Virginia Cardiac Services Quality Initiative

Summer 2024 Quarterly Meeting



Transforming Cardiovascular Care to Improve Patient Experience and Value

To ensure a smooth meeting...

- Please mute your lines (phone or audio), until called upon
 - > Interactive features available under 'participants' window
- Hold questions until end of presentation
- > Use "Raise Hand" feature for questions or comments
- > The Chat Room can also be used to ask questions
- > Call/text Sherri (216) 513-3141 if you need assistance

┚╍

Invite

Participant

 \bigcirc

Record

Share



- Zoom Meeting viewer interaction



New CME Opportunities Available

- Medicine- AMA PRA Category 1
- Nursing- ANCC Contact Hours
- Physician Assistant AAPA
- IPCE Performance Improvement
- ABMS Maintenance of Certification -MOC II- ABIM



UNIVERSITY VIRGINIA HEALTH SYSTEM



How to Claim Credit

- 1. Go to <u>www.cmevillage.com</u>.
- 2. Click on the "Learning Portal" button and select "CE Certificate".
- 3. Sign in with your email and password or create an account if you are a new user.
- 4. Enter CE Activity Code <u>150805</u> and click "Submit" and "Continue".
- 5. Complete the evaluation and click "Done".
- 6. Certificate Preparation; indicate number of credits you wish to claim for attending this activity. Click "Submit"
- 7. Click "Print Certificate" or you can access later by visiting our website, Click "Learning Portal", Sign in at the top of the page and click "Credit History & Past Certificate".

For problems, contact the CME office at <u>uvacme@virginia.edu</u>

PLEASE NOTE: The post activity evaluation will <u>only</u> be available for a <u>30-day period</u>. Credit will not be issued after the evaluation period has closed.

Tonight's Agenda

Welcome and Highlights from the Board Mohammed Quader, MD; Virginia Commonwealth University

> *QI Updates* Sherri White, Quality Improvement Advisor

Quality Data Review Eddie Fonner; VCSQI Executive Director

ACC 2024 Trials Likely to Affect Clinical Practice Michael Kontos, MD; Virginia Commonwealth University



VCSQI Strategic Plan

<u>Mission</u>

Transform Cardiovascular Care to Improve Patient Experience and Value

<u>Vision</u>

Optimize Heart Care Outcomes Through National Collaboration, Innovation and Research

Core Values

- V alue-Based Best Practices
- C ollabration & Transparency
- S tewardship of Healthcare & Costs
- Q uality and Patient Centered
- Innovation; Data and Analytic-Driven





QI Updates

Sherri White, MSc, SSGBC Quality Improvement Advisor, VCSQI

Transforming Cardiovascular Care to Improve Patient Experience and Value

COLLABORATIVE	WORKGROUPS	CHAMPIONS
VCSQI	 CathPCI (Data Managers) Quality (STS Data Managers) Research & Writing DEI 2.0 Perfusion Group 	TBD Judy Smith (UVA) Ourania Preventza, MD (UVA) Halima Walker (UVA), Judy Smith (UVA), Sharmaine McCoy (Inova) Eve Dallas (UVA)
	AKIReadmission	Mike Brown (Mary Washington), Shelley Cahalan (Sentara), Judy Smith (UVA), Chris Sytsma (Winchester) Robert Lancey, MD (Sentara) & Andre Tolleris (VHHA)
VHAC	 Steering Committee ECG Education Thrombolytics PE Response Team (PERT) ED Bypass and False Activation Shock 	Peter O'Brien, MD (Centra) & Michael Kontos, MD (VCU) Bob Page (VA Ed.) & Sheree Emore (Carilion) Robert Konstance, MD (HCA Lewis Gale), John Patterson, MD (LewisGale Montgomery) & Michael Kontos, MD (VCU) Michael Kelley, MD (Carilion) & Jessica Mountjoy (Mary Washington) Peter O'Brien, MD (Centra) & Michael Kontos, MD (VCU) Chalak Berzingi, MD (Carilion) & Michael Joseph, MD (Carilion)
Perfect Care Impact Network	 Goal-Directed Perfusion Goal-Directed Therapies Readmission & AKI Data Integration 	Eve Dallas (UVA) & Terri Haber (MCSQI) Amanda Rae (MCSQI) & Shannon Crotwell (Atrium) Shannon Crotwell (Atrium) Eddie Fonner (VCSQI), Judy Smith (UVA) & Diane Alejo (MCSQI)

For more information or to join a workgroup, contact Sherri via Sherri@vcsqi.org.

DEI 2.0 Workgroup

DEI Resource Library



Discovery & Definition





In an inspiring response to the national call for racial justice and health equity, the Inova Health System established the Inova Schar Heart & Vascular Committee on Equity Education and Outreach. Born out of the tumultuous events following Mr. George Floyd's tragic death in 2020, the committee embodies Inova's commitment to dismantling healthcare disparities and fostering a culture of inclusion within its community.

BE PART OF OUR DISCUSSION AT

Under the leadership of Dr. Kelly Epps and Dr. Cleveland Francis, the committee has crafted a multifaceted strategy to address systemic bias, racism, diversity, and

disparities in care. By forming subcommittees dedicated to recruitment, onboarding, community engagement, mentorship, and healthcare disparities, Inova is taking concrete steps towards realizing its mission. Unite Us is a shared technology platform the creates a coordinated care network with partners working together to provide a broad range of locally based services.

