# Meta-analysis of the impact of successful chronic total occlusion percutaneous coronary intervention on left ventricular systolic function and reverse remodeling

Michael Megaly MD, MS <sup>1,2</sup> $\square$ $\square$ Marwan Saad MD, PhD <sup>3</sup> $\square$ $\square$ Peter Tajti MD <sup>1</sup> $\square$
M. Nicholas Burke MD $^1$ $\mid$ Ivan Chavez MD $^1$ $\mid$ Mario Gössl MD, PhD $^1$ $\mid$
Daniel Lips MD <sup>1</sup>   Michael Mooney MD <sup>1</sup>   Anil Poulose MD <sup>1</sup>
Paul Sorajja MD $^1$ $\parallel$ Jay Traverse MD $^1$ $\parallel$ Yale Wang MD $^1$ $\parallel$ Louis P. Kohl MD $^2$ $\parallel$
Steven M. Bradlev MD. MPH <sup>1</sup>   Emmanouil S. Brilakis MD. PhD <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Minneapolis Heart Institute, Abbott Northwestern Hospital, Minneapolis, Minnesota

<sup>2</sup> Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, Hennepin County Medical Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota

<sup>3</sup> Department of Cardiovascular Medicine, University of Arkansas, Little Rock, Arkansas

#### Correspondence

Emmanouil S. Brilakis, MD, PhD, Minneapolis Heart Institute and Minneapolis Heart Institute Foundation, Abbott Northwestern Hospital, 920 E 28th Street #300, Minneapolis, MN 55407. Email: esbrilakis@gmail.com

Background: We sought to examine the impact of coronary chronic total occlusion (CTO) percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) on left ventricular (LV) function. Methods: We performed a systematic review and meta-analysis of studies published between January 1980 and November 2017 on the impact of successful CTO PCI on LV function.

Results: A total of 34 observational studies including 2735 patients were included in the meta-analysis. Over a weighted mean follow-up of 7.9 months, successful CTO PCI was associated with an increase in LV ejection fraction by 3.8% (95%CI 3.0-4.7, P < 0.0001,  $I^2 = 45\%$ ). In secondary analysis of 15 studies (1248 patients) that defined CTOs as occlusions of at least 3-month duration and reported follow-up of at least 3-months after the procedure, successful CTO PCI was associated with improvement in LV ejection fraction by 4.3% (95%CI [3.1, 5.6], P < 0.0001). In the 10 studies (502 patients) that reported LV end-systolic volume, successful CTO PCI was associated with a decrease in LV end-systolic volume by 4 mL, (95%Cl -6.0 to -2.1, P < 0.0001,  $I^2$  = 0%). LV end-diastolic volume was reported in 9 studies with 403 patients and did not significantly change after successful CTO PCI (-2.3 mL, 95%CI -5.7 to 1.2 mL,  $P = 0.19, I^2 = 0\%$ ).

Conclusions: Successful CTO PCI is associated with a statistically significant improvement in LV ejection fraction and decrease in LV end-systolic volume, that may reflect a beneficial effect of CTO recanalization on LV remodeling. The clinical implications of these findings warrant further investigation.

### KEYWORDS

chronic total occlusion, ejection fraction, left ventricular function, left ventricular reverse remodeling

# 1 | INTRODUCTION

Coronary chronic total occlusions (CTOs) are common and have been associated with increased risk for ventricular arrhythmias and adverse clinical outcomes.<sup>1–4</sup> Several studies, most of which were retrospective, have examined whether CTO revascularization improves symptoms, and most have suggested a benefit.<sup>5,6</sup>

The effect of successful CTO revascularization on left ventricular (LV) systolic function remains unclear, with the only randomized controlled trial performed to date demonstrating no benefit from CTO recanalization in the setting of recent ST-segment elevation acute myocardial infarction.<sup>7</sup> We performed a systematic review and metaanalysis to examine the impact of successful CTO PCI on LV size and ejection fraction (EF).

# 2 | METHODS

### 2.1 Data sources and eligibility criteria

Our meta-analysis was conducted and reported according to the proposal for conducting and reporting Meta-analyses of Observational studies (MOOSE)<sup>8</sup> and was registered with the International Prospective Register for Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO: CRD42018084926). We performed a computerized systematic search through MEDLINE, EMBASE, and COCHRANE databases from January 1980 to November 2017 using the following search terms separately and in combination; "CTO," "Chronic total occlusion," "Chronic total coronary occlusion," "revascularization," "PCI," "Angioplasty," and "Recanalization." A similar search strategy was performed for abstracts of the major scientific sessions (American College of Cardiology, European Society of Cardiology, American Heart Association) until November 2017. We further screened the bibliographies of the retrieved studies, prior meta-analyses as well as ClinicalTrials.gov for any relevant studies not retrieved through the initial search. Our search was limited to the English language.

We included in this meta-analysis studies that evaluated the impact of successful CTO PCI on LVEF. Studies had to include patients with a CTO (definition of CTO in each study is illustrated in Table 1) who received successful PCI, and the LV function had to have been assessed before and after successful PCI.

#### 2.2 Data extraction and quality assessment

The data were extracted by two independent investigators (MM, MS) including baseline study characteristics, patients' demographic and outcomes of interest from the retrieved studies. Discrepancies among investigators were settled by consensus. The quality of the included studies was assessed using New-Castle Ottawa Scale for cohort studies.<sup>9</sup>

#### 2.3 Outcomes

The primary outcome of the current study was the mean difference in LVEF before and after successful CTO PCI. Secondary outcomes included the mean difference in left ventricular end-diastolic volume (LVEDV) and Left ventricular end-systolic volume (LVESV) before and after successful PCI. To ensure homogeneity in the outcome definitions, we included the reported volumes (mL) rather than volume indices (mL/m<sup>2</sup>) that were reported by few studies. We also evaluated the mean difference in LVEF after unsuccessful CTO PCI if reported in the included studies. The numerical values of the outcomes were tabulated. Outcomes were reported at the longest available follow-up.

#### 2.4 | Data synthesis and statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was conducted using Review manager software (Version 5.3.5. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014). Descriptive analyses were conducted using frequencies for categorical variables and standardized means with standard deviations (SD) for continuous variables. Summary results were presented as mean difference. Confidence intervals (CI) were calculated at 95% level for overall estimates effect. A standard, fixed-effects model (Mantel-Haenszel method) was used in the absence of heterogeneity among studies ( $l^2 < 25\%$ ).<sup>10</sup> In the presence of heterogeneity, the DerSimonian and Laird random-effects model was used. Statistical heterogeneity across trials was assessed by  $l^2$ statistics, with I<sup>2</sup> statistic values <25%, 25-50%, and >50% considered as low, moderate, and high degree of heterogeneity, respectively.<sup>10</sup> Tests were two-tailed and a P-value ≤0.05 was considered statistically significant. Weighted mean follow-up durations were calculated with the sample size being the weight. Potential publication bias was assessed by visual assessment of constructed funnel plots using Egger's test.<sup>11</sup>

Subgroup analysis was performed for the primary outcome comparing studies with mean baseline LVEF <50% versus those with mean baseline LVEF of 50% or higher. Further sensitivity analyses included studies that defined CTOs as occlusions of at least 3 month duration, and with follow-up period of at least 3 months, which has been proposed as the minimum time interval required for stunned and hibernating myocardium to recover after revascularization.<sup>12</sup>

## 3 | RESULTS

# 3.1 | Characteristics of the included studies and quality assessment

The study selection process is described in Figure 1. Our initial search yielded 827 citations. The characteristics of the included studies are described in (Table 1). Only one randomized-controlled trial (RCT) was identified.<sup>7</sup> Thirty-four observational studies [including two abstracts <sup>13,14</sup>] with a total of 2804 patients met our inclusion criteria.<sup>13-46</sup> Cardiac magnetic resonance imaging (CMR) was used to assess LVEF in nine studies.<sup>22,24,26,31,36,37,39,43-45</sup> Other studies used left ventriculography<sup>13,20,21,23,25,28,34,35,42,46</sup> or nuclear imaging,<sup>27,38</sup> or did not specify the method used for assessing LVEF.<sup>18,19,30</sup> The

