aution	Study Type,				Study Limitations;
Year	Study Size (N)				Adverse Events and Summary
DANAMI 3- PRIMULTI Engstrom T, et al., 2015 (15) (Not yet in PubMed)	<u>Aim</u> : To determine whether staged angiographic or FFR guided revasc in STEMI patients with MVD reduces the primary endpoint of all cause death, reinfarction and repeat revascularisation compared with COR <u>Study type</u> : Randomized Size: 627 (314 staged MV	Inclusion criteria: STEMI ≤12 h Successful IRA PPCI >50% stenosis >2mm in non- IRA suitable for PCI Exclusion criteria: Hemodynamic instability or ischemia in non IRA territory CTO of non-IRA	Intervention: Complete in- hospital revasc with staged MV PCI for lesions >90% and staged FFR-guided MV PCI for lesions of 50- 90% severity(n=314) <u>Comparator</u> : COR (n=313)	 <u>1° endpoint</u>: MACE at 12 mo (Death, MI, ischemia-driven revasc of non-IRA lesions) <u>MV PCI vs. COR</u> 40/314 (13%) patients treated with staged MV PCI vs 68 of 313 (22%) patients treated with COR, p=0.004; (HR 0.56, 95% CI 0.38-0.83, p=0.001) 	 12-mo mortality: 15/314 (5%) vs. 11/313 (4%) This study used FFR guidance for lesions of 50%-90% severity. Benefit was driven by a significant reduction in ischemia- driven revascularization; death and MI rates were similar
	PCI; 313 COR)				
CvLPRIT Gershlick AH, et al., 2015 (16) 25766941	<u>Aim</u> : To compare differences in outcome for patients with STEMI and MVD randomized to MV PCI or COR <u>Study type</u> : Randomized <u>Size</u> : 296 (MV PCI=150; COR=146)	Inclusion criteria: STEMI <12 h	Intervention: MV PCI either at time of PPCI or as a staged in- hospital procedure (n=150) <u>Comparator</u> : COR (n=146)	<u>1° endpoint</u> : Composite of death, re- MI, CHF and ischemia- driven revasc at 12 mo <u>MV PCI vs. COR</u> 10.0% vs.21.2% (HR: 0.45; 95% CI: 0.24-0.84; p=0.009)	 65% of pts underwent MV PCI at time of PPCI Benefit was driven by sum of individual endpoints; no statistically significant difference in outcome in individual components of primary endpoint Total 12-mo mortality: 4/150 (2.7%) vs. 10/146 (6.9%) (HR: 0.38; 95% CI: 0.12- 1.20; p=0.09

		 Exclusion criteria: Indication for or contraindication to complete revasc Prior Q wave MI Prior CABG Shock, VSD or Moderate to severe mitral regurgitation Chronic kidney disease Stent thrombosis CTO of the only non-IRA 			
PRAMI Wald DS, et al., 2013 (17) 23991625	Aim: To compare the outcomes of MV PCI at the time of PPCI with COR and an ischemia guided approach to non-culprit artery disease. Study type: Randomized Size: 465 (234 MV PCI at time of PPCI; 231 COR)	Inclusion criteria: Acute STEMI (incl LBBB) Successful PPCI MVD with ≥50% stenosis in ≥1 other artery suitable for PCI Exclusion criteria: Shock, Prior CABG, LM or ostia of both LAD and circumflex with >50% stenosis CTO of non-IRA	Intervention: MV PCI at the time of PPCI (n=234) <u>Comparator</u> : COR with ischemia guided approach to non-culprit artery disease (n=231)	<u>1° endpoint</u> : MACE: (death from cardiac causes, nonfatal MI, or refractory angina). Results assessed after mean f/u of 23 mo <u>MV PCI at the time of PPCI vs. COR</u> • 9.0% vs.22.9%, (HR 0.35, 95% CI 0.21–0.58, <0.001)	 Trial stopped early by DSMB HR for components of primary endpoint (MV PCI vs PPCI only): Death from cardiac causes: 0.34 (95% CI, 0.11 to 1.08) Non-fatal MI: 0.32 (95% CI, 0.13 to 0.75) Refractory angina: 0.35 (95% CI, 0.18 to 0.69) All-cause mortality: 12/234 (5.1%) vs 16/231 (6.9%), p=NS
