

冠狀動脈介入與藥物治療:支架置放與否的抉擇

PCI vs medical therapy-- To stent or not to stent?

Ting-Hsing Chao (趙庭興), MD, FACC, FESC, FAPSC

Professor of Internal Medicine

National Cheng Kung University College of Medicine and Hospital

Secretary General, Taiwan Society of Cardiology

Patients with chronic coronary syndrome (CCS) have a high risk of myocardial ischemia, coronary revascularization, and acute coronary events. Optimal medical treatment (OMT) is the mainstay of therapeutic approach for CCS. However, invasive strategy on top of OMT should be considered in some clinical settings. Although invasive strategy, especially the implementation of percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI), has become a widely-adopted therapeutic approach for CCS, clinical decision should be made according to the available evidence of benefits outweighing its harms and costs. appropriate indications for coronary angiography and revascularization, and the duration of dual anti-platelet treatment, according to the results of some brand new evidence and new major clinical guidelines. Three issues should be addressed before making final recommendations: 1) Could PCI plus OMT provide better cardiovascular outcomes than OMT alone with respect to cardiovascular death, myocardial infarction, or coronary revascularization in patients with CCS? 2) Could PCI plus OMT provide more anginal improvement and better health quality than OMT alone in patients with CCS? 3) Is there any subset of patients with CCS could benefit from PCI plus OMT much more than OMT alone with respect to hard endpoints or symptom relief? The aforementioned issues will be discussed in today's presentation.