

· 临床研究 ·

老年冠状动脉搭桥术后急性心肌梗死患者2年预后分析

李海蓬, 张健*

(泰达国际心血管病医院心血管内科, 天津 300457)

【摘要】目的 观察老年冠状动脉搭桥术(CABG)后急性心肌梗死(AMI)患者2年预后情况, 分析预后的影响因素。

方法 选择2017年6月至2020年6月泰达国际心血管病医院收治的CABG术后因AMI就诊的70例老年患者为研究对象。收集患者临床资料并进行2年随访, 观察心血管事件发生情况。应用SPSS 27.0统计软件进行数据分析。根据数据类型, 分别采用t检验、 χ^2 检验或Fisher精确检验进行组间比较。采用多因素logistic回归分析患者预后的影响因素。**结果** 2年随访中有31例(44.3%)患者发生心血管事件。logistic回归分析显示, 年龄>75岁($OR=6.465, 95\%CI 1.454\sim28.734$)、CABG术后吸烟($OR=5.874, 95\%CI 1.457\sim23.674$)、介入术后心肌梗死溶栓(TIMI)血流分级<3级($OR=9.353, 95\%CI 1.279\sim68.371$)为心血管事件的危险因素; 原位冠状动脉介入治疗($OR=0.153, 95\%CI 0.043\sim0.540$)为心血管事件的保护因素。**结论** 对于CABG术后发生AMI的老年患者, 年龄>75岁、CABG术后吸烟、介入术后TIMI血流<3级增加心血管事件的发生, 原位冠状动脉介入治疗可减少心血管事件的发生。

【关键词】 老年人; 冠状动脉搭桥术; 急性心肌梗死; 预后

【中图分类号】 R541.4

【文献标志码】 A

【DOI】 10.11915/j.issn.1671-5403.2023.03.040

Two-year prognosis analysis of elderly patients with acute myocardial infarction after coronary artery bypass graft

Li Haipeng, Zhang Jian*

(Department of Cardiology, TEDA International Cardiovascular Hospital, Tianjin 300457, China)

【Abstract】 Objective To observe the two-year prognosis of elderly patients with acute myocardial infarction (AMI) after coronary artery bypass graft (CABG), and investigate the factors that influence the prognosis. **Methods** A total of 70 patients suffering from AMI after CABG admitted in our hospital from June 2017 to June 2020 were recruited in this study. Their clinical data were collected, and the incidence of cardiovascular events were observed in a two-year follow-up. SPSS statistics 27.0 was used for data analysis. Student's *t* test, Chi-square test, or Fisher exact test was employed for intergroup comparison depending on data type. Multivariate logistic regression model was adopted to analyze the factors influencing the prognosis of patients. **Results** There were 31 (44.3%) patients experiencing cardiovascular events during the two years' follow-up. Logistic regression analysis showed that age >75 years ($OR=6.465, 95\%CI 1.454\sim28.734$), smoking after CABG ($OR=5.874, 95\%CI 1.457\sim23.674$), and thrombolysis in myocardial infarction (TIMI) flow grade <3 after percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) ($OR=9.353, 95\%CI 1.279\sim68.371$) were risk factors for cardiovascular events, while PCI in native coronary artery ($OR=0.153, 95\%CI 0.043\sim0.540$) was a protective factor for the events in the elderly. **Conclusion** For the elderly patients suffering from AMI after CABG, age >75 years, smoking after grafting, and TIMI flow grade<3 after PCI increase the incidence, while PCI in native coronary artery reduces the incidence of cardiovascular events.

【Key words】 aged; coronary artery bypass graft; acute myocardial infarction; prognosis

Corresponding author: Zhang Jian, E-mail: 13920642460@163.com

冠状动脉搭桥术(coronary artery bypass graft, CABG)后的老年患者常合并多重心血管危险因素, 若发生急性心肌梗死(acute myocardial infarction, AMI), 往往预后不良。目前对于此类高危患者的治

疗多依赖于临床经验。受发病率所限, 既往相关研究以个案报道或短期随访为主。本研究对CABG后再发AMI患者进行2年随访, 观察心血管不良事件的发生情况, 分析事件的危险因素。

