To the Editor:

We read with great interest the recent article by Mussa and colleagues. Their update article providing a current perspective on the use of radial grafting in coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) comes at a time of increasing evidence supporting such utilization. We, however, wish to comment on 2 fronts. First, we concur that there is considerable interest in how radial patency compares with that of saphenous vein grafts, especially in light of the high vein failure rate compared with that of internal thoracic artery (ITA) conduits. Yet in this respect only the negative radial findings of Khot and associates are discussed, albeit with a word of caution that their data are in stark contrast with those of most reports. That study, among other limitations, also reported that diabetes somehow protects against radial graft failure, and hence their data should be carefully and objectively considered. Note, 2 weeks earlier in the same journal, our group had shown the opposite findings in closely matched vein and radial patient groups. There, 242 total grafts were reassessed (2-year median follow-up) in a subcohort of recatheterized symptomatic patients. Importantly, for patients receiving both types of conduits (ie, each patient served as own control), absolute radial graft failure—defined as occlusion, stenosis >90%, or string sign—was significantly less than that of vein grafts (29% vs 41%; \(P = 0.039\)), and the 6-year cumulative Kaplan-Meier radial patency.
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Figure 1. Updated 8-year survival comparison in the same well-matched radial and vein CABG with LITA-LAD patient pairs (925 each) first reported by Zacharias and colleagues. Cumulative survival remains significantly better in the radial artery cohort, and implicitly, the time-varying death hazard shows an increased vein relative death risk after 1 year. The latter is perhaps forecast by the landmark study by Desai and colleagues, in which they report greater incidence of subocclusive angiographic stenoses in vein graft bodies at 1 year.
was greater. Similar results have since been reported from the randomized prospective trial by Desai and colleagues.2

Second, Mussa and colleagues probably agree that the ultimate goal of optimizing graft patency is improving survival. In well-matched patients undergoing CABG, all of whom received left ITA to left anterior descending coronary artery pedicle (LITA-LAD) grafts, using the radial artery as a second arterial conduit as opposed to vein resulted in improved late survival, especially after the third postoperative year (Figure 1).3 This benefit is similar to or better than what has been reported with bilateral ITA grafting. We suggest that the radial artery is indeed the arterial conduit of second choice, at least in patients in whom the bilateral ITA is contraindicated.

Atrial fibrillation: Isolation or ablation?

To the Editor:

The article “Map-Guided Surgery for Atrial Fibrillation” by Nitta and associates1 confirms and raises important issues. An adequately performed pulmonary vein isolation (PVI) cures most patients with intermittent atrial fibrillation (AF) but fails as an isolation procedure in patients with non–pulmonary vein (non-PV) foci and in those with continuous AF, in whom the PVs and the circuits they harbor become irrelevant to the maintenance of AF. In these patients the goal shifts from isolating the trigger to ablating the macroreentrant circuits. Although a left atrial (LA) procedure is mandatory, the real question is the following: When do we address the right atrium (RA)?

The identification of the transition from intermittent to continuous AF is crucial in determining the pattern of activation and the procedure needed. What was the relationship between the activation pattern and (1) the underlying structural heart disease and (2) the pattern (continuous or intermittent) and duration of AF?
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