Dambrink JH, et al., 2010 (18) <u>20542783</u>	Aim: To compare effect of early invasive FFR guided management vs. COR and ischemia-guided management on LV EF <u>Study type</u> : Randomized <u>Size</u> : 121 (FFR-guided MV PCI 80; COR 41)	Inclusion criteria: STEMI patients undergoing successful PPCI MVD with ≥1 additional major artery or branch with ≥50 % disease and at least 2.5 mm diameter Exclusion criteria: Urgent indication for additional revasc >80 y CTO of non IRA Prior CABG LM ≥50 %, Restenotic lesions in non-IRA Chronic atrial fibrillation, Limited life expectancy Other factors that made complete follow-up unlikely.	Intervention: PPCI and elective (within 3 wk) FFR guided management of non IRA disease (n=80) <u>Comparator</u> : COR with conservative ischemia- guided management of non IRA (n=41)	<u>1° endpoint</u> : EF at 6 mo <u>FFR guided staged PCI vs. COR and</u> <u>ischemia-guided approach</u> : EF 59± 9% vs. 57± 9%, p=0.362 ART ASSOCIATI	 MACE at 6 mo: 21% vs. 22%, p=0.929 MACE at 3 years: 35.4% vs 35.0%, p=0.96 Death or MI at 3 years: 20.3% vs 0%, p=0.002 Death at 3 years: 2/80 vs. 0/41

Politi L, et al., 2010 (19) <u>19778920</u>	Aim: To compare long-term outcomes of three different strategies during PPCI in patients with STEMI and	Inclusion criteria: Chest pain within 12 h STEMI	Intervention: PPCI plus staged MV PCI: 65; MV PCI at the time of PPCI (n=65)	<u>1° endpoint</u> : MACE at mean f/u 2.5 y: (death, re-MI, re-hospitalization for ACS and repeat coronary revasc)	There were no differences in outcomes for staged MV PCI vs. MV PCI at time of PPCI but small number of enrolled patients
	MVD: COR vs. staged MV PCI vs. MV PCI at the time of PPCI <u>Study type</u> : Randomized <u>Size</u> : 214 (65 MV PCI at time of PPCI; 65 staged MV PCI; 84 COR)	Exclusion criteria: • Cardiogenic shock • LM ≥50% • Prior CABG • Severe valvular heart disease • Unsuccessful PPCI	Comparator: COR (n=84)	MV PCI at the time of PPCI vs. staged MV PCI vs. COR: 23.1% vs.20% vs.50% p<0.001	 Mortality for MV PCI vs COR: 10/130 (7.7%) vs.13/84 (15.5%),
HELP-AMI, et al., Di Mario C, et al., 2004 (20) <u>16146905</u>	<u>Aim</u> : To evaluate the efficacy of a complete revascularization strategy at the time of PPCI on reducing repeat revascularizations in follow-up <u>Study type</u> : Randomized <u>Size</u> : 69 (MV PCI at time of PPCI 52; COR 17)	Inclusion criteria: Ischemic CP and STEMI MVD on angiogram technically amenable to PCI Exclusion criteria: Lesion in bypass grafts Prior PCI or stent in segment with disease Thrombolysis within past wk; Shock LM disease Intention to treat more than 1 lesion Calcified or tortuous vessels with lesions; side branch >2	Intervention: MV PCI at time of PPCI (n=52) Comparator: COR then PCI of other vessels at operators discretion (n=17)	<u>1° endpoint</u> : Any repeat revasc at 1 y <u>MV PCI at time of PPCI vs. COR</u> : 17.3% vs.35.3%, p=0.174	 Very small study; Unbalanced randomization <u>12-mo mortality:</u> 1/52 (1.9%) vs. 0/17 (0%), p=0.754

