#### **CLINICAL RESEARCH**

#### **Interventional Cardiology**

## A Contemporary View of Diagnostic Cardiac Catheterization and Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in the United States

A Report From the CathPCI Registry of the National Cardiovascular Data Registry, 2010 Through June 2011

Gregory J. Dehmer, MD,\* Douglas Weaver, MD,† Matthew T. Roe, MD,‡ Sarah Milford-Beland, MS,§ Susan Fitzgerald, RN,|| Anthony Hermann, RN, MBA,|| John Messenger, MD,¶ Issam Moussa, MD,# Kirk Garratt, MSC, MD,\*\* John Rumsfeld, MD, PHD,¶ Ralph G. Brindis, MD, MPH††

Temple, Texas; Detroit, Michigan; Durham, North Carolina; Washington, DC; Denver, Colorado; Jacksonville, Florida; New York, New York; and San Francisco, California

**Objectives** This study sought to provide a report to the public of data from the CathPCI Registry of the National Cardiovascular Data Registry. Background The CathPCI Registry collects data from approximately 85% of the cardiac catheterization laboratories in the United States. Methods Data were summarized for 6 consecutive calendar quarters beginning January 1, 2010, and ending June 30, 2011. This report includes 1,110,150 patients undergoing only diagnostic cardiac catheterization and 941,248 undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI). Results Some notable findings include, for example, that on-site cardiac surgery was not available in 83% of facilities performing fewer than 200 PCIs annually, with these facilities representing 32.6% of the facilities reporting, but performing only 12.4% of the PCIs in this data sample. Patients 65 years of age or older represented 38.7% of those undergoing PCI, with 12.3% being 80 years of age or older. Almost 80% of PCI patients were overweight (body mass index  $\ge$  25 kg/m<sup>2</sup>), 80% had dyslipidemia, and 27.6% were current or recent smokers. Among patients undergoing elective PCI, 52% underwent a stress study before the procedure, with stress myocardial perfusion being used most frequently. Calcium scores and coronary computed tomography angiography were used very infrequently (<3%) before diagnostic or PCI procedures. Radial artery access was used in 8.3% of diagnostic and 6.9% of PCI procedures. Primary PCI was performed with a median door-to-balloon time of 64.5 min for nontransfer patients and 121 min for transfer patients. In-hospital risk-adjusted mortality in ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction patients was 5.2% in this sample. Conclusions Data from the CathPCI Registry provide a contemporary view of the current practice of invasive cardiology in the United States. (J Am Coll Cardiol 2012;60:2017-31) © 2012 by the American College of Cardiology Foundation

Technologies (co-founder), Guided Delivery Systems, MedLogics, and Arstasis; and research support from Abbott Vascular (institutional PI) and Boston Scientific (national PI). Dr. Weaver is a member of the Data and Safety Monitoring Board of Boston Scientific. Dr. Roe is a consultant to AstraZeneca, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Eli Lilly & Company, GlaxoSmithKline, Merck & Co., Novartis Pharmaceutical Corporation, sanofiaventis, and Schering-Plough Corporation; and has received research grants from Bristol-Myers Squibb, Eli Lilly & Company, Sanofi-aventis, and Schering-Plough Corporation; and has received research grants from Bristol-Myers Squibb, Eli Lilly & Company, sanofi-aventis, and Schering-Plough Corporation. Dr. Messenger has received an institutional research grant from Medtronic and Site PI. Dr. Garratt has received honoraria, and has investments. All other authors have reported that they have no relationships relevant to the contents of this paper to disclose.

Manuscript received June 9, 2012; revised manuscript received July 25, 2012, accepted August 13, 2012.

From the \*Texas A&M Health Science Center College of Medicine, Division of Cardiology, Scott & White Healthcare, Temple, Texas; †Cardiology Division, Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit, Michigan; ‡Cardiology Division, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina; \$Duke Clinical Research Institute, Durham, North Carolina; ||American College of Cardiology, Washington, DC; ¶Division of Cardiology, University of Colorado, Denver, Colorado; #Division of Cardiology, Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, Florida; \*\*Department of Interventional Cardiology, Lenox Hill Hospital, New York, New York; and the ††Department of Medicine, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, California. Dr. Dehmer has received honoraria/speaking fees from Sanofi-aventis, Daiichi-Sankyo, The Medicines Company, Boston Scientific, Medtronic, and Abbott Vascular; consultancies from The Medicines Company, Boston Scientific, and Abbott Vascular; equity holdings in Infarct Reduction

#### Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACCF = American College of Cardiology Foundation	America Founda oped to
BMS = bare-metal stent(s) CABG = coronary artery bypass graft	ers and ing thei
CAD = coronary artery disease	tion labo
NCDR = National	medical
Cardiovascular Data	ipating
Registry	close ga
PCI = percutaneous	reduce
coronary intervention	care va
<b>STEMI</b> = ST-segment	effective
elevation myocardial	provem
infarction	move in
STS = Society of Thoracic	and pub
Surgeons	the NC

The National Cardiovascular Data Registry (NCDR) of the an College of Cardiology tion (ACCF) was develassist healthcare providinstitutions in documentir processes and outcomes in the cardiac catheterizaoratory. As a resource, the is positioned to help professionals and partichospitals identify and aps in the quality of care; wasteful and inefficient riations; and implement e, continuous quality imnent processes. As we nto the era of transparency olic reporting, the value of CDR is increasing, not only for benchmarking out-

comes, but also as a potent repository of clinical data to answer research questions.

## History of the CathPCI Registry

A full description of the historical development of the NCDR is presented elsewhere (1,2). Today, 1,488 facilities in the United States are enrolled in the CathPCI Registry, which captures an estimated 85% of the percutaneous coronary interventions (PCI) performed in the United States (Fig. 1). The Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions collaborates with the ACCF on the registry effort.

### **Participation, Data Definitions, and Collection**

Participation in the NCDR CathPCI Registry is voluntary. Most participating facilities (68%) submit data on diagnostic catheterization and PCI procedures, 29% submit data only on PCI procedures, and 3% provide information only on diagnostic procedures. Because interventional practices are driven by technologies that change quickly, there have been several registry modifications leading to the current version 4.4 that began receiving data on April 1, 2011. This version expanded data collection on pre-catheterization imaging procedures, used a new bleeding definition, and provided the first report of test metrics for assessment of the appropriate use criteria for coronary revascularization. The current version has 253 data fields, with definitions and specifications available online (3). Data are collected up to the time of hospital discharge, which is a potential limitation (4).

### **Site Performance and Auditing Program**

The NCDR Data Quality Program was developed to ensure that data submitted are complete, consistent, and accurate

and thus usable to improve the quality of clinical practice. Participant submissions are reviewed for completeness and are not accepted if data completeness criteria are unmet. Each year, 25 sites are selected randomly for a comprehensive on-site data audit. The structure of the Data Quality Program and audit results recently were reported (5). Several states conduct more extensive audits of data, because they are used for statewide reporting programs.

### **NCDR Reports and Risk Adjustment Methods**

Participants in the registry receive quarterly reports reflecting their aggregate data and a rolling summary of the previous 4 quarters. Results from facilities with similar procedure volumes and from the entire registry are provided for comparison with a recent online tool developed to allow facilities to perform a detailed analysis of their own data. An executive summary of key metrics is provided in a box-and-whisker plot format (Fig. 2). The NCDR provides an in-hospital risk-adjusted mortality model that is endorsed by the National Quality Forum (6,7). Bleeding and acute kidney injury risk models also have been developed (8).



Download English Version:

# https://daneshyari.com/en/article/2946605

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/2946605

Daneshyari.com