# **TABLE 1** Baseline characteristics of the patients that were included in the meta-analysis studies

Study	Vear	Country of	Number of	Number of patients (Included in outcomes)	CTO	CTO TIMI flow	Duration of follow up (months mean)	Assessment of
Choi et al <sup>19</sup>	2017	South	305	305	3 months	0	20	
	2017	Korea	505	305	5 months	0	20	
Nakashi et al <sup>36</sup>	2017	Japan	59	59	3 months	0	8	ECHO
Sotomi et al <sup>43</sup>	2017	Japan	37	35	Unknown	0	3	ECHO
Stuijfzand et al <sup>14</sup>	2017	The Netherlands	69	69	Unknown	Unknown	3	CMR
Bucciarelli et al <sup>15</sup>	2016	UK	50	50	3 months	0	3	CMR
Cardona et al <sup>16</sup>	2016	Spain	32	29	3 months	?	6	CMR
Chadid et al <sup>17</sup>	2015	Germany	43	43	3 months	0	9	CMR
El shafey et al <sup>24</sup>	2015	Egypt	37	37	3 months	0 or 1	3	ECHO
Daniłowicz- Szymanowicz et al <sup>22</sup>	2014	Poland	23	23	4 weeks	Unknown	3	ECHO
Erdogan et al <sup>26</sup>	2013	Turkey	118	118	3 months	0 or 1	1	ECHO
Omura et al <sup>13</sup>	2013	Japan	168	168	Unknown	Unknown	6	left ventriculogram
Pujadas et al <sup>40</sup>	2013	Spain	33	33	3 months	0	6	CMR
Roifman et al <sup>41</sup>	2013	Canada	19	19	3 months	0 or 1	4	CMR
Kirschbaum et al <sup>33</sup>	2012	The Netherlands	43	43	3 months		6	CMR
Park et al <sup>37</sup>	2012	South Korea	58	58	1 month	0 or 1	6	ECHO
Sun et al <sup>44</sup>	2012	China	99	99	3 months	Unknown	12	ECHO
Chen et al <sup>18</sup>	2009	China	132	132	3 months	0	12	NR
Fiocchi et al <sup>29</sup>	2009	Italy	14	14	3 months	Unknown	6	CMR
Pavlovic et al <sup>38</sup>	2009	Serbia	20	20	3 months	0 or 1	11	Nuclear scan
Kirschbaum et al <sup>32</sup>	2008	The Netherlands	21	21	6 weeks	0	36	CMR
Valenti et al <sup>45</sup>	2008	Italy	290	290	3 months	0	6	ECHO
Ermis et al <sup>27</sup>	2005	USA	19	19	6 weeks	Unknown	1.5	Radionucleotide ventriculography
Fang et al <sup>28</sup>	2005	Taiwan	129	129	6 weeks	0	6	L Ventriculogram
Piscione et al <sup>39</sup>	2005	Italy	35	35	Unknown	Chronic occlusion	6	ECHO
Wener et al <sup>46</sup>	2005	Germany	119	119	2 weeks	0	4.9	L Ventriculogram
Chung et al <sup>20</sup>	2003	Taiwan	75	75	3 months	0 or 1	6	L Ventriculogram
Dzavik et al <sup>23</sup>	2001	Canada	139	139	6 weeks	0 or 1	6	L Ventriculogram
Jin et al <sup>31</sup>	2001	China	64	64	2 weeks	0	6	ECHO
Sirnes et al <sup>42</sup>	1998	Norway	95	95	Unknown	Unknown	6.7	L Ventriculogram
Danchin et al <sup>21</sup>	1996	France	55	55	10 days	0	6	L Ventriculogram
Mori et al <sup>35</sup>	1996	Japan	96	96	1 month	0 or 1	6	L Ventriculogram
Engelstein et al <sup>25</sup>	1994	Germany	49	49	3 weeks	0 or 1	2.5	L Ventriculogram
Ivanhoe et al <sup>30</sup>	1992	USA	242	175	10 days	0 or 1	6	NR
Melchior et al <sup>34</sup>	1987	Switzerland	20	20	Unknown	Unknown	9	L Ventriculogram

ECHO, echocardiogram; CMR, cardiac magnetic-resonance imaging; L ventriculogram, Left ventriculogram; NR, not reported.



**FIGURE 1** Flow diagram of the studies included in the meta-analysis

weighted mean follow-up period was 7.9 months. Four studies also reported the change in LVEF after failed CTO PCI.<sup>18,33,40,41</sup> All studies met the inclusion criteria with no evidence of publication bias (Supplementary Figures S1-S4). The risk of bias of the included studies, as assessed with the Newcastle-Ottawa scale is shown in Supplementary Table S1.

### 3.2 | Baseline characteristics of the included cohorts

The baseline patient characteristics are described in Table 2. Mean age was  $61 \pm 10$  years and 80.6% of the patients were men. Approximately half of the patients had prior myocardial infarction (47%). The CTO target artery was the left anterior descending (LAD) in 43% and the right coronary (RCA) in 40% of patients. Baseline characteristics and demographics of patients in studies describing LVEF change after failed CTO PCI are described in (Supplementary Table S2).

## 3.3 | Outcomes

Successful CTO PCI was associated with a significant increase in LVEF (mean difference 3.8%, 95%CI 3.0-4.6, P < 0.0001,  $I^2 = 45\%$ ) over a weighted mean follow-up of 7.9 months (Figure 2), while failed CTO PCI was not associated with a change in LVEF (4 studies, 70

patients)<sup>18,33,40,41</sup> (mean difference 2.2%, 95%Cl -1.4, 5.8, P = 0.24) (Figure 3).

LVESV was analyzed in 10 studies including 502 patients.<sup>15–17,24,26,29,36,38,40,44</sup> Successful CTO PCI was associated with a significant decrease in LVESV (-4.0 mL, 95%CI -6.0, -2.1, P < 0.0001,  $l^2 = 0$ %) (Figure 4). LVEDV was analyzed in nine studies including 403 patients.<sup>15–17,24,26,29,36,38,40</sup> Successful CTO PCI was not associated with a decrease in LVEDV (-2.2 mL, 95%CI -5.7 to 1.1, P = 0.19,  $l^2 = 0$ %) (Figure 4).

In a subgroup analysis for the primary outcome comparing studies with documented baseline LVEF <50% versus those with baseline LVEF  $\geq$ 50%, successful CTO PCI remained associated with improvement in LVEF in both groups (mean difference 5.0%, 95%CI 3.7, 6.2, *P* < 0.0001, *I*<sup>2</sup> = 45% and 2.6 %, 95%CI 1.8, 3.4, *P* < 0.0001, *I*<sup>2</sup> = 2%), respectively. Successful CTO PCI was associated with greater improvement of LVEF in studies with LVEF <50% as compared with studies with LVEF  $\geq$  50% (*P* = 0.003) (Figure 5).

Furthermore, in a sensitivity analysis including only studies with documented CTO duration of at least 3 months and follow-up duration of at least 3 months after CTO PCI (15 studies, 1248 patients),<sup>15-20,24,29,33,36,38,40,41,44,45</sup> successful CTO PCI remained associated with significant improvement in LVEF (4.3%, 95%CI 3.0, 5.5, P < 0.00001).

#### TABLE 2 Demographics of the patients in the included studies

Study	Year	N	Male (%)	Age (Mean)	Smoking (%)	DM (%)	HTN (%)	Dyslipidemia (%)	prior MI (%)	CTO in LAD (%)	CTO in RCA (%)	CTO in LCX (%)
Choi et al	2017	305	75	62±11	55.4	44.6	64.3	28.5	20.3	39	39.7	27.9
Nakashi et al	2017	69										
Sotomi et al	2017	59	90	66±11	68	37	78	86	61	36	46	19
Stuijfzand et al	2017	37	78.4	65.6 ± 11.1	54.1	43.2	75.7	59.5	35.1			
Bucciarelli et al	2016	50	94	65±9	69	22	66	72				
Cardona et al	2016	29	79	59 ± 10.2	34	31	47	53	56	41	37	22
Chadid et al	2015	37	94.5	57.25 ± 8					50	46.5	33.5	20
El shafey et al	2015	43	95.3	62.5 ± 9.6	60.5	30.2	79.1	79.1		37.2	41.9	20.9
Daniłowicz- Szymanowicz et al	2014	23	70.5	55 ± 7.5		43.5	66	100	60			
Erdogan et al	2013	168										
Omura et al	2013	118										
Pujadas et al	2013	33	79	66 ± 9.5	70	37	84	76	67			
Roifman et al	2013	19	74	62.4 ± 9.8	11	26	74	95	58	37	47	16
Kirschbaum et al	2012	43	79	60 ± 10	21	21	42	79	53			
Park et al	2012	58	82.8	59.9 ± 10.5	48.3	36.2	56.9	34.5	12.1	50	34.5	15.5
Sun et al	2012	99	91.933	54.47 ± 3.77	68.83333	24.6	35.933	30.5	65.03			
Chen et al	2009	132	74.2	63.92 ± 10.74	34.8	25.8	75.8	19.7	45.5			
Fiocchi et al	2009	14										
Pavlovic et al	2009	20	74.15	56±5	0	16.5	71.5	86.5	100			
Kirschbaum et al	2008	21	86	63.7 ± 10.7	28.5	14.2	42.8	66.6	57.1	52.3	38	9.5
Valenti et al	2008	290										
Ermis et al	2005	19	84.2	58.3 ± 5.4					84.2			
Fang et al	2005	129	72.95	65.6 ± 11.5	37.3	41.65	61.15	64.7	37.1	41.1	37.15	21.75
Piscione et al	2005	35	87		26	18	13	26	100	50	27	23
Wener et al	2005	119										
Chung et al	2003	75	81.5	66.5 ± 9.5	40.5	40	57.5	25.5	50	47	53	
Dzavik et al	2001	64	71	61.85 ± 11.5	35.5	14	41	71.5	69.5	32.9	44.65	22.35
Jin et al	2001	139										
Sirnes et al	1998	95			21	8.4	24.2					
Danchin et al	1996	55	79.5	54.5 ± 10						52	48	
Mori et al	1996	96	85.65	59 ± 8.5		27	44	27.5	58.5	59	25.5	15.5
Engelstein et al	1994	49	83.5	52 ± 9.5					62	44	51.5	
Ivanhoe et al	1992	242										
Melchior et al	1987	20	85	53.25 ± 10.9					70			
Weighted mean		2804	80.6	$61.22 \pm 10.1$	45.45	31.5	57.02	43.47	47.11	43.4	39.85	22.17

DM, diabetes mellitus; HTN, hypertension; MI, myocardial infarction; LAD, left anterior descending artery; RCA, right coronary artery; LCX, left circumflex artery; CTO, chronic total occlusion.