ACS indicates acute coronary syndrome; AMI, acute myocardial infarction; BRAVE-2, Beyond 12 hours Reperfusion Alternative Evaluation trial; C, coronary; CAD, coronary artery disease; Cath, catheterization; CHF, congestive heart failure; CI, confidence interval; Contra, contraindications; COR, culprit artery-only (or infarct related artery-only) PCI; CR, complete revascularizations; CTO, chronic total occlusion; CV, cardiovascular; CVA, stroke; EF, ejection fraction; FFR, Fractional Flow Reserve; f/u, follow up; Fx, fibrinolysis; gp, group; HR, hazard ratio; IR, incomplete revascularization; IRA, infarct related artery; LAD, left anterior descending artery; LBBB, left bundle branch block; LM, left main; LV, left ventricle; MACE, major adverse cardiac events; MI, myocardial infarction; MVD; multivessel disease; MV PCI, multivessel PCI; NY, New York; Occ, occlusion; OR, odds ratio; PA, pulmonary artery; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; PCWP, pulmonary-capillary wedge pressure; POBA, balloon angioplasty; PPCI, primary PCI; pts., patients; RCT, randomized control trial; re-MI, recurrent MI; RCT; randomized controlled trial; revasc, revascularization; RR, relative risk; SK, streptokinase; SPECT, single-photon emission computed tomography; STE, ST elevation; STEMI, ST elevation myocardial infarction; tPA, tissue plasminogen activator; TVR, target vessel revascularization; tx, treatment; and VSD, ventricular septal defect.

Patient Population Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Acronym Aim of Study; Study Intervention Primary Endpoint and Results Author Study Type; Study Limitations; Year Study Size (N) Adverse Events and Summary TOTAL Aim: To assess whether Inclusion criteria: Intervention: Thrombus 1° endpoint: Composite of CV death, Safety endpoint: Stroke within 30 d: Jolly SS, et al., thrombus aspiration aspiration before PCI (5033) thrombectomy 0.7% vs. 0.3% PCI alone Symptoms of re-MI, cardiogenic shock, NYHA heart • 2015 (21) reduces MACE in patients myocardial ischemia failure within 180 d (HR: 2.06; 95% CI: 1.13-3.75; p=0.02) 25853743 with STEMI lasting for \geq 30 min Comparator: PCI alone CV death: thombectomy 3.1% vs. 3.5% • (5030) ٠ Definite ECG changes Thrombectomy vs PCI alone: PCI alone (HR: 0.90; 95% CI 0.73-1.12; Study type: Randomized 6.9% vs. 7.0% (HR: 0.99; 95% CI: indicating STEMI p=0.34). 0.85-1.15; p=0.86) ٠ Patients referred for Size: 10.732 primary PCI Primary outcome + stent thrombosis • (thrombectomy 5372, PCI +TVR: thrombectomy 9.9% vs. 9.8% PCI • Randomized within 12 alone 5360); alone, (HR: 1.00; 95% CI: 0.89-1.14; h of symptom onset p=0.95). and prior to diagnostic angiography Summary: Exclusion criteria: No group differences with respect to re-٠ Prior CABG MI, shock, NYHA heart failure, stent ٠ thrombosis, TVR, major bleeding, net • Life expectancy <6 mo clinical benefit (primary efficacy outcome due to non-cardiac or stroke). condition No differences in rate of primary outcome Treatment with in pre-specified subgroups, including fibrinolytic therapy for extent of thrombus burden. qualifying index STEMI event Improved ST resolution and lower rates of distal embolization with thrombectomy Bailout thrombectomy rate 7.1% among patients randomized to PCI alone. No or possible thrombus present (TIMI thrombus grade 0-1) in 6.7% thrombectomy patients, 8.1% PCI-alone patients. TASTE Intervention: Thrombus Aim: To assess if Inclusion criteria: 1° endpoint: N/A (previously reported • Events at 1 year f/u: Lagerqvist B, et al., thrombus aspiration aspiration before PCI (3621) Chest pain, at least for in TASTE) Death from any cause 5.3% vs. ٠ reduces mortality in 2014 (22) 30 min, onset of sx to 5.6% (HR: 0.94; 95% CI: 0.78-1.15; STEMI pts at 1 y in the Comparator: PCI only (3623) 25176395 admission <24 h p=0.57), TASTE study • STEMI or LBBB Rehospitalization for MI 2.7% vs. 2.7% (HR: 0.97; 95% CI: 0.73-1.28; Study type: Randomized Exclusion criteria: p=0.81), stent thrombosis 0.7% vs. Need for CABG 0.9% (HR: 0.84: 95% CI: 0.50-1.40: ٠ Size: 7244 (3621 p=0.51) ٠ Previous thrombectomy, 3623 PCI Incidence of composite of death, randomization in • alone) TASTE trial rehospitalization for MI. or stent thrombosis: 8.0% v. 8.5% (HR: 0.94; 95% CI: 0.8-1.11; p=0.48). Outcome events were recorded on the