1 对象与方法

1.1 研究对象

选择2017年6月至2020年6月因AMI就诊于泰达国际心血管病医院的≥60岁的70例CABG后患者为研究对象。纳入标准:(1)既往接受CABG;(2)AMI符合1型心肌梗死;(3)AMI发生时年龄≥60岁。排除标准:(1)CABG后<1个月;(2)无法完成冠状动脉造影;(3)因其他疾病预期寿命<1年。住院期间完成冠状动脉及桥血管造影,并进行介入治疗。

1.2 临床资料收集

查阅患者病历,收集基线资料,包括性别、年龄、既往病史、吸烟史等,辅助检查资料包括相关化验(血脂、肾功能、肌钙蛋白峰值等)指标,心脏超声指标(左室舒张末期直径,左室射血分数)。调阅影像数据,记录冠状动脉及桥血管病变和介入治疗情况。

1.3 随访

自心肌梗死发病起随访2年,收集患者出院后用药情况及主要心血管不良事件(心源性死亡、再次心肌梗死、靶血管血运重建、因心力衰竭入院)发生情况。发生多次事件时以首发事件为准。

1.4 统计学处理

采用SPSS 27.0统计软件进行数据分析。计量资料以均数±标准差($\bar{x}\pm s$)表示,组间比较采用t检验。计数资料以例数(百分率)表示,组间比较采用 χ^2 检验或Fisher精确检验。采用多因素logistic回归分析患者预后的影响因素。 $P<0.05$ 为差异有统计学意义。

2 结果

2.1 2组患者临床资料与随访结果

70例患者中,男性60例,女性10例;年龄60~84(68.30 ± 6.88)岁;非ST段抬高型心肌梗死55例,ST段抬高型心肌梗死15例(前壁2例,侧壁1例,下壁9例,下壁后壁3例)。既往病史中陈旧性心肌梗死31例(44.3%),房颤13例(18.6%),高血压54例(77.1%),糖尿病31例(44.3%),脑血管病12例(17.1%)。42例(60.0%)患者既往吸烟,而19例(27.1%)患者在CABG后仍吸烟。

2年随访期内有31例(44.3%)患者发生心血管不良事件,以首发事件为准,其中猝死2例、因心力衰竭入院16例、再次心肌梗死10例、再次靶血管

重建3例。

根据是否发生心血管事件将患者分为事件组(31例)和无事件组(39例)。事件组患者的左室射血分数较无事件组低[(49.00 ± 10.12)%和(53.92 ± 9.87)%; $P<0.05$]。2组患者年龄、性别、既往合并症史、入院时心肌梗死类型、血脂水平、肾功能指标、肌钙蛋白峰值及出院后用药情况等差异无统计学意义($P>0.05$)。

2.2 2组患者血管病变及介入治疗情况比较

事件组患者桥血管年限较无事件组长,进行原位冠状动脉介入治疗(percutaneous coronary intervention,PCI)的比例较无事件组低,于静脉桥血管介入治疗比例高,差异均有统计学意义($P<0.05$;表1)。

2.3 影响患者2年内心血管事件的多因素 logistic 回归分析

以年龄>75岁、性别(男性)、高血压病史、糖尿病史、CABG后吸烟、低密度脂蛋白胆固醇>1.8 mmol/L及桥血管年限>10年、LIMA-LAD桥通畅、血栓性病变、原位冠状动脉介入治疗、PCI术后TIMI血流<3级为自变量,以是否发生心血管事件为因变量进行多因素logistic回归分析。结果显示,年龄>75岁、CABG后吸烟、PCI术后TIMI血流<3级为老年CABG后AMI患者2年内发生心血管事件的危险因素,原位冠状动脉介入治疗则为保护因素(表2)。

3 讨论

目前对CABG后出现AMI患者预后的研究有限。据报道,AMI患者中3.4%~7.2%有CABG病史^[1,2],而CABG术后5年内有约2.2%患者发生AMI^[3],但这类人群的年龄大,合并其他系统疾病比例高,长期预后差。本研究主要观察有CABG史的老年患者在发生AMI后的预后情况。发现患者合并高血压(77.1%)、糖尿病(44.3%)、脑血管病(17.1%)的比例较高,2年内共有44.3%(31/70)的患者发生心血管事件。有研究显示CABG后桥血管发生病变与冠心病传统的危险因素无明显相关性^[4]。对于CABG后行静脉桥介入治疗的患者,女性、急性冠状动脉综合征及中风可能是心血管事件的独立预测因素^[5]。本研究结果显示,年龄>75岁和CABG后吸烟是心血管事件的危险因素。虽然吸烟史在2组间无显著差异,但是CABG后继续吸烟则是高危因素。吸烟史主要影响原冠状动脉病变,术后吸烟则可能对桥血管病变进展有较大影响。