CSQI

Guest Speaker: Martha Rodysill



Goal-Directed Perfusion Workgroup

Why Join Us?

Perfect Care Impact Network

SPERFECTCARE + VCSOL + MCSO

- **Collaborate:** Work with leading perfusionists and healthcare professionals from multiple states.
- Innovate: Develop and implement innovative standards and guidelines.
- Improve Outcomes: Use data-driven insights to enhance patient outcomes.
- Network: Expand your professional network and share best practice

How to Join:

- 1. Email info@vcsqi.org to confirm your interest.
- 2. Join Teams: Accept the Microsoft Teams invitation you'll receive after



MACPAQ Angiogram Film Review



For more information or to signup, contact Sherri via Sherri@vcsqi.org.

Planning Committees

- VHAC Statewide Planning Committee
 - > Megan Vaughan (Bon Secours)
 - > Melanie Johnson (Carilion)
 - Cindi Cole (Centra)
 - Bob Page (VA Ed.)
- VCSQI Quarterly Meetings (currently recruiting)
 - Eve Dallas (UVA)





Surveys

Workgroup	Link
VHAC - Thrombolytics Workgroup	https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/7CFJDWQ
Perfect Care Impact Network - Drainology	https://qfreeaccountssjc1.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/fo rm/SV_29PTduQC8yH0Iho?Q_DL=kO6mu0parPkpKJL_ 29PTduQC8yH0Iho_CGC_Jq2K3YL04i1DYF2&Q_CHL=e mail
VHAC - PERT Workgroup	https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/VHACPERT
CathPCI/VHAC - Data Managers Resource Allocation	https://www.cognitoforms.com/VCSQI1/DataManag erForm



Teams Conversion & Website Enhancements

Members Portal - Construction Underway



Strategies for Change

-

rategies for Change - U... 🕓



in partnership with the Virginia Hospitals and

Update your Profile



Welcome and Highlights from the Board

Mohammed Quader, MD Virginia Commonwealth University VCSQI Chair

Transforming Cardiovascular Care to Improve Patient Experience and Value

Board Updates: Summer 2024

Succession Planning:

- New Vice Chair and Vice Chair Elect
- Vice Chair: Dr. Robert Lancey, Sentara Rockingham
- Vice Chair Elect: Dr. Peter O'Brien, Centra Lynchburg
- New Research & Writing Chair
 - > Dr. Ourania Preventza, UVA

Collaboration with UVA MPH Program



Impact of Operating Room Times on Postoperative Resource Utilization and Patient Outcomes Following CABG

VCSQI Data from 2011 to 2023



Transforming Cardiovascular Care to Improve Patient Experience and Value

Objective

To investigate the impact of OR times on postoperative resource utilization and patient outcomes following CABG

HYPOTHESIS: Longer OR times are associated with increased post-operative complications and resource utilization



Patient Population

Data source: VCSQI

Inclusion:

- 1. Adults (age <u>></u>18)
- 2. Isolated, primary CABG
- 3. Timeframe: January 2011 December 2023

Exclusion:

- 1. Emergent CABG
- 2. Off-pump CABG
- 3. Redo sternotomies
- 4. Outlying times (>99th percentile or <1st percentile)



Definition of OR Times

	OR entry	Skin incision	CBP start	CBP end	Skin closure	OR exit
1. Total OR Time						
2. Total Surgery Tim	ne					
3. Non-surgery OR time						
4. Surgery time off- CBP						
5. CBP time					/	
					VCS	SQI

Outcomes

Primary Outcomes:

- 1. All-cause morbidity
- 2. Time to initial extubation
- 3. Initial ICU length of stay
- 4. Hospital length of stay

Secondary Outcomes:

- 1. Mortality
- 2. Sepsis
- 3. Prolonged ventilation
- 4. Renal failure

- 5. Bleeding
- 6. Pneumonia
- 7. Stroke
- 8. Year-adjusted cost



Analysis

Logistic regression models for categorical outcomes Linear regression models for continuous outcomes Hospital of surgery was controlled for as random effect Models were adjusted for:

- (1) STS score for morbidity or mortality (PROM and PROMM)
- (2) Intraoperative blood transfusion
- (3) CBP time
- (4) Cross clamp time
- (5) Teaching institution
- (6) Year of surgery



Study Summary

Total OR time-	Distribution of time spent in the OR (in mins)				
4 hr 31 mins to 5 hours 51 minutes Median- 5 hours 8 minutes Total surgery	Percentile	OR Time	Total Surgery Time	Non- Surgery OR Time	Surgery Time Off- CBP
	Min	197	131	40	80
time- 3 hr 21 minutes to 4 hours 34	1%	209	146	43	88
	<mark>25%</mark>	<mark>271</mark>	<mark>201</mark>	<mark>61</mark>	<mark>121.00</mark>
minutes	<mark>50%</mark>	<mark>308</mark>	<mark>235</mark>	<mark>72</mark>	<mark>141.00</mark>
Median- 3 hours 55 minutes	<mark>75%</mark>	<mark>351</mark>	<mark>274</mark>	<mark>85</mark>	165.00
Significant spread across the data	99%	468	376	132	241.85
	Max	525	419	156	265.00

Distribution of Time Spent in OR



Total OR Time

Adjusted predictions for postoperative outcomes with increasing total time spent in the OR



Total OR time had no impact on pneumonia, stroke, sepsis, bleeding, and time to extubation

Total Surgery Time

Adjusted predictions for postoperative outcomes with increasing total surgery time



Total surgery time had no impact on pneumonia, stroke, sepsis, bleeding, and time to extubation



Non-Surgery OR Time

Adjusted predictions for postoperative outcomes with increasing non-surgery OR time



Non-surgery OR time had no impact on pneumonia, stroke, renal failure, and sepsis.

