Brief Clinical Reports

cardiopulmonary bypass has to be ready, even if it should be reserved for salvage, because of recent neurologic lesions that are often associated. We preferred an off-pump strategy via a lateral thoracotomy, rather than a sternotomy, for an elective intracardiac repair. The choice of the left side for the approach was based on left pleural effusion draining the mediastinal infection, but a right access to the esophagus is also feasible. The esophageal repair or esophagectomy is chosen according to the local severity of necrosis and mediastinitis. A pericardial flap was easy and efficient to separate the atrial and esophageal sutures, correcting the natural pericardial defect that caused AEF after CA.

References

- Cappato R, Calkins H, Chen SA, Davies W, Iesaka Y, Kalman J, et al. Prevalence and causes of fatal outcome in catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2009;53:1798-803.
- Grande L, Lacima G, Ros E, Pera M, Ascaso C, Visa J, et al. Deterioration of esophageal motility with age: a manometric study of 79 healthy subjects. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 1999;94:1795-801.
- Doll N, Borger MA, Fabricius A, Stephan S, Gummert J, Mohr FW, et al. Esophageal perforation during left atrial radiofrequency ablation: is the risk too high? *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2003;125:836-42.
- Bunch TJ, Nelson J, Foley T, Allison S, Crandall BG, Osborn JS, et al. Temporary esophageal stenting allows healing of esophageal perforations following atrial fibrillation ablation procedures. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. 2006;17:435-9.
- Pappone C, Oral H, Santinelli V, Vicedomini G, Lang CC, Manguso F, et al. Atrioesophageal fistula as a complication of percutaneous transcatheter ablation of atrial fibrillation. *Circulation*. 2004;109:2724-6.

Lower graft patency after off-pump than on-pump coronary artery bypass grafting: An updated meta-analysis of randomized trials

Hisato Takagi, MD, PhD, Masafumi Matsui, MD, and Takuya Umemoto, MD, PhD, Shizuoka, Japan

Our previous meta-analysis of randomized trials demonstrated a significant increase in overall graft occlusion, especially in saphenous vein graft occlusion, in off-pump coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) compared with on-pump CABG.¹ Since we conducted the meta-analysis, graft patency in several randomized trials has been reported. The likelihood of graft occlusion was no different between off-pump and on-pump CABG groups in a study by Angelini and associates,² whereas Shroyer and collaborators³ revealed that the overall rate of graft patency was lower in the off-pump group than in the on-pump group. We performed an updated meta-analysis of graft patency after offpump versus on-pump CABG from randomized trials.

CLINICAL SUMMARY

All prospective randomized controlled trials that compared graft patency of 3 or more months after off-pump versus on-pump CABG were identified using a 2-level search strategy. First, a public domain database (MEDLINE) was

J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2010;140:e45-7

0022-5223/\$36.00

Copyright @ 2010 by The American Association for Thoracic Surgery doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2009.11.045

searched with a Web-based search engine (PubMed). Second, relevant studies were identified through a manual search of secondary sources, including references of initially identified articles and a search of reviews and commentaries. The MEDLINE database was searched from January 1966 to October 2009. Exploding keywords included "off-pump," "off pump," "opcab," "patency," and "randomized trial." Studies considered for inclusion met the following criteria: The design was a prospective randomized controlled clinical trial; patients were randomly assigned to off-pump or on-pump CABG; and main outcomes included graft patency of 3 or more months. Data regarding detailed inclusion criteria; duration of follow-up; and internal thoracic artery, saphenous vein, and overall graft patency were abstracted from each individual study. For each study, data regarding patency in both the off-pump and on-pump CABG groups were used to generate risk ratios (RRs) for graft occlusion (<1, favors off-pump CABG; > 1, favors on-pump CABG) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Study-specific estimates were combined with inverseweighted averages of logarithmic RRs in both fixed- and random-effects models. Between-study heterogeneity was analyzed by means of standard chi-square tests. Where no significant statistical heterogeneity was identified, the fixed-effects estimate was used preferentially as the summary measure. Sensitivity analyses were performed to assess the contribution of each study to the pooled estimate by excluding individual trials one at a time and recalculating the pooled RR estimates for the remaining studies. To assess the impact of differential length of follow-up on the pooled

From the Department of Cardiovascular Surgery, Shizuoka Medical Center, Shizuoka, Japan.

Disclosures: None.

Received for publication Nov 9, 2009; accepted for publication Nov 22, 2009; available ahead of print Jan 14, 2010.

Address for reprints: Hisato Takagi, MD, PhD, Department of Cardiovascular Surgery, Shizuoka Medical Center, 762-1 Nagasawa, Shimizu-cho, Sunto-gun, Shizuoka 411-8611, Japan (E-mail: kfgth973@ybb.ne.jp).