# 4 | DISCUSSION

Our meta-analysis of 34 studies with 2804 patients demonstrates that successful CTO PCI is associated with statistically significant increase in mean LVEF by 3.8% during a mean follow-up duration of 7.9 months. This improvement was consistent in further sensitivity and subgroup analyses. Furthermore, successful CTO PCI was associated with statistically significant reduction in LVESV indicating an improvement in LV

Study or Subgroup         Mean         SD         Total         Mean         SD         Total         Weight         V. Random, 95% Cl           Bucciardia et 2016         67         12         50         62         13         50         21%         5.00 [10, 9, 90]         -           cradina et 2016         37.7         8         29         3.83         7.4         29         2.8%         6.40 [2.43, 10.37]         -           Chadid et al 2015         51.5         10.8         43         49.1         10.4         43         2.4%         2.40 [2.08, 6.88]         -           choi et al 2003         57.44         17.33         75         53.28         10.004         75         1.8%         4.16 [-1.28, 6.00]         -           Danchin et al 1996         60.14         1.318         65         5.78         1.36 [0.27, 4.17]         -           Dankine et al 2001         62.54         8.42         2.30 [0.57, 10.71]         -         -           Dankine et al 2001         62.4         1.52         3.75         5.75 [0.75, 10.71]         -           Endage et al 2015         5.28         10.2         118         8.44         2.01 [0.54, 4.56]         -           Endage at 2015 </th <th></th> <th>Afte</th> <th>er CTO PO</th> <th>3</th> <th colspan="4">Before CTO PCI</th> <th>Mean Difference</th> <th>Mean Difference</th>		Afte	er CTO PO	3	Before CTO PCI				Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Bucciarelli et al 2016         67         12         50         62         13         50         2.1%         5.00 [0.10, 9.90]           cardon et 2016         37.7         8         29         31.3         7.4         29         2.8%         6.40 [2.43, 10.37]	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
cardona et 2018       37.7       8       29       31.3       7.4       29       2.8%       6.40 [2.43, 10.37]	Bucciarelli et al 2016	67	12	50	62	13	50	21%	5.00 (0.10, 9.90)	
Chadid et al 2015       51.5       10.8       4.3       49.1       10.4       4.3       2.4%       2.40       12.08       6.88         chen et al 2009       54       8       132       45       11       132       4.8%       9.00       [6.88,11.32]       -         Chung et al 2003       57.44       17.93       75       53.28       18.004       75       1.8%       4.18 [+1.28,9.60]         Danchine et al 2014       56.48       8.42       2.3       50.05       7.95       2.2%       5.43 [0.70, 10.16]         Draindwicz-Szymanowicz et al 2014       56.48       8.42       2.3       50.5       7.95       2.3       2.56       5.76 [0.75, 10.77]         Endogan et al 2015       54.4       5.52       71.07       40       56.9       6.9       4.3       3.2%       5.67 [2.09,9.25]       +         Endogan et al 2015       52.4       10.2       118       56.31       9.81       118       4.4%       2.01 [0.64,4.56]       +       -         Endogan et al 2005       52.8       10.2       11.8       4.4%       2.01 [0.64,4.56]       +       +       -       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +	cardona et 2016	37.7		29	31.3	74	29	2.8%	6 40 12 43 10 371	
chen et al 2009       54       8       132       45       11       132       4.8%       9.00 [6.88, 11.32]       -         choi et al 2017       51.6       12.2       305       4.7.8       12.3       305       5.3%       38.01 [1.83, 5.77]       -         Chung et al 2003       57.44       17.93       5.32.8       16.04       75       1.8%       4.16 [1.28, 9.60]       -         Danchin et al 1996       60.14       13.18       55       54.38       13.6       55       2.0%       5.43 [0.70, 10.16]         Dankin et al 2001       62.5       11.6       13.9       62       11.5       13.9       4.2%       0.50 [-2.22, 3.22]       -         Erndsenten et al 2013       58.22       10.2       118       56.31       9.8       9.2%       5.67 [2.09, 9.25]       +         Erndsenten et al 2005       52.8       10.2       118       56.31       9.8       13.8       4.4%       2.01 [-0.54, 4.56]         Erndsental 2005       52.7       15.76       10       24.2       5.45       10.13, 9.47       +         For chai 1982       56       10       175       55       10       242       5.4%       10.10, 0.44, 244       + <t< td=""><td>Chadid et al 2015</td><td>51.5</td><td>10.8</td><td>43</td><td>49.1</td><td>10.4</td><td>43</td><td>2.4%</td><td>2.40 [-2.08, 6.88]</td><td>+-</td></t<>	Chadid et al 2015	51.5	10.8	43	49.1	10.4	43	2.4%	2.40 [-2.08, 6.88]	+-
choi et al 2017       51.6       12.5       305       47.8       12.3       305       5.3%       3.80 [1.83, 5.77]       -         Chung et al 2003       57.44       17.93       75       53.28       16.004       75       1.8%       4.16 [1.28, 9.60]         Danchin et al 1996       60.14       13.18       55       52.38       13.6       55       2.2%       5.43 [0.70, 10.16]       -         Dzwik et al 2001       62.5       11.6       139       62.2       11.5       139       4.2%       0.50 [-22.2, 3.22]       -         Endgate tal 2013       58.32       10.2       118       56.3       8.4%       2.01 [-0.54, 4.56]       -         Ermis et al 2005       52.8       10.2       19       4.47       10.9       18       1.3%       8.10 [1.39, 14.81]         Factogan et al 2005       58.77       15.76       129       56.2       16.19       12.8%       8.10 [1.39, 14.81]         Factogan et al 2005       58.77       15.76       129       56.1       10.24       5.4%       1.00 [-0.94, 2.94]         Vanhoe et al 1992       56       10       175       55       10       242       5.4%       1.00 [-0.87, 8.87]         Vinschbau	chen et al 2009	54	8	132	45	11	132	4.8%	9.00 (6.68, 11.32)	•
Chung et al 2003       57.44       17.93       75       53.28       16.004       75       1.8%       4.16       1.28       9.60         Danchin et al 1996       60.14       13.18       55       54.38       13.6       55       2.0%       5.76       10.77       10.07         Dankiovicz szymanowicz et al 2014       62.5       11.6       139       62.2       30.05       7.95       32.2%       5.67       10.70       10.07         Darakiet al 2015       54.4       5.52       37       52.75       5.56       37       4.5%       1.65       10.87       1.7         Erdogan et al 2013       53.32       10.2       118       56.31       9.81       118       4.4%       2.01       10.54       4.56         Ermis et al 2005       52.8       10.2       119       56.2       18.19       129       2.8%       2.57       1.36, 6.47         Fiocchi et al 2005       56.7       17.5       129       56.2       18.19       129       2.8%       2.57       1.38, 6.47         Jan et al 2013       56.10       174       49.68       16.13       14       4.9%       5.41       [3.19, 7.63]       +         Jin et al 2006 <t< td=""><td>choi et al 2017</td><td>51.6</td><td>12.5</td><td>305</td><td>47.8</td><td>12.3</td><td>305</td><td>5.3%</td><td>3.80 (1.83. 5.77)</td><td>+</td></t<>	choi et al 2017	51.6	12.5	305	47.8	12.3	305	5.3%	3.80 (1.83. 5.77)	+
Danchin et al 1996       60.14       13.18       55       54.38       13.6       55       2.0%       5.76       0.75, 10.77         Danikowicz-Szymanowicz et al 2014       55.48       8.42       23       50.05       7.95       23       2.2%       5.43       10.71       10.16         Dzwik et al 2011       62.5       11.6       139       62       11.6       139       62       11.6       139       62       11.6       139       62       11.6       139       62       11.6       139       62       11.6       139       62       11.6       139       62       11.6       139       62       11.6       139       62       11.6       139       62       11.6       139       62       11.6       139       62       11.6       139       62       11.6       139       14       40.8       61       10.1       10.5       65       10       10.5       11.6       139       14       14.8       10.9       11       138       8.10       13.9       13.4       11.6       139       62       14       14.9       10.9       11       138       14.0       14.9       14.9       14.9       14.9       14.9       1	Chung et al 2003	57.44	17.93	75	53.28	16.004	75	1.8%	4.16 [-1.28, 9.60]	
Danikowicz-Szymanowicz et al 2014       55.48       8.42       23       50.05       7.95       23       2.2%       5.43       0.70, 10.16         Dzawik et al 2001       62.5       11.6       139       62       11.5       139       62.23, 32.21         El shafey et al 2015       62.4       55.2       37       52.75       55.6       37       4.5%       1.05 [0.87, 4.17]         Engelstein et al 1994       62.57       10.75       49       56.9       6.9       49       3.2%       5.67 [2.09, 9.25]         Erdogan et al 2013       58.32       10.2       18       45.1       118       4.4%       2.01 [0.54, 4.56]         Finis et al 2005       58.77       15.76       129       56.2       16.19       129       2.8%       2.57 [1.33, 6.47]         Fiocchi et al 2009       54.15       16.84       14       49.86       16.13       14       0.1%       4.07 [-7.74, 16.68]         Jin et al 2001       39.65       6.7       64       34.24       6.1       64       4.76 [-7.74, 16.68]       4.01         Kirschbaum et al 2012       54       12       43       50       11       40.0 [-0.27, 8.87]       4.00 [-0.27, 8.87]       4.00 [-0.27, 8.87]       4.00 [-0.	Danchin et al 1996	60.14	13.18	55	54.38	13.6	55	2.0%	5,76 (0,75, 10,77)	
Dzavik et al 2001       62.5       11.6       139       62       11.5       139       4.2%       0.50 [-2.2, 3.22]         El shafey et al 2015       54.4       5.52       37       52.75       5.56       37       4.5%       1.66 [-0.87, 4.17]         Engelstein et al 1994       62.57       10.75       49       56.9       6.9       49       3.2%       5.67 [2.09, 9.25]         Erdogan et al 2013       58.32       10.2       118       56.31       9.81       118       4.4%       2.01 [-0.54, 4.56]         Fang et al 2005       52.8       10.2       119       44.7       10.9       19       1.3%       8.10 [1.39, 14.81]         Find et al 2005       58.77       15.76       129       5.62       16.19       129       2.8%       2.57 [-1.3, 6.47]         Find et al 2009       54.15       16.84       14       49.88       16.13       14       0.4%       4.04 [-7.74, 16.68]         Vanhoe et al 2001       39.65       6.7       64       34.24       61       64       4.9%       5.41 [3.19, 7.63]       -         Kirschbaum et al 2008       63       11       21       6.4       4.00 [-2.23, 10.23]       -         Mori et al 1996	Daniłowicz-Szymanowicz et al 2014	55.48	8.42	23	50.05	7.95	23	2.2%	5.43 [0.70, 10.16]	