Surgery Time minus-CPB time

Adjusted predictions for postoperative outcomes with increasing off-CBP surgery time in the OR



CBP OR time had no impact on pneumonia, stroke, sepsis, bleeding, and time to extubation.



CPB Time

Adjusted predictions for postoperative outcomes with increasing CBP time in the OR



Impact of CT fellowship training on OR time

Linear regression models looking at the impact of CT fellowship training on OR times

Adjusted for:

- Intraoperative blood products
- PROMM
- Year of surgery

Time	Estimate	p-value
Total OR time	32.29 [-14.86, 79.45]	0.165
Surgery time	16.97 [-23.52, 57.46]	0.386
Non-surgery OR time	15.32 [2.69; 27.97]	0.021
Surgery time off CBP	15.85 [-4.48; 36.17]	0.117
CBP time	1.13 [-21.63; 23.90]	0.917

CT fellowship training was associated with longer non-surgery OR time only.



Recent ACC Trials Likely to Affect Clinical Practice

Michael C. Kontos, MD

Medical Director, Coronary Intensive Care Unit

Director, Chest Pain Evaluation Center

Professor

Departments of Internal Medicine (Cardiology), Radiology and Emergency Medicine

Virginia Commonwealth University Medical Center

Richmond, Virginia

Transforming Cardiovascular Care to Improve Patient Experience and Value

Disclosures

- Consultant:
 - Beckman Coulter (not relevant)

Trials That Will Be Discussed

- DEDICATE DZHK6
 - TAVI vs TAVR in Low-Intermediate risk patients with severe AS
- REDUCE MI
 - Beta blockers after MI with preserved LVEF
- DanGer Shock
 - Microaxial flow pump in cardiogenic shock after STEMI

Additional Important Trials

- ULTIMATE-DAPT -- One-month Ticagrelor Monotherapy After PCI in Acute Coronary Syndromes
 - ACS treated with PCI with contemporary DES free from ischemic and bleeding events after 1 month on DAPT
 - Ticagrelor alone for 1-12 months decreased major bleeding with no difference in MACCE vs Ticagrelor + ASA
- The EMPACT-MI--Empagliflozin after Acute Myocardial Infarction
 - Patients with acute MI at risk for HF (sx or LVEF < 45%)
 - No significant reduction in the risk of time to first HHF or death
 - However, there was a significant 23% and 33% RRR of first HHF and total HHF
- AEGIS-II--CSL 112 (Apolipoprotein A-I) Infusions and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Patients With Acute Myocardial Infarction (ApoA-I Event ReducinG in Ischemic Syndromes
 - AMI patients with multivessel disease and additional cardiovascular risk factors
 - No significant reduction in 90 day CV death, MI, or CVA treated with 4 weekly infusions of CSL112
 - However, there was significant reduction in MI and Death/MI in those with LDL > 100 mg/dL

DEDICATE-DZHK6 Trial

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation vs. Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement In Patients At Low To Intermediate Risk

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Transcatheter or Surgical Treatment of Aortic-Valve Stenosis

S. Blankenberg, M. Seiffert, R. Vonthein, H. Baumgartner, S. Bleiziffer,
M.A. Borger, C. Yeong-Hoon, P. Clemmensen, J. Cremer, M. Czerny, N. Diercks,
I. Eitel, S. Ensminger, D. Frank, N. Frey, A. Hagendorff, C. Hagl, C. Hamm,
U. Kappert, M. Karck, W.-K. Kim, I.R. König, M. Krane, U. Landmesser, A. Linke,
L.S. Maier, S. Massberg, F.-J. Neumann, H. Reichenspurner, T.K. Rudolph,
C. Schmid, H. Thiele, R. Twerenbold, T. Walther, D. Westermann, E. Xhepa,
A. Ziegler, and V. Falk, for the DEDICATE-DZHK6 Trial Investigators*
Introduction

- Prior studies demonstrated similar outcomes between TAVI and SAVR in low-risk patients (STS < 4%)
- Studies limited by:
 - Restricted to device specific TAVI
 - Industry sponsored trials



Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Main Inclusion Criteria

- ✓ Severe symptomatic aortic stenosis
- Age: 65-85 years
- Low or intermediate operative risk*
- Eligible for <u>both</u> TAVI and SAVR*
 - * According to Heart team assessment

Main Exclusion Criteria

- Congenital bicuspid/unicuspid or non-calcified aortic valve, endocarditis
- × Cardiac reoperation
- **X Relevant CAD** or PCI w/in 1 month
- × Severe mitral or tricuspid valve disease
- ✗ Severely impaired LV function (LVEF <20%)</p>
- **X Stroke**/ICB w/in 1 month
- × Contraindication for isolated aortic valve procedure