Data Supplement 2. RCTs for Aspiration Thrombectomy (Section 3)

					basis of registry data and were not systematically adjudicated (ascertainment of outcome events may have been less accurate than a RCT). Results cannot necessarily be extrapolated to very high- risk pts who would not have been eligible for inclusion.
TASTE Frobert O et al.,	<u>Aim</u> : To assess if thrombus aspiration	Inclusion criteria: Chest pain, at least for	Intervention: Thrombus aspiration before PCI (3621)	<u>1° endpoint</u> : All-cause mortality at 30 d	<u>Rate of rehospitalization for recurrent MI</u> at 30 d : HR:0.61; 95% CI:0.34-1.07;
2013 (23) 23991656	reduces mortality in STEMI pts.	30 min Onset of sx to	Comparator: PCI only (3623)	Thrombus aspiration vs PCI only:	p=0.09 Bate of stent thrombosis: HB: 0.47: 95%
	<u>Study type</u> : Randomized	 admission<24 h STEMI or LBBB 	<u></u>	 2.8% vs 3.0%; HR: 0.94; 95% CI: 0.72-1.22; p=0.63 	Cl: 0.20-1.02; p=0.06). <u>TVR</u> did not differ between groups
	<u>Size</u> : 7244 (3621 thrombectomy, 3623 PCI alone)	Exclusion criteria: Need for CABG Previous randomization in TASTE trial			 Bias due to the treating physician being aware of the group to which pt was assigned and entering the angiographic variables. No adjudication of events and no blinded review of angiograms
INFUSE-AMI Stone GW, et al.,	Aim: To evaluate reduction of infarct size by	Inclusion criteria: STEMI >30 min and	Intervention: Thrombectomy (174)	<u>1° endpoint</u> : Infarct size at 30 d as assessed by cardiac MRI	There were also no significant differences in absolute infarct mass or abnormal wall
2012 (24)	IC abciximab, manual	≥1 mm			motion score
22447888	or both (with bivalirudin anticoagulation)	 PPCI sx-onset-to- device time of ≤5 h 	thrombectomy (179)	Infarct size 17.0% vs 17.3% (p=0.51)	
	<u>Study type</u> : Randomized, 2x2 factorial design	Exclusion criteria: Prior MI, CABG, or LAD stent Shock or CPP	11	911	nn
	Size: 353 with evaluable	Prior lytic or Ilb/Illa			
	arms (thrombectomy=174; no thrombectomy=179)	inhibitor for the present admission			
EXPIRA Sardella G, et al., 2009 (25)	<u>Aim</u> : To determine the effects of manual thrombectomy device on	Inclusion criteria: 1st STEMI <9 h from sx onset	Intervention: Manual thrombectomy-PCI (88)	<u>1° endpoint</u> : Occurrence of final myocardial blush grade ≥2	 <u>Rate of ST resolution >70%;</u> (manual thrombectomy-PCI vs. PCI [64% vs.39%; p=0.001])
<u>19161878</u>	myocardial perfusion and infarct size assessed by	 Infarct-related artery ≥2.5 mm in diameter 	Comparator: PCI alone (87)	Manual thrombectomy vs.PCI alone 88% vs. 60%; p=0.001	Cardiac death at 9 mos lower with manual thrombectomy-PCI (p=0.02)
	CE-MRI	 Thrombus score ≥3 			CE-MRI substudy: presence and extent
	Study type: Randomized	 I IMI flow grade ≤1 			of MVO in acute phase (significantly lower with manual thrombectomy-PCI)
	<u>Size</u> : 175	Exclusion criteria: Cardiogenic shock, 3 vessel/ left main disease,			and infarct size extent at 3 mo (significant reduction with manual thrombectomy- PCI)
		TIMI >0-1, TS <3, contra to GPIIb/IIIa			Single center experience with small no. of pts.