El shafey et al 2015       54.4       5.52       37       52.75       5.56       37       4.5%       1.65 [-0.87, 4.17]         Engelstein et al 1994       62.57       10.75       49       56.9       49       3.2%       5.67 [2.09, 9.25]         Erdogan et al 2013       58.32       10.2       118       56.31       9.81       118       4.4%       2.01 [-0.54, 4.56]         Ermis et al 2005       58.77       15.76       129       56.2       16.19       129       2.8%       2.57 [+1.33, 6.47]         Fiocchi et al 2009       54.15       16.84       14       49.88       16.13       14       0.4%       4.47 [-7.4, 16.68]         Jan et al 2001       39.65       6.7       64       34.24       6.1       64       4.9%       5.41 [3.19, 7.63]         Kirschbaum et al 2012       54       12       43       50       11       43       2.1%       4.00 [-2.23, 10.23]         Mori et al 1987       63       9       20       59       11       20       1.4%       4.00 [-2.23, 10.23]       -         Mori et al 1986       44.8       10.9       96       40.47       9.41       96       4.0%       4.33 [1.45, 7.21]       - <td< td=""><td>Dzavik et al 2001</td><td>62.5</td><td>11.6</td><td>139</td><td>62</td><td>11.5</td><td>139</td><td>4.2%</td><td>0.50 [-2.22, 3.22]</td><td>+</td></td<>	Dzavik et al 2001	62.5	11.6	139	62	11.5	139	4.2%	0.50 [-2.22, 3.22]	+
Engelstein et al 1994       62.57       10.75       49       56.9       6.9       49       3.2%       5.67       [2.09, 9.25]	El shafey et al 2015	54.4	5.52	37	52.75	5.56	37	4.5%	1.65 [-0.87, 4.17]	+
Erdogan et al 2013       58.32       10.2       118       56.31       9.81       118       4.4%       2.01 [-0.54, 4.56]         Ermis et al 2005       52.8       10.2       19       44.7       10.9       19       1.3%       8.10 [1.39, 14.81]         Fang et al 2005       58.77       15.76       129       56.2       16.19       129       2.8%       2.57 [-1.33, 6.47]         Flocchi et al 2009       54.15       16.84       14       49.86       16.13       14       0.4%       4.47 [-7.74, 16.68]         Vanhoe et al 1992       56       10       175       55       10       242       5.4%       1.00 [-0.94, 2.94]         Jin et al 2012       54       12       43       50       11       43       2.1%       4.00 [-0.87, 8.87]         Kirschbaum et al 2012       54       12       43       50       11       43       2.1%       4.00 [-0.27, 10.23]         Mori et al 1987       63       9       20       59       11       20       1.4%       4.00 [-2.23, 10.23]         Omura et al 2013       56       13       168       55       13       168       4.1%       1.00 [-1.78, 3.76]         Paviovic et al 2005       48.7 </td <td>Engelstein et al 1994</td> <td>62.57</td> <td>10.75</td> <td>49</td> <td>56.9</td> <td>6.9</td> <td>49</td> <td>3.2%</td> <td>5.67 [2.09, 9.25]</td> <td>+</td>	Engelstein et al 1994	62.57	10.75	49	56.9	6.9	49	3.2%	5.67 [2.09, 9.25]	+
Ermis et al 2005       52.8       10.2       19       44.7       10.9       19       1.3%       8.10 [1.39, 14.81]         Fang et al 2005       58.77       15.76       129       56.2       16.19       129       2.8%       2.57 [-1.33, 6.47]         Flocchi et al 2009       54.15       16.84       14       49.68       16.13       14       0.4%       4.47 [-7.74, 16.68]         Wanhoe et al 1992       56       10       175       55       10       242       5.4%       1.00 [-0.94, 2.94]         Jin et al 2001       39.65       6.7       64       34.24       6.1       64       4.9%       5.41 [3.19, 7.63]         Kirschbaum et al 2012       54       12       43       50       11       43       2.1%       4.00 [-0.87, 8.87]         Melchior et al 1987       63       9       20       59       11       20       1.4%       4.00 [-2.23, 10.23]       -         Mori et al 1996       44.8       10.9       96       40.47       9.41       96       4.0%       4.33 [1.45, 7.21]       -         Nakashi et al 2017       56.1       10.6       55       13       168       4.1%       1.00 [-1.78, 3.78]       -	Erdogan et al 2013	58.32	10.2	118	56.31	9.81	118	4.4%	2.01 [-0.54, 4.56]	+
Fang et al 2005       58.77       15.76       129       56.2       16.19       129       2.8%       2.57       [1.33, 6.47]         Flocchi et al 2009       54.15       16.84       14       49.68       16.13       14       0.4%       4.47       [7.7,4] f.6.68]         Jun et al 2001       39.65       66       10       175       55       10       242       5.4%       1.00 [-0.94, 2.94]         Jun et al 2003       63       11       21       60       9       21       1.5%       3.00 [-3.08, 9.08]         Kirschbaum et al 2012       54       12       43       50       11       43       2.1%       4.00 [-0.27, 8.87]         Melchior et al 1987       63       9       20       59       11       20       1.4%       4.00 [-0.27, 8.87]         Nakashi et al 2017       56.1       10.6       59       54.2       12.1       59       2.7%       1.90 [-2.20, 6.00]         Omura et al 2013       56       13       168       57.3       9.9       58       3.4%       2.80 [-0.52, 6.12]       Pavoice 1.1.44         Pavoice et al 2005       48.7       8.11       35       41.7       8.11       35       2.9%       7.00 [3.20, 10.	Ermis et al 2005	52.8	10.2	19	44.7	10.9	19	1.3%	8.10 [1.39, 14.81]	
Fiocchi et al 2009       54.15       16.84       14       49.68       16.13       14       0.4%       4.47 [-7.74, 16.68]         Ivanhoe et al 1992       56       10       175       55       10       242       5.4%       1.00 [-0.94, 2.94]         Jin et al 2001       39.65       6.7       64       34.24       6.1       64       4.9%       5.41 [3.19, 7.63]         Kirschbaum et al 2012       54       12       43       50       11       43       2.1%       4.00 [-0.87, 8.87]         Melchior et al 1987       63       9       20       59       11       43       2.1%       4.00 [-0.87, 8.87]         Nakashi et al 2017       56.1       10.6       59       54.2       12.1       59       2.7%       1.90 [-2.20, 6.00]         Omura et al 2013       56       13       168       55       13       168       4.1%       1.00 [-1.78, 3.78]         park et al 2012       60.1       8.3       56       13       168       2.9%       7.00 [3.20, 10.80]          Pulades et al 2013       65       11.5       35       62       12.2       33       1.6%       3.00 [-3.72, 8.72]          Simes et al 2013	Fang et al 2005	58.77	15.76	129	56.2	16.19	129	2.8%	2.57 [-1.33, 6.47]	+-
Ivanhoe et al 1992       56       10       175       55       10       242       5.4%       1.00       [-0.94, 2.94]         Jin et al 2001       39.65       6.7       64       34.24       6.1       64       4.9%       5.41       [3.19, 7.63]       *         Kirschbaum et al 2012       54       12       43       50       11       43       2.1%       4.00       [-0.23, 10.23]       *         Melchior et al 1987       63       9       20       59       11       20       1.4%       4.00       [-2.23, 10.23]       *         Mori et al 2917       66.1       10.6       59       54.2       12.1       59       2.7%       1.90       [-2.20, 6.00]       *         Omura et al 2017       56.1       10.6       55       13       168       4.1%       1.00       [-1.78, 3.78]       *         Park et al 2012       60.1       8.3       58       57.3       9.9       58       3.4%       2.80       [-0.52, 6.12]       *         Parkovic et al 2009       47.86       15.355       20       45.66       14.45       20       0.7%       2.20 [-7.04, 11.44]       *       *         Pujadas et al 2013       65	Fiocchi et al 2009	54.15	16.84	14	49.68	16.13	14	0.4%	4.47 [-7.74, 16.68]	
Jin et al 2001       39.65       6.7       64       34.24       6.1       64       4.9%       5.41 [3.19, 7.63]       +         Kirschbaum et al 2008       63       11       21       60       9       21       1.5%       3.00 [-3.08, 9.08]       +         Kirschbaum et al 2012       54       12       43       50       11       43       2.1%       4.00 [-0.87, 8.87]         Melchior et al 1987       63       9       20       59       11       20       1.4%       4.00 [-2.23, 10.23]         Mori et al 1996       44.8       10.9       96       40.47       9.41       96       4.0%       4.33 [1.45, 7.21]       +         Nakashi et al 2017       56.1       10.6       59       54.2       12.1       59       2.7%       1.90 [-2.20, 6.00]       +         Omura et al 2013       56       13       168       4.1%       1.00 [-1.78, 3.78]       +         Park et al 2012       60.1       8.3       58       57.3       9.9       58       3.4%       2.80 [-0.52, 6.12]       +         Parkovic et al 2009       47.86       15.355       20       45.66       14.45       20       0.7%       2.20 [-7.04, 11.44]       +	lvanhoe et al 1992	56	10	175	55	10	242	5.4%	1.00 [-0.94, 2.94]	+
Kirschbaum et al 2008       63       11       21       60       9       21       1.5%       3.00 [-3.08, 9.08]         Kirschbaum et al 2012       54       12       43       50       11       43       2.1%       4.00 [-0.27, 8.87]         Melchior et al 1987       63       9       20       59       11       20       1.4%       4.00 [-0.27, 8.87]         Mori et al 1987       63       9       20       59       11       20       1.4%       4.00 [-0.27, 8.87]         Mori et al 1986       44.8       10.9       96       40.47       9.41       96       4.0%       4.33 [1.45, 7.21]         Nakashi et al 2017       56.1       10.6       59       54.2       12.1       59       2.7%       1.90 [-2.20, 6.00]         Omura et al 2013       56       13       168       57.3       9.9       58       3.4%       2.80 [-0.52, 6.12]         Paviovic et al 2009       47.86       15.355       20       45.66       14.45       20       0.7%       2.20 [-7.04, 11.44]         Piscione et al 2013       65       11.5       33       62       12.2       33       1.6%       3.00 [-3.72, 8.72]         Roifman et al 2013       54.3	Jin et al 2001	39.65	6.7	64	34.24	6.1	64	4.9%	5.41 [3.19, 7.63]	+
Kirschbaum et al 2012       54       12       43       50       11       43       2.1%       4.00 [-0.87, 8.87]         Metchior et al 1987       63       9       20       59       11       20       1.4%       4.00 [-0.87, 8.87]         Mori et al 1996       44.8       10.9       96       40.47       9.41       96       4.0%       4.33 [1.45, 7.21]       +         Nakashi et al 2017       56.1       10.6       59       54.2       12.1       59       2.7%       1.90 [-2.20, 6.00]       +         Omura et al 2013       56       13       168       55       13       168       4.1%       1.00 [-1.78, 3.78]       +         Park et al 2012       60.1       8.3       58       57.3       9.9       58       3.4%       2.80 [-0.52, 6.12]       +         Pavlovic et al 2009       47.86       15.355       20       45.66       1.45       20       0.7%       2.20 [-0.52, 6.12]       +         Pavlovic et al 2005       48.7       8.11       35       41.7       8.11       35       2.9%       7.00 [3.20, 10.80]       +         Stima et al 2013       65       11.5       33       62       12.2       33       1.6% <td>Kirschbaum et al 2008</td> <td>63</td> <td>11</td> <td>21</td> <td>60</td> <td>9</td> <td>21</td> <td>1.5%</td> <td>3.00 [-3.08, 9.08]</td> <td>+</td>	Kirschbaum et al 2008	63	11	21	60	9	21	1.5%	3.00 [-3.08, 9.08]	+
Melchior et al 1987       63       9       20       59       11       20       1.4%       4.00 [-2.23, 10.23]         Mori et al 1996       44.8       10.9       96       40.47       9.41       96       4.0%       4.33 [1.45, 7.21]       +         Nakashi et al 2017       56.1       10.6       59       54.2       12.1       59       2.7%       1.90 [-2.20, 6.00]       +         Omura et al 2013       56       13       168       55       13       168       4.1%       1.00 [-7.8, 3.78]       +         Pavlovic et al 2009       47.86       15.355       20       45.66       14.45       20       0.7%       2.20 [-7.04, 11.44]       +         Pujadas et al 2013       65       11.5       33       62       12.2       33       1.6%       3.00 [-2.72, 8.72]       +         Roifman et al 2013       54.3       10.7       19       50.3       12.6       19       1.1%       4.00 [-3.43, 11.43]       +         Simes et al 1998       67       11       95       62       13       95       3.3%       5.00 [1.58, 8.42]       +         Stuijtzand et al 2017       59.2       15       35       57.7       15.9       3.7 </td <td>Kirschbaum et al 2012</td> <td>54</td> <td>12</td> <td>43</td> <td>50</td> <td>11</td> <td>43</td> <td>2.1%</td> <td>4.00 [-0.87, 8.87]</td> <td></td>	Kirschbaum et al 2012	54	12	43	50	11	43	2.1%	4.00 [-0.87, 8.87]	