Baseline Characteristics

	TAVI (n=701)	SAVR (n=713)
Age (years)	74.3 ± 4.6	74.6 ± 4.2
Male sex (%)	56.0%	57.3%
BMI (kg/m²)	28.1 (25.3 - 31.9)	28.1 (25.4 - 31.2)
STS-PROM (%)	1.8 (1.2 - 2.4)	1.9 (1.2 - 2.5)
EuroSCORE II (%)	2.1 ± 1.4	2.1 ± 1.8
NYHA Class III/IV	46.2%	45.6%
LV-EF (%)	57.8 ± 9.8	57.7 ± 9.3
Diabetes mellitus	33.8%	32.8%
Coronary artery disease	34.3%	38.2%

Primary Outcome: Death or Stroke



Secondary Outcomes

Death

Stroke



Secondary Outcomes

TAVI (n=701)	SAVR (n=713)	HR (95% CI)
1.3%	3.1%	0.42 (0.19-0.88)
2.0%	4.4%	0.47 (0.24-0.86)
7.9%	0.7%	10.64 (4.84-28.94)
4.3%	17.2%	0.24 (0.16-0.35)
1.3%	2.5%	0.56 (0.24-1.21)
1.0%	2.1%	0.51 (0.20-1.19)
12.4%	30.8%	0.36 (0.28-0.46)
32.0%	17.5%	2.03 (1.63-2.54)
11.8%	6.7%	1.81 (1.27-2.61)
1.6%	0.6%	2.44 (0.87-8.15)
0.6%	0.9%	0.66 (0.18-2.19)
0.7%	0.3%	2.09 (0.50-11.64)
0.6%	0.3%	1.70 (0.38-9.78)
12.2%	13.3%	0.89 (0.66-1.20)
	TAVI (n=701) 1.3% 2.0% 7.9% 4.3% 1.3% 1.3% 1.4.3% 1.0% 12.4% 32.0% 11.8% 1.6% 0.6% 0.7% 12.2%	TAVI (n=701)SAVR (n=713)1.3%3.1%2.0%4.4%7.9%0.7%4.3%17.2%1.3%2.5%1.0%2.1%12.4%30.8%32.0%17.5%11.8%6.7%1.6%0.6%0.7%0.3%0.6%0.3%12.2%13.3%

Secondary Outcomes

1.3%	3.1%	0.42 (0.19-0.88)
2.0%	4.4%	0.47 (0.24-0.86)
7.9%	0.7%	10.64 (4.84-28.94)
4.3%	17.2%	0.24 (0.16-0.35)
1.3%	2.5%	0.56 (0.24-1.21)
1.0%	2.1%	0.51 (0.20-1.19)
12.4%	30.8%	0.36 (0.28-0.46)
32.0%	17.5%	2.03 (1.63-2.54)
11.8%	6.7%	1.81 (1.27-2.61)
1.6%	0.6%	2.44 (0.87-8.15)
0.6%	0.9%	0.66 (0.18-2.19)
0.7%	0.3%	2.09 (0.50-11.64)
0.6%	0.3%	1.70 (0.38-9.78)
12.2%	13.3%	0.89 (0.66-1.20)
	1.3% 2.0% 7.9% 4.3% 1.3% 1.3% 1.0% 12.4% 32.0% 11.8% 1.6% 0.6% 0.7% 0.6% 12.2%	1.3%3.1%2.0%4.4%7.9%0.7%4.3%17.2%1.3%2.5%1.0%2.1%12.4%30.8%32.0%17.5%11.8%6.7%1.6%0.6%0.6%0.9%0.7%0.3%0.6%0.3%12.2%13.3%

Conclusion

Among patients with severe aortic stenosis at low or intermediate surgical risk, TAVI with prosthesis selection based on operator description was not inferior to SAVR for death or stroke 1 year

Caveats/Limitations

- Analysis limited to 1 year follow-up (although will be evaluated at 5 years)
- Excluded patients with bicuspid aortic stenosis, concomitant coronary disease or valve disease
- Potentially impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic
- Data on long term outcomes needed (but coming)

REDUCE AMI Trial

Beta-blockers after myocardial infarction and preserved ejection fraction

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Beta-Blockers after Myocardial Infarction and Preserved Ejection Fraction

T. Yndigegn, B. Lindahl, K. Mars, J. Alfredsson, J. Benatar, L. Brandin, D. Erlinge, O. Hallen, C. Held, P. Hjalmarsson, P. Johansson, P. Karlström, T. Kellerth, T. Marandi, A. Ravn-Fischer, J. Sundström, O. Östlund, R. Hofmann, and T. Jernberg, for the REDUCE-AMI Investigators*

Background: Pre-Reperfusion Era

- Previous studies involved large MIs, often with LV systolic dysfunction predating contemporary treatment
- Performed before:
 - routine early revascularization with PCI
 - potent antithrombotic agents
 - high intensity statins
 - angiotensin blockade

Study Aim

• To determine whether long-term oral beta-blocker treatment in patients with acute MI and preserved ejection fraction improves outcomes