TADAC	Alter To determine condise	In charten entrete	Internetien Three burg		
TAPAS	Aim: To determine cardiac	Inclusion criteria:	Intervention: Inrombus	1º endpoint: Combined cardiac death	 <u>1 y cardiac death</u>: Thrombus aspiration
Vlaar PJ, et al.,	death or reinfarction rate	 AMI sx >30 min 	aspiration (535); 1 y f/u (530)	or non-fatal re-MI at 1y;	vs. PCI:3.6% vs.6.7% [HR: 1.93; 95% CI:
2008 (26)	at 1y	 Time from sx onset 			1.11-3.37; p=0.02]
<u>18539223</u>		<12 h, STE >0.1mV in	Comparator: PCI (536); 1 y	Thrombus aspiration vs. PCI alone:	Limited power to assess clinical outcome.
	Study type: Randomized	≥2 leads	f/u PCI (530)	5.6% vs.9.9% [HR: 1.81; 95% CI:	No systematic measurement of infarct
				1.16-2.84: p=0.0091	size or LVF performed
	Size: 1071	Exclusion criteria:			
		Rescue PCI after			
		thrombolysis			
		Known concomitant			
		disease with life			
		ulsease with the			
Sviless T. et al.	Aim. To access whether		Intervention, Thrombus	10 and a sint. Deathans as done	Thread a second stration of DOI shares at 20
Svilaas T, et al.,	AIm: To assess whether	inclusion criteria:	intervention: Inrombus	<u>1º endpoint</u> : Post procedure	Inrombus aspiration vs. PCI alone at 30-
2008 (27)	manual thrombus	 AMI sx >30 min 	aspiration (535)	myocardial blush grade of 0 (no	<u>day:</u>
<u>18256391</u>	aspiration is superior to	 Time from sx onset 		myocardial blush) or 1 (minimal	 <u>Major bleeding</u>: 3.8% vs.3.4%, RR:
	conventional treatment	<12	Comparator: PCI alone (536)	myocardial blush or contrast density).	1.11; 95% CI: 0.60-2.08; p=0.11
	during primary PCI	 STE >0.1 mV in ≥2 			 <u>Target vessel revascularization</u>:
		leads		Thrombus aspiration vs. PCI alone:	4.5% vs.5.8%, RR: 0.77; 95% CI
	Study type: Randomized			17.1 % vs.26.3% [RR: 0.65; 95% CI:	0.46-1.30; p=0.34),
		Exclusion criteria:		0.51-0.83; p<0.001]	 <u>Reinfarction</u>: 0.8% vs.1.9%, RR:
	<u>Size</u> : 1071	Rescue PCI after			0.40; 95% CI: 0.13-1.27; p=0.11,
		thrombolysis			 Death:2.1% vs.4.0%, RR: 0.52; 95%
		Known concomitant			CI 0.26-1.07; p=0.07
		disease with life			O MACE: 6.8% vs.9.4%, RR: 0.72;
- 10c	~ ~ ~	ulsease with the			95% CI: 0.48-1.08; p=0.12
		expectancy <0 mo			Single-center study using surrogate
				and the set	endpoints (myocardial blush grade and
					ECG variables): performed randomization
					prior to coronary angiography (selection
					hias since some nationts did not undergo
					Dias since some patients did not undergo
					Pol/received alternative therapy)

CABG indicates coronary artery bypass graft; CE-MRI, contrast enhanced MRI; CI, confidence interval; cMRI, cardiac magnetic resonance imaging; Contra, contraindications; CrCI, creatinine clearance; CV, cardiovascular; ECG, electrocardiogram; EM, Export Medtronic; GP2B/3A, glycoprotein IIb/IIIa; Hgb, hemoglobin; Hosp., hospitalization; HR, hazard ratio; IC, intracoronary; ITT, intention-to-treat; LVF, Left ventricular function; MACE, major adverse cardiac events; MACCE, major adverse cardiac and cerebrovascular events; MI, myocardial infarction; MVO, microvascularobstruction; NYHA, New York Heart Association; OR, odds ratio; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; PL, platelet count; RCT, randomized controlled trial; RR, relative risk; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; STR, ST-segment resolution; SVG, Saphenous venous graft; TIMI, Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction; TS, thrombus score; and TVR, target vessel revascularization.