Mori et al 1996       44.8       10.9       96       40.47       9.41       96       4.0%       4.33 [1.45, 7.21]       -         Nakashi et al 2017       56.1       10.6       59       54.2       12.1       59       2.7%       1.90 [-2.20, 6.00]       -         Omura et al 2013       56       13       168       55       13       168       4.1%       1.00 [-1.78, 3.78]       -         park et al 2012       60.1       8.3       58       57.3       9.9       58       3.4%       2.80 [-0.52, 6.12]       -         Pavlovic et al 2009       47.86       15.355       20       45.66       14.45       20       0.7%       2.20 [-7.04, 11.44]       -         Piscione et al 2005       48.7       8.11       35       41.7       8.11       35       2.9%       7.00 [3.20, 10.80]       -         Pujadas et al 2013       65       11.5       33       62       12.2       33       1.6%       3.00 [-2.72, 8.72]       -         Simes et al 1998       67       11       95       3.26       19       1.1%       4.00 [-3.43, 11.43]       -         Stuijtzand et al 2017       59.2       15       35       57.7       15.9 <td< td=""><td>Melchior et al 1987</td><td>63</td><td>9</td><td>20</td><td>59</td><td>11</td><td>20</td><td>1.4%</td><td>4.00 [-2.23, 10.23]</td><td>+</td></td<>	Melchior et al 1987	63	9	20	59	11	20	1.4%	4.00 [-2.23, 10.23]	+
Nakashi et al 2017       56.1       10.6       59       54.2       12.1       59       2.7%       1.90 [-2.20, 6.00]         Omura et al 2013       56       13       168       55       13       168       4.1%       1.00 [-1.78, 3.78]         park et al 2012       60.1       8.3       58       57.3       9.9       58       3.4%       2.80 [-0.52, 6.12]         Pavlovic et al 2009       47.86       15.355       20       45.66       14.45       20       0.7%       2.20 [-7.04, 11.44]         Piscione et al 2005       48.7       8.11       35       41.7       8.11       35       2.9%       7.00 [3.20, 10.80]         Pujadas et al 2013       65       11.5       33       62       12.2       33       1.6%       3.00 [-2.72, 8.72]         Solme et al 2013       54.3       10.7       19       50.3       12.6       19       1.1%       4.00 [-3.43, 11.43]         Simes et al 1998       67       11       95       62       13       95       3.3%       5.00 [1.58, 8.42]       +         sotomi et al 2017       59.2       15       35       57.7       15.9       37       1.1%       1.50 [-5.64, 8.64]       + <t< td=""><td>Mori et al 1996</td><td>44.8</td><td>10.9</td><td>96</td><td>40.47</td><td>9.41</td><td>96</td><td>4.0%</td><td>4.33 [1.45, 7.21]</td><td>+</td></t<>	Mori et al 1996	44.8	10.9	96	40.47	9.41	96	4.0%	4.33 [1.45, 7.21]	+
Omura et al 2013       56       13       168       55       13       168       4.1%       1.00 [-1.78, 3.78]         park et al 2012       60.1       8.3       58       57.3       9.9       58       3.4%       2.80 [-0.52, 6.12]         Pavlovic et al 2009       47.86       15.55       20       45.66       14.45       20       0.7%       2.20 [-7.04, 11.44]         Piscione et al 2005       48.7       8.11       35       41.7       8.11       35       2.9%       7.00 [3.20, 10.80]         Pujadas et al 2013       65       11.5       33       62       12.2       33       1.6%       3.00 [-7.2, 8.72]         Roifman et al 2013       54.3       10.7       19       50.3       12.6       19       1.1%       4.00 [-3.43, 11.43]         Simes et al 1998       67       11       95       62       13       95       3.3%       5.00 [1.58, 8.42]       +         sotomi et al 2017       59.2       15       35       57.7       15.9       37       1.1%       1.50 [-5.64, 8.64]       +         Sun et al 2012       11.2       7.638       99       46.4       11       69       3.0%       1.10 [-2.64, 4.84]       +      <	Nakashi et al 2017	56.1	10.6	59	54.2	12.1	59	2.7%	1.90 [-2.20, 6.00]	+
park et al 2012       60.1       8.3       58       57.3       9.9       58       3.4%       2.80 [-0.52, 6.12]         Pavlovic et al 2009       47.86       15.355       20       45.66       14.45       20       0.7%       2.20 [-7.04, 11.44]         Piscione et al 2005       48.7       8.11       35       41.7       8.11       35       2.9%       7.00 [3.20, 10.80]         Pujadas et al 2013       65       11.5       33       62       12.2       33       1.6%       3.00 [-7.2, 8.72]         Roifman et al 2013       54.3       10.7       19       50.3       12.6       19       1.1%       4.00 [-3.43, 11.43]         Sirnes et al 1998       67       11       95       62       13       95       3.3%       5.00 [1.58, 8.42]       +         sotomi et al 2017       59.2       15       35       57.7       15.9       37       1.1%       1.50 [-5.64, 8.64]       +         Stuijtizand et al 2017       47.5       11.4       69       46.4       11       69       3.0%       1.10 [-2.64, 4.84]       +         Valenti et al 2012       7.638       99       46.8       9.34       93       4.7%       4.40 [2.02, 6.78]       +	Omura et al 2013	56	13	168	55	13	168	4.1%	1.00 [-1.78, 3.78]	+
Pavlovic et al 2009       47.86       15.355       20       45.66       14.45       20       0.7%       2.20 [-7.04, 11.44]         Piscione et al 2005       48.7       8.11       35       41.7       8.11       35       2.9%       7.00 [3.20, 10.80]	park et al 2012	60.1	8.3	58	57.3	9.9	58	3.4%	2.80 [-0.52, 6.12]	+
Piscione et al 2005       48.7       8.11       35       41.7       8.11       35       2.9%       7.00 [3.20, 10.80]	Pavlovic et al 2009	47.86	15.355	20	45.66	14.45	20	0.7%	2.20 [-7.04, 11.44]	
Pujadas et al 2013       65       11.5       33       62       12.2       33       1.6%       3.00 [-2.72, 8.72]         Roifman et al 2013       54.3       10.7       19       50.3       12.6       19       1.1%       4.00 [-3.43, 11.43]         Simes et al 1998       67       11       95       62       13       95       3.3%       5.00 [1.58, 8.42]       **         sotomi et al 2017       59.2       15       35       57.7       15.9       37       1.1%       1.50 [-5.64, 8.64]       **         Suipitzand et al 2017       47.5       11.4       69       46.4       11       69       3.0%       1.10 [-2.64, 4.84]       **         Sun et al 2012       51.2       7.638       99       46.8       9.34       99       4.7%       4.40 [2.02, 6.78]       **         Valenti et al 2008       46.5       11.3       290       42.2       12.1       290       5.4%       4.30 [2.39, 6.21]       *         Werner et al 2005       67       16       119       60       19       119       2.4%       7.00 [2.54, 11.46]       *	Piscione et al 2005	48.7	8.11	35	41.7	8.11	35	2.9%	7.00 [3.20, 10.80]	
Roifman et al 2013       54.3       10.7       19       50.3       12.6       19       1.1%       4.00 [-3.43, 11.43]         Simes et al 1998       67       11       95       62       13       95       3.3%       5.00 [1.58, 8.42]       +         sotomi et al 2017       59.2       15       35       57.7       15.9       37       1.1%       1.50 [-5.64, 8.64]       +         Stuijfizand et al 2017       47.5       11.4       69       46.4       11       69       3.0%       1.10 [-2.64, 4.84]       +         Sun et al 2012       51.2       7.638       99       46.8       9.34       99       4.7%       4.40 [2.02, 6.78]       +         Valenti et al 2008       46.5       11.3       290       42.2       12.1       290       5.4%       4.30 [2.39, 6.21]       +         Werner et al 2005       67       16       119       60       19       119       2.4%       7.00 [2.54, 11.46]       +	Pujadas et al 2013	65	11.5	33	62	12.2	33	1.6%	3.00 [-2.72, 8.72]	+
Sirnes et al 1998       67       11       95       62       13       95       3.3%       5.00 [1.58, 8.42]       +         sotomi et al 2017       59.2       15       35       57.7       15.9       37       1.1%       1.50 [-5.64, 8.64]       +         Stuijfizand et al 2017       47.5       11.4       69       46.4       11       69       3.0%       1.10 [-2.64, 4.84]       +         Sun et al 2012       51.2       7.638       99       46.8       9.34       99       4.7%       4.40 [2.02, 6.78]       +         Valenti et al 2008       46.5       11.3       290       42.2       12.1       290       5.4%       4.30 [2.39, 6.21]       +         Werner et al 2005       67       16       119       60       19       119       2.4%       7.00 [2.54, 11.46]       -	Roifman et al 2013	54.3	10.7	19	50.3	12.6	19	1.1%	4.00 [-3.43, 11.43]	+
sotomi et al 2017       59.2       15       35       57.7       15.9       37       1.1%       1.50 [-5.64, 8.64]         Stuijtzand et al 2017       47.5       11.4       69       46.4       11       69       3.0%       1.10 [-2.64, 4.84]         Sun et al 2012       51.2       7.638       99       46.8       9.34       99       4.7%       4.40 [2.02, 6.78]       +         Valenti et al 2008       46.5       11.3       290       42.2       12.1       290       5.4%       4.30 [2.39, 6.21]       +         Werner et al 2005       67       16       119       60       19       119       2.4%       7.00 [2.54, 11.46]       -	Sirnes et al 1998	67	11	95	62	13	95	3.3%	5.00 [1.58, 8.42]	+
Stuijfzand et al 2017       47.5       11.4       69       46.4       11       69       3.0%       1.10 [-2.64, 4.84]       -         Sun et al 2012       51.2       7.638       99       46.8       9.34       99       4.7%       4.40 [2.02, 6.78]       +         Valenti et al 2008       46.5       11.3       290       42.2       12.1       290       5.4%       4.30 [2.39, 6.21]       +         Werner et al 2005       67       16       119       60       19       119       2.4%       7.00 [2.54, 11.46]	sotomi et al 2017	59.2	15	35	57.7	15.9	37	1.1%	1.50 [-5.64, 8.64]	+-
Sun et al 2012       51.2       7.638       99       46.8       9.34       99       4.7%       4.40 [2.02, 6.78]       +         Valenti et al 2008       46.5       11.3       290       42.2       12.1       290       5.4%       4.30 [2.39, 6.21]       +         Werner et al 2005       67       16       119       60       19       119       2.4%       7.00 [2.54, 11.46]	Stuijfzand et al 2017	47.5	11.4	69	46.4	11	69	3.0%	1.10 [-2.64, 4.84]	+
Valenti et al 2008         46.5         11.3         290         42.2         12.1         290         5.4%         4.30 [2.39, 6.21]         +           Werner et al 2005         67         16         119         60         19         119         2.4%         7.00 [2.54, 11.46]	Sun et al 2012	51.2	7.638	99	46.8	9.34	99	4.7%	4.40 [2.02, 6.78]	+
Werner et al 2005 67 16 119 60 19 119 2.4% 7.00 [2.54, 11.46]	Valenti et al 2008	46.5	11.3	290	42.2	12.1	290	5.4%	4.30 [2.39, 6.21]	•
	Werner et al 2005	67	16	119	60	19	119	2.4%	7.00 [2.54, 11.46]	
Total (95% Cl) 2735 2804 100.0% 3.84 [3.01, 4.67]	Total (95% CI)			2735			2804	100.0%	3.84 [3.01, 4.67]	1
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 2.34; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 59.50, df = 33 (P = 0.003); i <sup>2</sup> = 45%	Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 2.34; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 59.	50, df = 3	33 (P = 0.	003); i	<sup>2</sup> = 45%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 9.09 (P < 0.00001) -100 -50 U 50 100	Test for overall effect: Z = 9.09 (P < 0.0	00001)	•							-100 -50 0 50 100