Inclusion Criteria

- Type 1 MI within 1 to 7 days
- Coronary angiography with obstructive coronary disease
- LVEF ≥50%

Study protocol

Not placebo controlled

Target doses:Metoprolol 100 mg daily (62%)Bisoprolol 5 mg daily (39%)

Patients on BB (10%) were weaned off



Baseline Characteristics

Characteristic	Beta-blockers	No Beta-blockers
	(n=2508)	(n=2512)
Demography		
Median age (IQR) – year	65 (57-73)	65 (57-73)
Female sex, no (%)	563 (22.4)	568 (22.6)
Risk Factors		
Current smoker, no (%)	478 (19.4)	530 (21.3)
Hypertension, no (%)	1155 (46.1)	1163 (46.3)
Diabetes mellitus, no (%)	346 (13.8)	354 (14.1)
Prior cardiovascular disease		
Prior myocardial infarctions, no (%)	165 (6.6)	192 (7.7)
Prior PCI, no (%)	147 (5.9)	175 (7.0)
Prior CABG, no (%)	33 (1.3)	36 (1.4)
Prior Stroke, no (%)	52 (2.1)	67 (2.7)
Prior Heart failure, no (%)	13 (0.5)	22 (0.9)
Presentation characteristics		
Chest pain as main symptoms, no (%)	2421 (96.6)	2417 (96.2)
CPR before hospital, no (%)	10 (0.4)	11 (0.4)
Pulmonary rales, no (%)	29 (1.2)	42 (1.7)
Atrial fibrillation, no (%)	21 (0.8)	23 (0.9)
ST-elevation MI, no (%)	877 (35.0)	892 (35.5)
On oral beta-blocker treatment, no (%)	269 (10.9)	302 (12.2)

Treatment and Medications

Characteristic	Beta-blockers (n=2508)	No Beta-blockers (n=2512)
In-hospital Course		
Coronary angiography		
1-vessel disease, no (%)	1378 (55.5)	1378 (55.3)
2-vessel disease, no (%)	676 (27.2)	668 (26.8)
LM or 3-vessel disease, no (%)	404 (16.3)	420 (16.9)
Percutaneous coronary intervention, no (%)	2387 (95.8)	2376 (95.2)
Coronary artery by-pass grafting, no (%)	92 (3.7)	103 (4.1)
Medication at discharge		
Aspirin, no (%)	2450 (97.7)	2440 (97.1)
P2Y12-rec blockade, no (%)	2411 (96.2)	2398 (95.5)
Beta-blockade, no (%)	2399 (95.8)	247 (9.8)
ACEI or ARB, no (%)	1985 (79.2)	2040 (81.2)
Statins, no (%)	2481 (99.0)	2461 (98.0)
Diuretics, no (%)	211 (8.4)	191 (7.6)
Calcium channel blocker	416 (16.6)	496 (19.8)



Primary and Secondary Outcomes

Outcome	Beta-blockers		s No Beta-blockers		Hazard r	atio (95% CI)	p-value
	(n=2508)		08) (n=2512)				
Primary endpoint							
All-cause death or myocardial infarction, no (%)	199	(7.9)	208	(8.3)	0.96	(0.79-1.16)	0.64
Secondary endpoints							
All-cause death, no (%)	97	(3.9)	103	(4.1)	0.94	(0.71-1.24)	0.66
Cardiovascular death, no (%)	38	(1.5)	33	(1.3)	1.15	(0.72-1.84)	0.55
Myocardial infarction, no (%)	112	(4.5)	117	(4.7)	0.96	(0.74-1.24)	0.74
Admission to hospital because of atrial fibrillation, no (%)	27	(1.1)	34	(1.4)	0.79	(0.48-1.31)	0.37
Admission to hospital because of heart failure, no (%)	20	(0.8)	22	(0.9)	0.91	(0.50-1.66)	0.76

82% of BB group taking them at 12 months13% of the no BB group taking them at 12 months

Primary and Secondary Outcomes

Outcome		-blockers	No Beta	blockers	Hazard r	atio (95% CI)	p-value
		(n=2508)		(n=2512)			
Primary endpoint							
All-cause death or myocardial infarction, no (%)	199	(7.9)	208	(8.3)	0.96	(0.79-1.16)	0.64
Secondary endpoints							
All-cause death, no (%)	97	(3.9)	103	(4.1)	0.94	(0.71-1.24)	0.66
Cardiovascular death, no (%)	38	(1.5)	33	(1.3)	1.15	(0.72-1.84)	0.55
Myocardial infarction, no (%)	112	(4.5)	117	(4.7)	0.96	(0.74-1.24)	0.74
Admission to hospital because of atrial fibrillation, no (%)	27	(1.1)	34	(1.4)	0.79	(0.48-1.31)	0.37
Admission to hospital because of heart failure, no (%)	20	(0.8)	22	(0.9)	0.91	(0.50-1.66)	0.76

