Appendix C. Summary Tables

Appendix C. Table 1. Study design and patient characteristics of FFR-guided stenting versus angiography-guided stenting (Key Question 1)

| AuthorYear [UI] CountryStudy Name | Study Design,N Center | Followup Duration, yr | IntervType | N | Age, yr | Male, % | Ejection Fraction, % | Previous MI, % | DM, % | HTN, % | Dyslipidemia, % | Stenoses Location, % | ACC/AHA Lesion Type, % | Risk of BiasComments |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tonino 2009Fearon, 2010Pijls 2010[191449372112697320537493] | RCTMulticenter | 2 yr | FFR | 509 | 64.6 ± 10.3 | 75.4 | 57.2 | 36.7 | 24.2 | 61.3 | 71.9 | ND | ND | Low |
| USEurope FAME |  |  | Angio | 496 | 64.2 ± 10.2 | 72.6 | 57.1 | 36.3 | 25.2 | 65.9 | 73 | ND | ND |  |
| Wongpraparut 2005[16188509]US | Prospective comparativeSingle center | 2.5 yr | FFR | 57 | 58 ± 10 | 75 | 52  | ND | 43 | 78 | 66 | ND | ND | Mediumnon-randomized study; no matched or adjusted analysis |
|  |  |  | Angio | 80 | 62 **±** 12 | 79 | 50 | ND | 34 | 70 | 60 | ND | ND |  |
| Muramatsu, 2002[12403892] | Prospective intervention with historical control | ~2 yr | FFR | 77 | 62 ± 11 | 79.3 | ND | ND | 12.5 | ND | 22.5 | LAD 62.3Multivessel 48.1 | ND | Highhistorical control, intervention group prospective sample of consecutive patients; unadjusted analyses |
| Japan |  |  | Angio | 77 | 64 ± 11 | 73.1 | ND | ND | 18.9 | ND | 24.3 | LAD 39.7Multivessel 48.7 | ND |  |