DK Crush should be the technique of choice for 1,1,1 Left Main disease: Against
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Two parts

- Theory, Intuition, Logic, Conceptualisation
- Data
• Theory, Intuition, Logic, Conceptualisation
Crush technique

• Born in adversity
• Opposite of what the engineers intended
What are its drawbacks?

1) Inflexible technique which commits you from the start to a two-stent approach
   
   • Rigidity limits Adaptability
What are its drawbacks?

2) It is a technique which, of necessity, requires many steps for completion

- Every additional procedural step offers you an original and creative way to totally screw up the case
What are its drawbacks?

2) It is a technique which, of necessity, requires many steps for completion

- Be honest with yourself, how many 1,1,1 LM cases do you do a year?
What are its drawbacks?

2) It is a technique which, of necessity, requires many steps for completion

- “There is nothing more likely to go wrong than a complicated bifurcation strategy undertaken as something of a novelty”

- DHS, EBC, 2009 ad infinitum
What are its drawbacks?

3) It leaves a triple layer of stent on the inner curvature
What are its drawbacks?

4) Inability to complete rewiring, crossing and final kissing balloon therapy is higher than with other techniques
NORDIC II & BBC ONE

Procedure n=650

- Crush
  - Failed kiss 20%
- Culotte
  - Failed kiss 9%
NORDIC II

MACE-free survival during 36 months F-U

![Graph showing MACE-free survival over time with different treatment groups.](image-url)
What are its drawbacks?

5) It is a technique in which rewiring *outside* the stented area is quite possible.
Is DK Crush a big improvement?

- Immediately inflexible technique which commits you from the start to a two-stent approach.
Is DK Crush a big improvement?

- It is a technique which, necessarily, requires many steps for completion.
Is DK Crush a big improvement?

- It is a technique in which rewiring outside the stented area is quite possible.
Is DK Crush a big improvement?

- Inability to complete rewiring, crossing and final kissing balloon therapy higher than with other techniques
Is DK Crush a big improvement?

- It leaves a triple layer of stent on the inner curvature
DK Crush

- Remains a technique which commits you to two stents from the start, has multiple catheter exchanges, may include inadvertent scaffold-free zones and leaves a triple layer of metal
• Data
Data

• “The data is the data”
DK Crush V trial

- 484 patients
- True LM bifurcation disease
- Randomised to DK Crush vs Provisional
DK Crush V Results

• Target Lesion Failure at 1 year
  • DK Crush 5%
  • Provisional 10%
### 2.1 What is new in the 2018 Guidelines?

**Calculation of the Syntax Score, if left main or multivessel revascularization is considered**
- Radial access as standard approach for coronary angiography and PCI
- DES for any PCI
- Systematic re-evaluation of patients after myocardial revascularization
- Stabilised NSTE-ACS patients: revascularization strategy according to principles for SCAD
- Use of the radial artery grafts over saphenous vein grafts in patients with high-degree stenosis
- Myocardial revascularization in patients with CAD, heart failure, and LVEF <35%
  - CABG preferred
  - PCI as alternative to CABG

**Completeness of revascularization prioritized, when considering CABG vs PCI**
- NOAC preferred over VKA in patients with non-valvular AF requiring anticoagulation and antiplatelet treatment
- No-touch vein technique, if open vein harvesting for CABG
- Annual operator volume for left main PCI of at least 25 cases per year
- Pre- and post-hydration with isotonic saline in patients with moderate or severe CKD if the expected contrast volume is >100 mL

**Routine non-invasive imaging surveillance in high-risk patients 6 months after revascularization**
- Double-kissing crush technique preferred over provisional T-stenting in true left main bifurcations.
- Cangrelor in P2Y₁₂-inhibitor naïve patients undergoing PCI
- GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors for PCI in P2Y₁₂-inhibitor naïve patients with ACS undergoing PCI
- Dabigatran 150-mg dose preferred over 110-mg dose when combined with single antiplatelet therapy after PCI
- De-escalation of P2Y₁₂ inhibitor guided by platelet function testing in ACS patients
- Routine revascularization of non-IRA lesions in myocardial infarction with cardiogenic shock
- Current generation BRS for clinical use outside clinical studies

---

The figure does not show changes compared with the 2014 version of the Myocardial Revascularization Guidelines that were due to updates for consistency with other ESC Guidelines published since 2014.
Critique

- Procedural success 100% in main vessel
- Final kissing success 99.6% in DK crush
- Follow-up 100%
Critique

- No POT prior to recrossing in provisional
- 47% of cases had crossover to 2 stents
- Final kissing 78% vs 99.6%
- Stent thrombosis 0.4% vs 3.3%
What happened here?

Hazard ratio, 0.46 (95% CI, 0.23=0.91)

\( p=0.022 \)

No. at risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>DK crush</th>
<th>Provisional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target Lesion Revascularization

Hazard ratio, 0.47 (95% CI, 0.21-1.05)
P = 0.058

7.9% vs 3.8%
Repeat Angiography?

Provisional stenting (N=282)

- 100%
- 65.3%

12-mo clinical F/U
13-mo angio F/U

DK crush (N=282)

- 100%
- 66.3%
All of which suggests to me:

- Operators very good at doing DK Crush
- Not very good at doing Provisional!

- And of course, results yet to be replicated…. 
Conclusion

- There are genuine theoretical, practical and data concerns about the DK Crush technique

- It should certainly not replace the provisional approach based on one contentious trial

- Roll on EBC MAIN