Subgroup Analysis

	Beta-bloc	k	No beta-blo	ock			
Subgroup	N	N / 100 years	N	N / 100 years	5		Hazard ratio (95% CI)
Beta-blockers on admission							
Yes	42/269	4.85	34/302	3.26		-	1.48 (0.94, 2.33)
No	152/2199	2.08	173/2170	2.44		+	0.85 (0.69, 1.06)
Resting heart rate							
>= 70	128/1576	2.46	136/1535	2.65			0.93 (0.73, 1.18)
< 70	70/913	2.3	71/960	2.28			1.01 (0.73, 1.4)
Sex							
Female	47/563	2.55	61/568	3.19			0.8 (0.55, 1.17)
Male	152/1945	2.35	147/1944	2.31)	1.02 (0.81, 1.28)
Age							
>= 75	72/489	4.79	68/495	4.45		P	1.08 (0.77, 1.5)
< 75	127/2019	1.87	140/2017	2.07		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.9 (0.71, 1.15)
Hypertension						1000	
Yes	121/1155	3.21	110/1163	2.91			1.1 (0.85, 1.43)
No	78/1352	1.72	96/1346	2.14			0.81 (0.6, 1.09)
Diabetes							
Yes	46/346	4.14	52/354	4.72			0.88 (0.59, 1.31)
No	153/2159	2.13	156/2154	2.17			0.98 (0.78, 1.22)
Previous MI						35	
Yes	31/165	5.66	29/192	4.63		-	1.23 (0.74, 2.03)
No	168/2338	2.17	178/2315	2.33		+	0.93 (0.75, 1.15)
Infarct type							
STEMI	65/877	2.24	80/892	2.76			0.81 (0.59, 1.13)
NSTEMI	134/1623	2.49	124/1597	2.33			1.07 (0.84, 1.36)
Revascularized							
Yes	194/2449	2.4	202/2442	2.5			0.96 (0.79, 1.17)
No	3/42	1.91	5/54	2.86		• T	0.68 (0.16, 2.83)
Complete revascularization							
Yes	126/1875	2.04	146/1876	2.38			0.86 (0.68, 1.09)
No	47/400	3.53	36/389	2.65		-	1.33 (0.86, 2.05)
Chronic kidney disease (eGFR	< 60)						and the second sec
Yes	36/226	5.02	47/229	6.64			0.76 (0.49, 1.17)
No	161/2273	2.13	161/2276	2.13			1 (0.8, 1.24)
Previous atrial fibrillation							
Yes	3/21	4.1	6/23	9.24			0.45 (0.11, 1.81)
No	196/2481	2.39	201/2481	2.45			0.97 (0.8, 1.19)
Country							
Estonia and New Zeeland	9/116	3.4	5/116	1.86		5	 1.82 (0.61, 5.44)
Sweden	190/2392	2.36	203/2396	2.53		a	0.93 (0.77, 1.14)
					125 AND A	a 671	

Conclusions

• In patients with acute MI with preserved left ventricular EF, long-term treatment with beta-blockers did not reduce the risk of death or MI

Caveats/Limitations

- Some treatment overlap:
 - 82% of BB group taking them at 12 months
 - 13% of the no BB group taking them at 12 months
- Not a placebo-controlled trial
- No information on ventricular arrhythmias, sudden death
- Potential for 21% benefit up to 16% harm
- "Evidence of absence is not the same as absence of evidence."
 - Event rates substantially lower than predicted at only 2.5%/yr
 - However, no signals in the secondary outcomes for benefit
 - Event rate so low would be difficult to show benefit
- At least 3 ongoing trials evaluating post MI beta blockers with NL LVEF

Percutaneous Transvalvular Micro-axial Flow Pump in Infarct Related Cardiogenic Shock

Results of The DanGer-Shock Trial

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Microaxial Flow Pump or Standard Care in Infarct-Related Cardiogenic Shock

J.E. Møller, T. Engstrøm, L.O. Jensen, H. Eiskjær, N. Mangner, A. Polzin, P.C. Schulze, C. Skurk, P. Nordbeck, P. Clemmensen, V. Panoulas, S. Zimmer, A. Schäfer, N. Werner, M. Frydland, L. Holmvang, J. Kjærgaard, R. Sørensen, J. Lønborg, M.G. Lindholm, N.L.J. Udesen, A. Junker, H. Schmidt, C.J. Terkelsen, S. Christensen, E.H. Christiansen, A. Linke, F.J. Woitek, R. Westenfeld, S. Möbius-Winkler, K. Wachtell, H.B. Ravn, J.F. Lassen, S. Boesgaard, O. Gerke, and C. Hassager, for the DanGer Shock Investigators*

Hypothesis

Routine use of the micro axial flow pump Impella CP on top of standard guideline directed care in patients with STEMI and cardiodiogenic shock result in a lower mortality compared with standard care alone



Micro Axial Flow Pump

Background

- Cardiogenic shock is a severe complication in STEMI patients
 - Occurs in 8-10% of STEMI patients
 - Is associated with the mortality of 40 to 50%
- Prior studies with mechanical support have not demonstrated improvement in outcomes
 - IABP in 2 randomized trials: no benefit
 - ECMO in 1 randomized trial: no benefit
 - Microaxial trials
 - 3 small randomized trials did not show a benefit
 - Data potentially skewed by high numbers of patients with cardiac arrest
 - Registry studies have consistently shown excess bleeding

STEMI and cardiogenic shock assessed for eligibility (N=1,211)