表1 2组患者血管病变及介入治疗情况比较

Table 1 Comparison of vascular lesion and interventional therapy between two groups

Item	Event group (n=31)	Non-event group (n=39)	t/χ ²	P value
Usage life of graft (years, $\bar{x} \pm s$)	10.10±3.90	7.36±3.63	3.032	0.003
Total number of graft ($\bar{x} \pm s$)	3.81±0.48	3.51±0.79	1.921	0.059
Occluded graft ($\bar{x} \pm s$)	2.03±0.91	1.59±1.07	1.834	0.071
Fluent graft ($\bar{x} \pm s$)	1.77±0.98	1.92±0.93	0.681	0.498
Fluent LIMA-LAD graft [n (%)]	23 (74.2)	32 (82.1)	0.633	0.426
Infarct related graft [n (%)]			3.996	0.262
LIMA-LAD	2 (6.5)	0 (0.0)		
AO-LAD/D	6 (19.4)	5 (12.8)		
AO-LCX/OM	12 (38.7)	14 (35.9)		
AO-RCA	11 (35.5)	20 (51.3)		
Oral lesions of graft [n (%)]	9 (29.0)	9 (23.1)	0.321	0.571
Anastomotic lesions of graft [n (%)]	3 (9.7)	1 (2.6)		0.315 *
Thrombotic lesions [n (%)]	7 (22.6)	3 (7.7)		0.096 *
Vessel type of PCI			11.124	0.004
Native coronary artery [n (%)]	11 (35.5)	29 (74.4)		
Vein graft [n (%)]	19 (61.3)	10 (25.6)		
LIMA graft [n (%)]	1 (3.2)	0 (0.0)		
Stent implanting [n (%)]	25 (80.6)	36 (92.3)		0.171 *
Total length of stent (mm, $\bar{x} \pm s$)	31.25±19.34	38.82±23.41	1.185	0.242
TIMI flow grade<3 after PCI [n (%)]	6 (22.6)	2 (5.1)		0.068 *

LIMA: left internal mammary artery; LAD: left anterior descending; AO: aorta; D: diagonal; LCX: left circumflex artery; OM: obtuse marginal; RCA: right coronary artery; PCI: percutaneous coronary intervention; TIMI: thrombolysis in myocardial infarction. *: Fisher's exact test.

表2 影响患者2年内心血管事件的多因素 logistic 回归分析

Table 2 Multivariate logistic regression analysis of cardiovascular events in two years

Factor	OR(95%CI)	P value
Age>75 years	6.465(1.454,28.734)	0.014
Gender (male)	1.458(0.663,3.259)	0.373
History of hypertension	1.164(0.457,1.831)	0.985
History of diabetes mellitus	1.272(0.819,1.975)	0.111
Smoking after CABG	5.874(1.457,23.674)	0.013
LDL-C>1.8 mmol/L	1.500(0.851,2.213)	0.203
Usage life of graft>10 years	1.786(0.859,2.819)	0.391
Fluent LIMA-LAD graft	0.802(0.447,1.441)	0.767
Thrombotic lesions	2.000(0.759,5.271)	0.261
PCI in native coronary artery	0.153(0.043,0.540)	0.004
TIMI flow grade<3 after PCI	9.353(1.279,68.371)	0.028

CABG: coronary artery bypass graft; LDL-C: low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LIMA: left internal mammary artery; LAD: left anterior descending; PCI: percutaneous coronary intervention; TIMI: thrombolysis in myocardial infarction.