FIGURE 2 Forrest plot of studies evaluating the impact of successful CTO PCI on LVEF. The results are presented as mean LVEF difference after versus before successful CTO PCI. CTO, chronic total occlusion; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention

remodeling. Conversely, failed CTO PCI was not associated with improvement in LVEF.

Our results are in contrast with the results of the only randomizedcontrolled trial published to date examining the impact of CTO PCI on LV function and volume that did not demonstrate any difference between the CTO PCI and medical therapy only groups. Similarly, the Recovery of left ventricular function in Chronic total occlusion (REVASC) trial (presented at the TCT 2017 meeting, Denver, Colorado) randomized 205 patients to CTO PCI versus medical therapy alone and showed no difference in LVEF during a median follow-up of 6 month. Potential explanations for the discrepancy between observational and randomized studies include: (a) inclusion of patients with recent ST-segment elevation acute myocardial infarction in the EXPLORE

trial; (b) inclusion of patients with 100% successful CTO recanalization in the observational studies, whereas CTO PCI success was 73% in EXPLORE: (c) short duration of follow-up (4 months in EXPLORE. 6 months in REVASC vs 7.9 months in the studies included in the metaanalysis studies). In patients with chronic ischemic LV dysfunction, improvement of dysfunctional but viable myocardium may not occur until after 3-6 months from revascularization.<sup>12</sup> However, Bondarenko et al studied the time course of functional recovery after revascularization of hibernating myocardium on 35 patients using contrastenhanced CMR. Functional myocardial recovery started at 3-6 months with continuing improvement up to 24 months, suggesting that recovery of systolic function can be further delayed up to 24 months, especially in myocardial segments with higher extent of

WILEY- Interventional Cardiology



FIGURE 3 Forrest plot of studies evaluating the impact of failed CTO PCI LVEF. The results are presented as mean LVEF difference after versus before failed CTO PCI. CTO, chronic total occlusion; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention

Forrest plot of studies evaluating the impact of successful CTO PCI on LVESV.

	After	CTO P	CI	Befor	e CTO F	PCI		Mean Difference		Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI		IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
Bucciarelli et al 2016	56	38	50	65	38	50	1.8%	-9.00 [-23.90, 5.90]			
cardona et 2016	143	58	29	160	54	29	0.5%	-17.00 [-45.84, 11.84]		10	
Chadid et al 2015	81	47	43	89	41	43	1.1%	-8.00 [-26.64, 10.64]			
El shafey et al 2015	48.14	8.96	37	51.59	10.86	37	18.9%	-3.45 [-7.99, 1.09]			
Erdogan et al 2013	31.63	16.22	118	34.54	16.49	118	22.4%	-2.91 [-7.08, 1.26]		-	
Fiocchi et al 2009	85.53	52.35	14	91.6	50.05	14	0.3%	-6.07 [-44.01, 31.87]			
Nakashi et al 2017	52.4	11.6	59	52.1	13.4	59	19.1%	0.30 [-4.22, 4.82]		+	
Pavlovic et al 2009	127.53	75.45	20	130.03	70.96	20	0.2%	-2.50 [-47.89, 42.89]			
Pujadas et al 2013	56	38.6	33	60	34.9	33	1.2%	-4.00 [-21.75, 13.75]			
Sun et al 2012	58.25	11.43	99	65.32	12.64	99	34.6%	-7.07 [-10.43, -3.71]		( <b>*</b>	
Total (95% CI)			502			502	100.0%	-4.09 [-6.06, -2.12]		•	
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8	.40, df = 9	-100	-50 0 50	100							
Test for overall effect. Z	= 4.06 (P	< 0.000	,,,							LVESV decrease LVESV increase	

Forrest plot of studies evaluating the impact of successful CTO revascularization on LVEDV

	After	CTO P	CI	Befor	e CTO F	PCI		Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
Bucciarelli et al 2016	161	42	50	166	42	50	4.4%	-5.00 [-21.46, 11.46]		
cardona et 2016	221	58	29	230	64	29	1.2%	-9.00 [-40.44, 22.44]	1 <del></del>	
Chadid et al 2015	160	56	43	169	49	43	2.4%	-9.00 [-31.24, 13.24]		
El shafey et al 2015	114.36	14.16	37	115.24	14.96	37	26.8%	-0.88 [-7.52, 5.76]	-	
Erdogan et al 2013	71.98	22.64	118	76.22	22.55	118	35.5%	-4.24 [-10.01, 1.53]		
Fiocchi et al 2009	163.78	10.7	14	162.31	9.62	14	20.8%	1.47 [-6.07, 9.01]		
Nakashi et al 2017	99.1	38.8	59	102	40.1	59	5.8%	-2.90 [-17.14, 11.34]		
Pavlovic et al 2009	210.86	84.81	20	218.33	83.69	20	0.4%	-7.47 [-59.69, 44.75]		
Pujadas et al 2013	149	46.8	33	153	38.9	33	2.7%	-4.00 [-24.76, 16.76]		
Total (95% CI)			403			403	100.0%	-2.29 [-5.72, 1.15]	•	
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 2	.27, df = 8	B(P = 0.)	97); I² =	: 0%						
i est for overall effect: Z	.= 1.30 (P	' = 0.19)	1						LVEDV decrease LVEDV increase	

**FIGURE 4** Forrest plot of studies evaluating the impact of successful CTO PCI on LVESV and LVEDV. The results as presented as mean LVESV/LVEDV difference after versus before CTO PCI. CTO, chronic total occlusion; LVESV, left ventricular end-systolic volume; LVEDV, left ventricular end-diastolic volume; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention

hyperenhancement.<sup>47</sup> Detection of changes in LV function may, therefore, require long-term follow-up after revascularization particularly in CTO patients with higher ischemic burden and higher extent of hyperenhancement at baseline.