Baseline Characteristics

Characteristic	Microaxial Flow Pump plus Standard Care (N=179)	Standard Care Alone (N = 176)
Median age (IQR) — yr	67 (58–76)	69 (61–76)
Male sex — no. (%)	142 (79.3)	139 (79.0)
Medical history — no. (%)		
Hypertension	89 (49.7)	94 (53.4)
Diabetes	33 (18.4)	47 (26.7)
Myocardial infarction	29 (16.2)	28 (15.9)
Heart failure	16 (8.9)	17 (9.7)
Chronic kidney disease	17 (9.5)	18 (10.2)
Median systolic blood pressure (IQR) — mm Hg	84 (72–91)	82 (72–91)
Median of the mean arterial blood pressure (IQR) — mm Hg	63 (55–72)	64 (55–73)
Median heart rate (IQR) — beats/min	94 (77–110)	95 (76–111)
Median arterial lactate level (IQR) — mmol/liter	4.6 (3.4-7.1)	4.5 (3.2-6.9)
Median left ventricular ejection fraction (IQR) — %	25 (20-31)	25 (15–30)
Resuscitation before randomization — no. (%)	39 (21.8)	33 (18.8)
Intubation before randomization — no. (%)	35 (19.6)	28 (15.9)
Transfer from outside hospital — no. (%)	51 (28.5)	48 (27.3)
Anterior myocardial infarction — no. (%)	126 (70.4)	129 (73.3)
SCAI–CSWG stage at admission — no. (%)†		
с	100 (55.9)	97 (55.1)
D	51 (28.5)	50 (28.4)
E	28 (15.6)	29 (16.5)

Treatment Characteristics

	Microaxial Flow Pump plus Standard Care (N=179)	Standard Care Alone (N = 176)
Intensive care management		
Mechanical ventilation — no. (%)	133 (74.3)	116 (65.9)
Median duration of mechanical ventilation (IQR) — days	5 (2-10)	3 (1-10)
Medication use — no. (%)		
Any vasopressor	159 (88.8)	146 (83.0)
Norepinephrine	156 (87.2)	142 (80.7)
Dopamine	51 (28.5)	41 (23.3)
Epinephrine	67 (37.4)	66 (37.5)
Any inotrope	124 (69.3)	109 (61.9)
Dobutamine	62 (34.6)	59 (33.5)
Milrinone	63 (35.2)	58 (33.0)
Levosimendan	40 (22.3)	39 (22.2)
Escalation to additional mechanical circulatory support		
Placement of Impella 5.0 device — no. (%)	7 (3.9)	5 (2.8)
Placement of Impella CP for venting during venoarterial ECMO therapy — no. (%)	0	4 (2.3)
Placement of Impella 2.5 device — no. (%)	0	1 (0.6)
Placement of Impella RP device — no. (%)	0	0
Venoarterial ECMO — no. (%)	21 (11.7)	33 (18.8)
Median time from randomization to placement of venoarterial ECMO (IQR) — hr	14 (4–54)	2 (1–5)
Placement of permanent LVAD — no. (%)	10 (5.6)	4 (2.3)
Any escalation to additional mechanical circulatory support — no. (%)	28 (15.6)§	37 (21.0)¶

Treatment Characteristics

	Microaxial Flow Pump plus Standard Care (N=179)	Standard Care Alone (N = 176)
Intensive care management	122 (74.2)	116 (65.0)
Mediae dentiation — no. (%)	133 (74.3)	116 (65.9)
Median duration of mechanical ventilation (IQR) — days	5 (2–10)	3 (1-10)
Medication use — no. (%)		
Any vasopressor	159 (88.8)	146 (83.0)
Norepinephrine	156 (87.2)	142 (80.7)
Dopamine	51 (28.5)	41 (23.3)
Epinephrine	67 (37.4)	66 (37.5)
Any inotrope	124 (69.3)	109 (61.9)
Dobutamine	62 (34.6)	59 (33.5)
Milrinone	63 (35.2)	58 (33.0)
Levosimendan	40 (22.3)	39 (22.2)
Escalation to additional mechanical circulatory support		
Placement of Impella 5.0 device — no. (%)	7 (3.9)	5 (2.8)
Placement of Impella CP for venting during venoarterial ECMO therapy — no. (%)	0	4 (2.3)
Placement of Impella 2.5 device — no. (%)	0	1 (0.6)
Placement of Impella RP device — no. (%)	0	0
Venoarterial ECMO — no. (%)	21 (11.7)	33 (18.8)
Median time from randomization to placement of venoarterial ECMO (IQR) — hr	14 (4-54)	2 (1–5)
Placement of permanent LVAD — no. (%)	10 (5.6)	4 (2.3)
Any escalation to additional mechanical circulatory support	28 (15.6) §	37 (21.0)¶