血管重塑是静脉桥血管在CABG后的必然过程。它需要形成新生内膜来应对动脉血流产生的剪切力。新生内膜形成和再内皮化是保持静脉桥血管

通畅的关键因素,在这一过程中的细胞因子和局部介质会促进血管粥样硬化的发展^[6]。静脉桥血管在CABG后病变率较高,3%~12%的静脉桥血管在出院前就发生闭塞,8%~25%则在1年内闭塞,10年后只有50%~60%保持通畅。其中有3个病理生理过程:血栓形成和技术原因是术后1个月内病变的主要机制;其次是1个月至1年的血管内膜增生;1年以上则粥样硬化是主要原因。静脉桥血管粥样硬化的进展速度比冠状动脉快,并且病变更不稳定^[7]。吸烟是导致血管内膜炎症的重要原因,可加速粥样硬化的进展。通过光学相干断层成像检查可以发现,吸烟者的脂质斑块和薄纤维帽粥样硬化发生率高,并且与斑块侵蚀和斑块破裂有关,从而引起血栓形成,发生急性心血管事件^[8]。既往吸烟对原静脉血管影响较小,但搭桥术后继续吸烟,则可能明显影响静脉桥血管的重塑。因此CABG术后戒烟可减少心血管事件的发生。这个建议对于有内乳动脉-前降支桥血管的患者同样适用^[9]。

既往有CABG史的患者行PCI的预后比无CABG的患者差。再次CABG可能比桥血管PCI的预后好,但和原位冠状动脉PCI的预后无明显差

异^[10]。2018年《ESC/EACTS血运重建指南》以及2020年《血管重建失败后治疗管理欧洲专家共识》均建议CABG后晚期(CABG手术>1个月)桥血管失败需血运重建时,首选PCI治疗^[11,12]。静脉桥血管的粥样硬化斑块脆弱,静脉桥血管PCI与2年不良缺血性事件的发生风险升高相关^[13]。在日本的研究中大多数CABG后患者的PCI病例是在原位冠状动脉血管中进行(89.7%)^[14]。虽然没有随机对照研究,但观察性研究显示原位PCI的短期和长期结果更好^[15,16]。因此,指南及共识建议CABG后需再次血运重建时,在原位冠状动脉行PCI^[11,12]。

对于CABG后再发心肌梗死患者,当罪犯血管是静脉桥血管时,3年心血管事件发生率高于原位冠状动脉^[17]。对于CABG后再发心肌梗死患者的血运重建方式,PCI是首选。但对于目标血管选择要因人而异。因为原位冠脉PCI并不总是容易完成的。既往CABG的患者原位冠状动脉病变往往比较复杂,常存在慢性完全闭塞病变和严重钙化病变,这类病变的干预常需要丰富的经验和专门的设备。AMI患者手术时,为保证患者安全,尽快开通血管可能更重要,因此在静脉桥急性病变导致心肌梗死的情况下,对原位冠状动脉病变进行PCI并不总是最佳选择,而对于静脉桥血管的介入治疗可能较快成功,改善血流及心肌灌注。因此,对靶血管的选择很大程度上取决于患者生命体征及冠状动脉病变情况。本研究中有30例(42.9%)患者采取了介入治疗桥血管的方式,但是采取原位冠状动脉治疗的心血管预后优于桥血管治疗是明确的,本研究结果也支持此结论。因此,对于此类高危患者,尽可能介入原位冠状动脉仍是首选。静脉桥血管介入治疗易发生无复流^[18],冠状动脉弥漫长病变介入治疗也易出现相似情况,术后若TIMI血流<3级,预示着不良预后^[19],在本研究中发现术后TIMI血流<3级是不良事件的独立危险因素。因此需采取积极措施预防改善无复流情况。目前使用血栓保护装置的效果仍不明确^[20],本研究中未使用此装置,更多的是采用直接支架置入,减少后扩张及药物来预防和逆转无复流。