References

- Iqbal MB, Ilsley C, Kabir T, et al. Culprit Vessel Versus Multivessel Intervention at the Time of Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in Patients With ST-Segment-Elevation Myocardial Infarction and Multivessel Disease: Real-World Analysis of 3984 Patients in London. Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes. 2014;7:936-43.
- 2. Santos AR, Picarra BC, Celeiro M, et al. Multivessel approach in ST-elevation myocardial infarction: impact on in-hospital morbidity and mortality. Rev Port Cardiol. 2014;33:67-73.
- 3. Jeger R, Jaguszewski M, Nallamothu BN, et al. Acute multivessel revascularization improves 1-year outcome in ST-elevation myocardial infarction: a nationwide study cohort from the AMIS Plus registry. Int J Cardiol. 2014;172:76-81.
- Manari A, Varani E, Guastaroba P, et al. Long-term outcome in patients with ST segment elevation myocardial infarction and multivessel disease treated with culprit-only, immediate, or staged multivessel percutaneous revascularization strategies: Insights from the REAL registry. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. 2014;84:912-22.
- 5. Jaguszewski M, Radovanovic D, Nallamothu BK, et al. Multivessel versus culprit vessel percutaneous coronary intervention in ST-elevation myocardial infarction: is more worse? EuroIntervention. 2013;9:909-15.
- 6. Bauer T, Zeymer U, Hochadel M, et al. Prima-vista multi-vessel percutaneous coronary intervention in haemodynamically stable patients with acute coronary syndromes: analysis of over 4.400 patients in the EHS-PCI registry. Int J Cardiol. 2013;166:596-600.
- Dziewierz A, Siudak Z, Rakowski T, et al. Impact of multivessel coronary artery disease and noninfarct-related artery revascularization on outcome of patients with ST-elevation myocardial infarction transferred for primary percutaneous coronary intervention (from the EUROTRANSFER Registry). Am J Cardiol. 2010;106:342-7.
- 8. Toma M, Buller CE, Westerhout CM, et al. Non-culprit coronary artery percutaneous coronary intervention during acute ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: insights from the APEX-AMI trial. Eur Heart J. 2010;31:1701-7.
- Hannan EL, Samadashvili Z, Walford G, et al. Culprit vessel percutaneous coronary intervention versus multivessel and staged percutaneous coronary intervention for ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction patients with multivessel disease. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2010;3:22-31.
- Cavender MA, Milford-Beland S, Roe MT, et al. Prevalence, predictors, and in-hospital outcomes of non-infarct artery intervention during primary percutaneous coronary intervention for ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (from the National Cardiovascular Data Registry). Am J Cardiol. 2009;104:507-13.