A previous meta-analysis of 34 studies with 2310 patients on the impact of CTO PCI on LV size and function was performed in 2015 by Hoebers et al and showed a statistically significant increase in LVEF (4.44%) and decrease in LVEDV index (6.14 mL/m<sup>2</sup>) as compared with baseline.<sup>48</sup> The findings of our larger meta-analysis are consistent with the Hoebers meta-analysis on the impact of CTO PCI on LV ejection fraction, however we did not have enough data regarding LV end diastolic volume to detect the effect of successful CTO PCI. Our results reported the change in LVEDV not the LVEDV index as it is reported more frequently in the included studies. Our analysis included more recent studies including higher number of patients. We also included more studies using CMR for quantification of volumes.

The effect of CTO PCI on LVEF may be more pronounced in patients with depressed LVEF. Most studies excluded patients with severely depressed LV function. Our subgroup analysis comparing studies with baseline LVEF lower than 50% versus those with baseline LVEF  $\geq$  50% suggests that patients with lower LVEF tend to have larger improvement in LV systolic function (5.0% vs 2.6%, *P* = 0.003). Cardona et al in 2016

studied 29 patients with systolic heart failure and demonstrated 6.4% improvement in LVEF after successful CTO PCI, with concomitant improvement in New York Heart Association functional class, angina, and brain natriuretic peptide levels.<sup>16</sup> Moreover, subgroup analyses of other studies have shown that the most improvement of LVEF is achieved when baseline LVEF is below 50%.<sup>13,17,19</sup>

Some of the studies included in the meta-analysis defined "CTOs" as lesions with <3 months occlusion duration, which is the currently accepted threshold for a lesion to be characterized as CTO. When restricting our analyses to studies with documented CTO duration of at least 3 months and with follow up duration of at least 3 months significant improvement in LVEF was shown (4.31%, 95%CI [3.08, 5.55], P < 0.00001) in 1248 patients 15 studies.<sup>15-20,24,29,33,6,38,40,41,44,45</sup>

## 4.1 | Study limitations

Our study has important limitations. There was moderate degree of heterogeneity in our primary analysis. This could be explained by difference in cohort sizes, definition of CTO, CTO location, imaging modality and follow-up duration. However, we used random-effects



	Afte	er CTO P	CI	Befo	ore CTO F	ID		Mean Difference	Mean Difference			
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl		IV, Random, 95% Cl		
Bucciarelli et al 2016	67	12	50	62	13	50	4.8%	5.00 [0.10, 9.90]		-		
cardona et 2016	37.7	8	29	31.3	7.4	29	6.4%	6.40 [2.43, 10.37]		-		
Chadid et al 2015	51.5	10.8	43	49.1	10.4	43	5.4%	2.40 [-2.08, 6.88]		+		
chen et al 2009	54	8	132	45	11	132	11.5%	9.00 [6.68, 11.32]		•		
choi et al 2017	51.6	12.5	305	47.8	12.3	305	12.9%	3.80 [1.83, 5.77]		•		
Chung et al 2003	57.44	17.93	75	53.28	16.004	75	4.1%	4.16 [-1.28, 9.60]				
El shafey et al 2015	54.4	5.52	37	52.75	5.56	37	10.7%	1.65 [-0.87, 4.17]		+		
Fiocchi et al 2009	54.15	16.84	14	49.68	16.13	14	1.0%	4.47 [-7.74, 16.68]				
Kirschbaum et al 2012	54	12	43	50	11	43	4.8%	4.00 [-0.87, 8.87]				
Nakashi et al 2017	56.1	10.6	59	54.2	12.1	59	6.2%	1.90 [-2.20, 6.00]		+		
Pavlovic et al 2009	47.86	15.355	20	45.66	14.45	20	1.6%	2.20 [-7.04, 11.44]				
Pujadas et al 2013	65	11.5	33	62	12.2	33	3.7%	3.00 [-2.72, 8.72]				
Roifman et al 2013	54.3	10.7	19	50.3	12.6	19	2.4%	4.00 [-3.43, 11.43]		+		
Sun et al 2012	51.2	7.638	99	46.8	9.34	99	11.2%	4.40 [2.02, 6.78]		*		
Valenti et al 2008	46.5	11.3	290	42.2	12.1	290	13.2%	4.30 [2.39, 6.21]		•		
Total (95% CI)			1248			1248	100.0%	4.31 [3.08, 5.55]		•		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 2.0	)5; Chi² =	= 23.74, 0	df = 14	(P = 0.0)	5); l² = 41	%			100			
Test for overall effect: Z =	6.85 (P	< 0.0000	1)						-100	-50 0 50 100		
	•									LVER worsening LVER improvement		

**FIGURE 5** Forrest plot of subgroup analysis of studies with baseline LVEF <50% versus studies with baseline LVEF 50% or more evaluating the impact of successful CTO PCI on LVEF. The results as presented as mean LVEF difference after versus before CTO PCI. CTO, chronic total occlusion; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention

model and performed multiple sensitivity and subgroup analyses that provided consistent results. Second, it is possible that the improvement of LVEF after successful CTO PCI may result from appropriate medical therapy, yet in our analysis, failed CTO PCI was not associated with significant improvement in LVEF. However, the number of studies documenting LVEF before and after the failed procedure was limited (only 4 studies including 70 patients) in comparison with studies describing successful procedures (34 studies, 2735 patients). Third, there is a possibility that inter-observer variability in evaluating LVEF before and after revascularization could have affected our results. Finally, we did not evaluate clinical outcomes after successful CTO PCI. In patients with ischemic cardiomyopathy, Cioffi et al<sup>15</sup> demonstrated that reverse cardiac remodeling was associated with lower mortality (3%) compared with no reversal (22%).<sup>49</sup> Moreover, In the V-HeFT I and II studies, A 5% increase in ejection fraction was the best predictor of mortality.<sup>50</sup> However, the clinical implications of the 3.8% increase in LVEF and 4 mL decrease in LVESV remain unclear.

# 5 | CONCLUSIONS

Successful CTO PCI is associated with a statistically significant improvement in LV ejection fraction and decrease in LV end systolic

volume, suggesting a beneficial effect of CTO recanalization on LV systolic function and remodeling. More pronounced improvement in LV ejection fraction is achieved in patients with lower baseline LVEF. An extended follow up period might be required to detect further improvement in systolic function after successful CTO recanalization. The clinical implications of these findings warrant further investigation.

#### DISCLOSURES

Michael Megaly, Marwan Saad, Peter Tajti, MD, M. Nicholas Burke, MD, Ivan Chavez, MD, Mario Gössl, MD, PhD, Daniel Lips, MD, Michael Mooney, MD, Anil Poulose, MD, Jay Traverse, MD, Yale Wang, MD, Louis P. Kohl, MD, and Steven M. Bradley, MD, MPH, have nothing to disclose. Paul Sorajja, MD, consulting, speaking for Abbott, Edwards, Medtronic, and BSCI. Emmanouil Brilakis: consulting/speaker honoraria from Abbott Vascular, ACIST, American Heart Association (associate editor Circulation), Amgen, Asahi, Cardiovascular Innovations Foundation (Board of Directors), CSI, Elsevier, GE Healthcare, and Medtronic; research support from Boston Scientific and Osprey. Shareholder: MHI Ventures. Board of Trustees: Society of Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions.