	Off-pump CABG		on-pump CABG		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI		
Al-Ruzzeh 2006	18	229	17	232	3.2%	1.07 [0.57, 2.03]			
Angelini 2009	26	237	27	255	5.0%	1.04 [0.62, 1.72]			
Khan 2004	16	128	3	128	0.9%	5.33 [1.59, 17.86]			
Lingaas 2006	20	135	15	153	3.3%	1.51 [0.81, 2.83]	+		
Nathoe 2003	6	69	6	89	1.1%	1.29 [0.43, 3.83]			
Puskas 2004	16	251	11	260	2.3%	1.51 [0.71, 3.18]			
Shroyer 2009	348	1998	256	2095	57.9%	1.43 [1.23, 1.65]	∎		
Widimsky 2004	99	283	111	356	26.3%	1.12 [0.90, 1.40]	+		
Total (95% CI)		3330		3568	100.0%	1.32 [1.18, 1.48]	•		
Total events	549		446						
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	9.79, df = 7	(P = 0.2)	0); $I^2 = 29\%$				0.2 0.5 1 2 5		
Test for overall effect:	: Z = 4.83 (P	< 0.0000	01)				Favours off-pump Favours on-pump		
Α									
	Off-pump	CABG	on-pump	CABG		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio		
Study or Subaroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI		
Angelini 2009	26	237	27	255	5.2%	1 04 [0 62 1 72]			
Lingaas 2006	20	135	15	152	3.2%	1 51 [0 81 2 82]			
Nathoe 2003	6	60	61	202	1 1%	1 29 [0 42 2 22]			
Puckas 2003	16	251	11	260	2 /0/	1 51 [0.43, 3.63]			
Shrover 2000	01	1009	256	200	60.4%	1 42 [1 22 1 65]			
Shroyer 2009	546	1990	250	2095	00.4%	1.45 [1.25, 1.05]			
wiaimsky 2004	99	283	111	350	27.4%	1.12 [0.90, 1.40]			
Total (95% CI)		2973		3208	100.0%	1.32 [1.17, 1.48]	◆		
Total events	515		426						
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	4.25, df = 5	(P = 0.5)	51); $I^2 = 0\%$						
Test for overall effect	: Z = 4.63 (P	< 0.000	01)				Eavours off-nump Eavours on-nump		
В									
						D 1 D 1			
Study or Subaroun	Off-pump C	ABG 0	on-pump C	ABG	Waight	KISK KATIO	RISK RATIO		
Study or Subgroup	Events	112	Events	114	weight	IV, FIXed, 95% CI			
Al-Ruzzen 2006	2	113	3	114	4.7%	0.67 [0.11, 3.95]			
Angelini 2009	6	105	12	117	16.5%	0.56 [0.22, 1.43]			
Knan 2004	4	50	0	47	1.8%	8.47 [0.47, 153.18]			
Lingaas 2006	3	51	2	56	4.8%	1.65 [0.29, 9.46]			
Shroyer 2009	29	618	24	635	52.4%	1.24 [0.73, 2.11]			
Widimsky 2004	9	107	10	110	19.8%	0.93 [0.39, 2.19]			
Total (95% CI)		1044		1079	100.0%	1.05 [0.71, 1.53]	+		
Total events	53		51						
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	4.69, df = 5	(P = 0.45)	5); I ² = 0%						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.23 (P =	= 0.82)					Favours off-pump Favours on-pump		
С							the second second second second		
-	Off_numn	CARC	00-0000	CARC		Rick Patio	Rick Patio		
Study or Subaroup	Events	Total	Fvents	Total	Weight	IV Fixed 95% CI	IV Fixed 95% CI		
	11		o	۲0tal	2 0%	1 53 [0 66 2 56]			
Angelini 2000	10	121	11	120	2.0%	1 37 [0.00, 3.30]			
Khan 2004	10	121	14	129	3.3%				
Kildii 2004	4	44	3	59	0.7%	1.79 [0.42, 7.58]			
Lingaas 2006	17	84	13	97	3.2%	1.51 [0.78, 2.92]			
PUSKas 2004	10	150	9	156	1.8%	1.16 [0.48, 2.76]			
Shroyer 2009	295	1262	217	1339	56.6%	1.44 [1.23, 1.69]			
Widimsky 2004	90	176	101	246	32.4%	1.25 [1.01, 1.53]			
Total (95% CI)		1898		2094	100.0%	1.37 [1.22, 1.55]	•		
Total events	445		365						
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	1.64, df = 6	(P = 0.9)	95 ; $I^2 = 0\%$						

Test for overall effect: Z = 5.25 (P < 0.00001)

D

FIGURE 1. Forrest plot of overall graft occlusion risk among patients randomized to off-pump versus on-pump CABG in all studies (A) and studies reporting graft patency of 1 year or more (B). Forrest plot of internal thoracic artery (C) and saphenous vein (D) graft occlusion risk. IV, Inverse variance; CI, confidence interval.