- 11. Varani E, Balducelli M, Aquilina M, et al. Single or multivessel percutaneous coronary intervention in ST-elevation myocardial infarction patients. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. 2008;72:927-33.
- 12. Qarawani D, Nahir M, Abboud M, et al. Culprit only versus complete coronary revascularization during primary PCI. Int J Cardiol. 2008;123:288-92.
- 13. Corpus RA, House JA, Marso SP, et al. Multivessel percutaneous coronary intervention in patients with multivessel disease and acute myocardial infarction. Am Heart J. 2004;148:493-500.
- 14. Roe MT, Cura FA, Joski PS, et al. Initial experience with multivessel percutaneous coronary intervention during mechanical reperfusion for acute myocardial infarction. Am J Cardiol. 2001;88:170-3, A6.
- Engstrom T, Kelbaek H, Helqvist S, et al. Complete revascularisation versus treatment of the culprit lesion only in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction and multivessel disease (DANAMI 3-PRIMULTI): an open-label, randomised controlled trial. The Lancet. 2015; Online publication.
- 16. Gershlick AH, Khan JN, Kelly DJ, et al. Randomized Trial of Complete Versus Lesion-Only Revascularization in Patients Undergoing Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention for STEMI and Multivessel Disease: The CvLPRIT Trial. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2015;65:963-72.
- 17. Wald DS, Morris JK, Wald NJ, et al. Randomized trial of preventive angioplasty in myocardial infarction. N Engl J Med. 2013;369:1115-23.
- 18. Dambrink JH, Debrauwere JP, van 't Hof AW, et al. Non-culprit lesions detected during primary PCI: treat invasively or follow the guidelines? EuroIntervention. 2010;5:968-75.
- 19. Politi L, Sgura F, Rossi R, et al. A randomised trial of target-vessel versus multi-vessel revascularisation in ST-elevation myocardial infarction: major adverse cardiac events during long-term follow-up. Heart. 2010;96:662-7.
- Di Mario C., Mara S, Flavio A, et al. Single vs multivessel treatment during primary angioplasty: results of the multicentre randomised HEpacoat for cuLPrit or multivessel stenting for Acute Myocardial Infarction (HELP AMI) Study. Int J Cardiovasc Intervent. 2004;6:128-33.
- 21. Jolly SS, Cairns JA, Yusuf S, et al. Randomized trial of primary PCI with or without routine manual thrombectomy. N Engl J Med. 2015:372:1389-98.
- 22. Lagerqvist B, Frobert O, Olivecrona GK, et al. Outcomes 1 year after thrombus aspiration for myocardial infarction. N Engl J Med. 2014;371:1111-20.
- 23. Frobert O, Lagerqvist B, Olivecrona GK, et al. Thrombus aspiration during ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction. N Engl J Med. 2013;369:1587-97.
- 24. Stone GW, Maehara A, Witzenbichler B, et al. Intracoronary abciximab and aspiration thrombectomy in patients with large anterior myocardial infarction: the INFUSE-AMI randomized trial. JAMA. 2012;307:1817-26.
- 25. Sardella G, Mancone M, Bucciarelli-Ducci C, et al. Thrombus aspiration during primary percutaneous coronary intervention improves myocardial reperfusion and reduces infarct size: the EXPIRA (thrombectomy with export catheter in infarct-related artery during primary percutaneous coronary intervention) prospective, randomized trial. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2009;53:309-15.

- 26. Vlaar PJ, Svilaas T, van der Horst IC, et al. Cardiac death and reinfarction after 1 year in the Thrombus Aspiration during Percutaneous coronary intervention in Acute myocardial infarction Study (TAPAS): a 1-year follow-up study. Lancet. 2008;371:1915-20.
- 27. Svilaas T, Vlaar PJ, van der Horst IC, et al. Thrombus aspiration during primary percutaneous coronary intervention. N Engl J Med. 2008;358:557-67.