# ORCID

Michael Megaly (b) http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3176-6677 Marwan Saad (b) http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2280-8030

#### REFERENCES

- Claessen BE, Dangas GD, Weisz G, et al. Prognostic impact of a chronic total occlusion in a non-infarct-related artery in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: 3-year results from the HORIZONS-AMI trial. *Eur Heart J.* 2012;33:768–775.
- Hoebers LP, Vis MM, Claessen BE, et al. The impact of multivessel disease with and without a co-existing chronic total occlusion on short-and long-term mortality in ST-elevation myocardial infarction patients with and without cardiogenic shock. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2013;15:425-432.
- Nombela-Franco L, Mitroi CD, Fernández-Lozano I, et al. Ventricular arrhythmias among implantable cardioverter-defibrillator recipients for primary prevention. *Circulation*. 2012;5:147–154.
- 4. Claessen BE, van der Schaaf RJ, Verouden NJ, et al. Evaluation of the effect of a concurrent chronic total occlusion on long-term mortality and left ventricular function in patients after primary percutaneous coronary intervention. *JACC*. 2009;2:1128–1134.
- Mehran R, Claessen BE, Godino C, et al. Long-term outcome of percutaneous coronary intervention for chronic total occlusions. JACC. 2011;4:952–961.
- Wilson W, Walsh S, Yan A, et al. Hybrid approach improves success of chronic total occlusion angioplasty. *Heart*. 2016;102:1486–1493.
- 7. Henriques JP, Hoebers LP, Råmunddal T, et al. Percutaneous intervention for concurrent chronic total occlusions in patients with STEMI: the EXPLORE trial. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2016;68: 1622-1632.
- Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. JAMA. 2000;283: 2008–2012.
- Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in metaanalyses. 2013. http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical\_epidemiol ogy/oxford.asp.
- Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ. 2003;327:557.
- 11. Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ.* 1997;315:629–634.
- 12. Bax JJ, Visser FC, Poldermans D, et al. Time course of functional recovery of stunned and hibernating segments after surgical revascularization. *Circulation*. 2001;104:I314–I318.
- Omura S, Takenaka K, Ejima E, et al. Effect of recanalization of chronic total occlusion on left ventricular function and exercise tolerance. *Am J Cardiol.* 2013;111:20B.
- Stuijfzand WJ, Biesbroek PS, Raijmakers PG, et al. Effects of successful percutaneous coronary intervention of chronic total occlusions on myocardial perfusion and left ventricular function. *EuroIntervention*. 2017;13:345.
- Bucciarelli-Ducci C, Auger D, Di Mario C, et al. CMR guidance for recanalization of coronary chronic total occlusion. JACC. 2016;9: 547–556.
- Cardona M, Martín V, Prat-Gonzalez S, et al. Benefits of chronic total coronary occlusion percutaneous intervention in patients with heart failure and reduced ejection fraction: insights from a cardiovascular magnetic resonance study. J Cardiovasc Magn Reson. 2016;18:78.
- Chadid P, Markovic S, Bernhardt P, Hombach V, Rottbauer W, Wöhrle J. Improvement of regional and global left ventricular function in magnetic resonance imaging after recanalization of true

coronary chronic total occlusions. Cardiovasc Revasc Med. 2015;16: 228-232.

- Chen S-I, Ye F, Zhang J-j, et al. Clinical outcomes of percutaneous coronary intervention for chronic total occlusion lesions in remote hospitals without on-site surgical support. *Chin Med J.* 2009;122: 2278–2285.
- Choi SY, Choi BG, Rha SW, et al. Percutaneous Coronary intervention versus optimal medical therapy for chronic total Coronary occlusion with well-Developed collaterals. J Am Heart Assoc. 2017;6:e006357.
- 20. Chung CM, Nakamura S, Tanaka K, et al. Effect of recanalization of chronic total occlusions on global and regional left ventricular function in patients with or without previous myocardial infarction. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. 2003;60:368–374.
- Danchin N, Angioï M, Cador R, et al. Effect of late percutaneous angioplastic recanalization of total coronary artery occlusion on left ventricular remodeling, ejection fraction, and regional wall motion. *Am J Cardiol.* 1996;78:729–735.
- Daniłowicz-Szymanowicz L, Pinna GD, Dorniak K, et al. The effect of chronically occluded coronary artery recanalisation on baroreflex sensitivity and left ventricular systolic function. *Kardiol Pol.* 2014;72:438-445.
- 23. Dzavik V, Carere RG, Mancini GJ, et al. Predictors of improvement in left ventricular function after percutaneous revascularization of occluded coronary arteries: a report from the Total Occlusion Study of Canada (TOSCA). Am Heart J. 2001;142:301–308.
- 24. El Shafey WH, Montaser SS, Badran HM, Gabr MK, Shokry KA, Galassi AR Assessment of left ventricular function before and after a percutanous coronary intervention to chronic total coronary occlusion: doppler tissue imaging study. *Menoufia Med J.* 2015;28:400.
- Engelstein E, Terres W, Hofmann D, Hansen L, Hamm C. Improved global and regional left ventricular function after angioplasty for chronic coronary occlusion. J Mol Med. 1994;72:442–447.
- Erdogan E, Akkaya M, Bacaksiz A, et al. Early assessment of percutaneous coronary interventions for chronic total occlusions analyzed by novel echocardiographic techniques. *Clinics.* 2013;68: 1333–1337.
- Ermis C, Boz A, Tholakanahalli V, et al. Assessment of percutaneous coronary intervention on regional and global left ventricular function in patients with chronic total occlusions. *Can J Cardiol.* 2005;21:275–280.
- Fang C-C, Jao YTFN, Chen Y, Wang S-P Coronary stenting or balloon angioplasty for chronic total coronary occlusions: the Taiwan experience (a single-center report). *Angiology*. 2005;56:525–537.
- Fiocchi F, Sgura F, Di Girolamo A, et al. Chronic total coronary occlusion in patients with intermediate viability: value of low-dose dobutamine and contrast-enhanced 3-T MRI in predicting functional recovery in patients undergoing percutaneous revascularisation with drug-eluting stent. *Radiol Med.* 2009;114:692–704.
- Ivanhoe RJ, Weintraub WS, Douglas JS, et al. Percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty of chronic total occlusions. Primary success, restenosis, and long-term clinical follow-up. *Circulation*. 1992;85:106-115.
- Jin J, Huang L, Wang H, et al. Value of myocardial regional perfusion on long-term function in collateral-dependent myocardium. *South Med J*. 2008;101:894.
- Kirschbaum SW, Baks T, van den Ent M, et al. Evaluation of left ventricular function three years after percutaneous recanalization of chronic total coronary occlusions. *Am J Cardiol.* 2008;101:179–185.
- Kirschbaum SW, Rossi A, Boersma E, et al. Combining magnetic resonance viability variables better predicts improvement of myocardial function prior to percutaneous coronary intervention. *Int J Cardiol.* 2012;159:192–197.
- Melchior J-P, Doriot PA, Chatelain P, et al. Improvement of left ventricular contraction and relaxation synchronism after recanalization of chronic total coronary occlusion by angioplasty. J Am Coll Cardiol. 1987;9:763–768.

- Mori M, Kurogane H, Hayashi T, et al. Comparison of results of intracoronary implantation of the Palmaz-Schatz stent with conventional balloon angioplasty in chronic total coronary arterial occlusion. *Am J Cardiol.* 1996;78:985–989.
- Nakachi T, Kato S, Kirigaya H, et al. Prediction of functional recovery after percutaneous coronary revascularization for chronic total occlusion using late gadolinium enhanced magnetic resonance imaging. J Cardiol. 2017;69:836–842.
- Park JJ, Chae I-H, Cho Y-S, et al. The recanalization of chronic total occlusion leads to lumen area increase in distal reference segments in selected patients: an intravascular ultrasound study. JACC. 2012;5: 827–836.
- Pavlovic SV, Sobic-Saranovic DP, Beleslin BD, et al. One-year followup of myocardial perfusion and function evaluated by gated SPECT MIBI in patients with earlier myocardial infarction and chronic total occlusion. *Nucl Med Commun.* 2009;30:68–75.
- Piscione F, Galasso G, De Luca G, et al. Late reopening of an occluded infarct related artery improves left ventricular function and long term clinical outcome. *Heart*. 2005;91:646–651.
- Pujadas S, Martin V, Rosselló X, et al. Improvement of myocardial function and perfusion after successful percutaneous revascularization in patients with chronic total coronary occlusion. *Int J Cardiol.* 2013;169:147–152.
- Roifman I, Paul GA, Zia MI, et al. The effect of percutaneous coronary intervention of chronically totally occluded coronary arteries on left ventricular global and regional systolic function. *Can J Cardiol.* 2013;29:1436–1442.
- Sirnes P, Myreng Y, Mølstad P, Bonarjee V, Golf S. Improvement in left ventricular ejection fraction and wall motion after successful recanalization of chronic coronary occlusions. *Eur Heart J.* 1998;19: 273–281.
- Sotomi Y, Okamura A, Iwakura K, et al. Impact of revascularization of coronary chronic total occlusion on left ventricular function and electrical stability: analysis by speckle tracking echocardiography and signal-averaged electrocardiogram. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2017;33: 815–823.
- Sun D, Wang J, Tian Y, et al. Multimodality imaging evaluation of functional and clinical benefits of percutaneous coronary intervention in patients with chronic total occlusion lesion. *Theranostics*. 2012;2:788.

- 45. Valenti R, Migliorini A, Signorini U, et al. Impact of complete revascularization with percutaneous coronary intervention on survival in patients with at least one chronic total occlusion. *Eur Heart J*. 2008;29:2336–2342.
- Werner GS, Surber R, Kuethe F, et al. Collaterals and the recovery of left ventricular function after recanalization of a chronic total coronary occlusion. *Am Heart J.* 2005;149:129–137.
- Bondarenko O, Beek AM, Twisk JW, Visser CA, van Rossum AC. Time course of functional recovery after revascularization of hibernating myocardium: a contrast-enhanced cardiovascular magnetic resonance study. *Eur Heart J.* 2008;29:2000–2005.
- Hoebers LP, Claessen BE, Elias J, Dangas GD, Mehran R, Henriques JP. Meta-analysis on the impact of percutaneous coronary intervention of chronic total occlusions on left ventricular function and clinical outcome. Int J Cardiol. 2015;187:90–96.
- Cioffi G, Stefenelli C, Tarantini L, Opasich C. Prevalence, predictors, and prognostic implications of improvement in left ventricular systolic function and clinical status in patients >70 years of age with recently diagnosed systolic heart failure. *Am J Cardiol.* 2003;92:166–172.
- Cintron G, Johnson G, Francis G, Cobb F, Cohn JN Prognostic significance of serial changes in left ventricular ejection fraction in patients with congestive heart failure. The V-HeFT VA Cooperative Studies Group. *Circulation*. 1993;87:VI17–23.

### SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

How to cite this article: Megaly M, Saad M, Tajti P, et al. Meta-analysis of the impact of successful chronic total occlusion percutaneous coronary intervention on left ventricular systolic function and reverse remodeling. *J Interv Cardiol.* 2018;31:562–571. https://doi.org/10.1111/joic.12538