Favours off-pump Favours on-pump

TABLE 1. Randomized trials included in the present meta-analysis

	Al-Ruzzeh	Angelini	Khan	Lingaas	Nathoe	Puskas	Shroyer	Widimsky
Reference	BMJ.	J Thorac	N Engl J	Ann Thorac	N Engl J Med.	JAMA.	N Engl J Med.	Circulation.
	2006;332:	Cardiovasc	Med.	Surg. 2006;81:	2003;348:	2004;291:	2009;361:	2004;110:
	1365	Surg.	2004;350:	2089-96	394-402	1841-9	1827-37	3418-23
		2009;137:	21-8					
		295-303						
No. of patients	168	401	103	120	110	197	2203	400
Follow-up	3 mo	7у	3 mo	1 y	1 y	1 y	1 y	1 y
Patients undergoing	90	50 ^a	80	91	64	78	62	64
CAG, %								
Intention to treat	No crossovers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Events committee	Blinded	Blinded	Blinded	NR	Blinded	Blinded	Blinded	NR

CAG, Coronary angiography; NR, not reported. ^aPatients undergoing multidetector computed tomographic coronary angiography.

estimate, the effects of off-pump CABG on graft patency were explored separately in studies with follow-up of 1 year or more. All analyses were conducted with Microsoft Excel version 11.5 (Microsoft Corp, Redmond, Wash) and Review Manager (RevMan) version 5.0 (Nordic Cochrane Centre, Copenhagen, Denmark).

RESULTS

Our search identified 8 results of prospective randomized controlled clinical trials that compared graft patency of 3 or more months after off-pump and on-pump CABG (Table 1). In total, our meta-analysis included data on 6898 grafts. Pooled analysis demonstrated a statistically significant 32% increase in overall graft occlusion in off-pump compared with on-pump CABG (fixed-effects RR, 1.32; 95% CI, 1.18–1.48; P < .00001; P for heterogeneity = .20; Figure 1, A). Exclusion of any single study from the analysis did not substantively alter the overall result of our analysis. Although the results seemed to be heavily influenced by Shroyer and colleagues' trial³ (weight, 57.9%), even eliminating the particular trial demonstrated a statistically significant 19% increase in overall graft occlusion in off-pump compared with on-pump CABG (fixed-effects RR, 1.19; 95% CI, 1.00 [1.0028] to 1.42; P = .05 [0.465]; P for heterogeneity = .27). When data from 6 studies reporting graft patency of 1 year or more were pooled, off-pump CABG was associated with a 32% increase in overall graft occlusion compared with on-pump CABG. This increase remained statistically significant (fixed-effects RR, 1.32; 95% CI, 1.17-1.48; P < .00001; P for heterogeneity = .51; Figure 1, B). Subanalyses demonstrated a statistically nonsignificant benefit of on-pump over off-pump CABG for internal thoracic artery graft patency (fixed-effects RR, 1.05; 95% CI, 0.71–1.53; P = .82; P for heterogeneity = .45; Figure 1, C) but a statistically significant 37% increase in saphenous vein graft occlusion in off-pump compared with on-pump CABG (fixed-effects RR, 1.37; 95% CI, 1.22–1.55; P < .00001; P for heterogeneity = .95; Figure 1, D).

CONCLUSIONS

The results of our updated meta-analysis suggest that offpump CABG may increase overall graft occlusion by 32%, especially saphenous vein graft occlusion by 37%, over onpump CABG. In the largest trial by Shroyer and coworkers,³ patients in the off-pump group had worse composite outcomes (death from any cause, a repeat revascularization procedure, or a nonfatal myocardial infarction) at 1 year of follow-up. The worse outcomes might be due to lower graft patency after off-pump CABG. Except for the study by Angelini and associates² with a 7-year follow-up, the remaining 7 studies included in the present meta-analysis reported graft patency of 1 year of less. To confirm our results, longer-term graft patency from randomized trials of off-pump versus onpump CABG is needed.

References

- Takagi H, Tanabashi T, Kawai N, Kato T, Umemoto T. Off-pump coronary artery bypass sacrifices graft patency: meta-analysis of randomized trials. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2007;133:e2-3.
- Angelini GD, Culliford L, Smith DK, Hamilton MC, Murphy GJ, Ascione R, et al. Effects of on- and off-pump coronary artery surgery on graft patency, survival, and health-related quality of life: long-term follow-up of 2 randomized controlled trials. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2009;137:295-303.
- Shroyer AL, Grover FL, Hattler B, Collins JF, McDonald GO, Kozora E, et al. On-pump versus off-pump coronary-artery bypass surgery. N Engl J Med. 2009;361:1827-37.