Revascularization

Mechanical Support



Primary Endpoint



Adverse Events



Subgroup Analysis

Subgroup	mAFP+ Standard Care no. of deaths/	Standard Care	Hazard Ratio for Death from Any Cause at 180 Days (95% CI)		
Overall	82/179 (45.8)	103/176 (58.5)	_	0.74 (0.55-0.99)	
Sex	, , ,	, , ,			
Female	24/37 (65)	24/37 (65)		→ 1.01 (0.58–1.79)	
Male	58/142 (41)	79/139 (57)		0.66 (0.47-0.93)	
Age					
≤67 yr	31/98 (32)	42/89 (47)		0.64 (0.40-1.02)	
>67 yr	51/81 (63)	61/87 (70)	_	0.85 (0.59–1.24)	
Arterial lactate level					
≤4.5 mmol/liter	31/88 (35)	45/92 (49)		0.68 (0.43-1.07)	
>4.5 mmol/liter	50/90 (56)	58/84 (69)		0.74 (0.51-1.08)	
Mean arterial pressure					
≤63 mm Hg	40/88 (45)	56/85 (66)	~	0.61 (0.41-0.92)	
>63 mm Hg	40/87 (46)	45/86 (52)		- 0.88 (0.57–1.34)	
LVEF					
≤25%	55/100 (55)	73/105 (70)		0.75 (0.53–1.06)	
>25%	27/79 (34)	29/70 (41)		- 0.79 (0.47–1.34)	
Location of STEMI					
Nonanterior	24/53 (45)	26/47 (55)	- +	- 0.76 (0.44–1.32)	
Anterior	58/126 (46)	77/129 (60)		0.73 (0.52–1.03)	
No. of diseased vessels					
1	19/51 (37)	19/47 (40)		→ 0.99 (0.52–1.87)	
≥2	63/128 (49)	84/129 (65)	→	0.68 (0.49–0.94)	
Year of randomization					
2013-2018	28/54 (52)	41/59 (69)		0.66 (0.41–1.07)	
2019-2023	54/125 (43)	62/117 (53)		0.80 (0.56–1.15)	
SCAI–CSWG stage					
С	35/100 (35)	45/97 (46)		0.73 (0.47–1.13)	
D or E	47/79 (59)	58/79 (73)		0.74 (0.50–1.08)	
			0.5 1.0	1.5	

mAFP+Standard Care Better Standard Care Better

Conclusions

- The routine use of Impella in addition to standard of care reduced death from any cause in patients with STEMI and cardiogenic shock
- This was associated with an increased risk of adverse events
- The study cannot be extrapolated to other causes of cardiogenic shock such as cardiac arrest, non-STEMI and nonischemic cardiogenic shock

Caveats/Limitations

- Doesn't inform on shock patients with OHCA, NICM, NSTEMI (trials with high rates OHCA showed no benefit)
- Took 10 years to perform (although no change in mortality over that time period)
- Small number of select centers
- High rate of complications (control group may not have had time to have complications)
- Impella placed prior to revascularization in majority randomized early (n=84 of 99)

Quality Data Review

Eddie Fonner Executive Director, VCSQI

Transforming Cardiovascular Care to Improve Patient Experience and Value
VCSQI Database Summary

Extensive Database

- 146,000+ STS Adult patients from 2001-2024
- > 76,000+ ACC CathPCI procedures
- > 38,000+ ACC CP-MI episodes
- ▶ 5,000+ TVT operations
- Quarterly and Ad Hoc Reports
- Scientific Publishing
 - > 80+ manuscripts & presentations



STS-ACC TVT



Average Length of Stay by Hospital: All TAVR Procedures, Q1 2021 - Q4 2023 (N=4,607)



Major or Minor Vascular Complication by Hospital: All TAVR Procedures, Q1 2021 - Q4 2023 (N=4,607)



Stage 1 AKI by Hospital: All TAVR Procedures, Q1 2021 - Q4 2023 (N=4,587)



ACC CathPCI



Observed Acute Kidney Injury: All PCI Procedures, CY 2017–2023



Observed AKI by Hospital: All PCI Procedures, Q1 2022 - Q4 2023 (N=14,490)



For the latest 4 quarter period:

A plus (+) following the hospital code indicates the hospital is statistically better than the rest of VCSQI An asterisk (*) following the hospital code indicates the hospital is statistically poorer than the rest of VCSQI

Average Cumulative Air Kerma (mGy): All PCI Procedures, Q1 2022 - Q4 2023 (N=23,778)



An asterisk (*) following the hospital code indicates the hospital is statistically poorer than the rest of VCSQI

Average Procedure Time (Minutes): All PCI Procedures, Q1 2022 - Q4 2023 (N=23,952)



An asterisk (*) following the hospital code indicates the hospital is statistically poorer than the rest of VCSQI

Same Day Discharge by Hospital: Elective PCI Procedures*, Q1 2022 - Q4 2023 (N=8,467)



* Denominator Excludes Deceased, Transfer, and DC AMA

For the latest 4 quarter period:

A plus (+) following the hospital code indicates the hospital is statistically better than the rest of VCSQI An asterisk (*) following the hospital code indicates the hospital is statistically poorer than the rest of VCSQI

STS Adult Cardiac



Red Blood Cell Transfusion Over Time



Reoperation for Bleeding Over Time





Prolonged Ventilation Over Time



2018-2020

2021

2022

2023

0%

2000-2005

2006-2011

2012-2017

Postoperative CVA Over Time



Postoperative Renal Failure Over Time





Thank You!

Questions / Suggestions?

Sherri White, MSc, SSGBC Quality Improvement Advisor Sherri@vcsqi.org Eddie Fonner Exec. Director / Data Science Eddie@vcsqi.org

Transforming Cardiovascular Care to Improve Patient Experience and Value

Thank You!

Have a Safe and Happy Summer!