本研究为单中心的回顾性研究,受发病率所限样本量较小,今后仍需继续随访,持续关注CABG后心肌梗死患者的治疗进展,为这一高危患者群体的治疗提供更好的建议。

【参考文献】

- [1] Karacsonyi J, Schmidt CW, Okeson BK, et al. Comparison of outcomes of patients with vs without previous coronary artery bypass graft surgery presenting with ST-segment elevation acute myocardial infarction [J]. Am J Cardiol, 2021, 154: 33–40. DOI: 10.1016/j.amjcard.2021.05.041.
- [2] Iqbal J, Kwok CS, Kontopantelis E, et al. Outcomes following primary percutaneous coronary intervention in patients with previous coronary artery bypass surgery [J]. Circ Cardiovasc Interv, 2016, 9(4): e003151. DOI: 10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.115.003151.
- [3] Johannesson H, Amadottir LO, Adalsteinsson JA, et al. Favourable long-term outcome after coronary artery bypass grafting in a nationwide cohort [J]. Scand Cardiovasc J, 2017, 51(6): 327–333. DOI: 10.1080/14017431.2017.1364418.
- [4] 李丽,赵强,盖鲁粤,等.冠状动脉旁路移植术后移植血管的转归及影响因素分析[J].中国循环杂志,2017,32(2):128–131. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1000-3614.2017.02.004.
Li L, Zhao Q, Gai LY, et al. Outcome and influencing factor analysis for graft vessels in patients after coronary artery bypass grafting [J]. Chin Circ J, 2017, 32(2): 128–131. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn. 1000-3614. 2017. 02. 004.
- [5] Adnan G, Ahmed I, Tai J, et al. Long-term clinical outcomes of percutaneous coronary intervention in saphenous vein grafts in a low to middle-income country [J]. Cureus, 2020, 12(11): e11496. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.11496.
- [6] Scarsini R, Zivelonghi C, Pesarini G, et al. Repeat revascularization: percutaneous coronary intervention after coronary artery bypass graft surgery [J]. Cardiovasc Revasc Med, 2016, 17(4): 272–278. DOI: 10.1016/j.carrev.2016.04.007.
- [7] Xenogiannis I, Zenati M, Bhatt DL, et al. Saphenous vein graft failure: from pathophysiology to prevention and treatment strategies [J]. Circulation, 2021, 144(9): 728–745. DOI: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.120.052163.
- [8] 杨炼,于波.吸烟与他汀类药物疗效在冠状动脉粥样硬化中的相互影响[J].心血管康复医学杂志,2021,30(3):366–370. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1008-0074.2021.03.31.
Yang S, Yu B. Interaction between smoking and statins in coronary atherosclerosis [J]. Chin J Cardiovasc Rehabil Med, 2021, 30(3): 366–370. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1008-0074.2021.03.31.
- [9] 潘丽娜,高云,刘虹宏,等.冠状动脉旁路移植术后二级预防措施与左乳内动脉桥血管病变相关性研究[J].心肺血管病杂志,2022,41(1): 56–60. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1007-5062.2022.01.012.
Pan LN, Gao Y, Liu HH, et al. Correlation between secondary prevention measures after coronary artery bypass grafting and

- lesions of left internal mammary artery [J]. J Cardiovasc Pulm Dis, 2022, 41(1): 56–60. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1007-5062.2022.01.012.
- [10] Locker C, Greiten LE, Bell MR, et al. Repeat coronary bypass surgery or percutaneous coronary intervention after previous surgical revascularization[J]. Mayo Clin Proc, 2019, 94(9): 1743–1752. DOI: 10.1016/j.mayocp.2019.01.048.
- [11] Neumann FJ, Sousa-Uva M, Ahlsson A, et al. 2018 ESC/EACTS guidelines on myocardial revascularization[J]. Eur Heart J, 2019 (40): 87–165. DOI: 10.1093/euroheartj/ehy394.
- [12] Stefanini GG, Alfonso F, Barbato E, et al. Management of myocardial revascularisation failure: an expert consensus document of the EAPCI[J]. EuroIntervention, 2020, 16(11): e875–e890. DOI: 10.4244/EIJ-D-20-00487.
- [13] Redfors B, Généreux P, Witzenbichler B, et al. Percutaneous coronary intervention of saphenous vein graft[J]. Circ Cardiovasc Interv, 2017, 10(5): e004953. DOI: 10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.117.004953.
- [14] Oba Y, Inohara T, Takahashi M, et al. In-hospital outcomes and usage of embolic protection devices in percutaneous coronary intervention for coronary artery bypass grafts: insights from a Japanese nationwide registry[J]. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv, 2021, 98(3): E356–E364. DOI: 10.1002/ccd.29695.
- [15] Abdelrahman A, Dębski M, More R, et al. One-year outcomes of percutaneous coronary intervention in native coronary arteries versus saphenous vein grafts in patients with prior coronary artery bypass graft surgery [J]. Cardiol J, 2022, 29(3): 396–404. DOI: 10.5603/CJ.a2020.0131.
- [16] Brilakis ES, O'Donnell CI, Penny W, et al. Percutaneous coronary intervention in native coronary arteries *versus* bypass grafts in patients with prior coronary artery bypass graft surgery[J]. JACC Cardiovasc Interv, 2016, 9(9): 884–893. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcin.2016.01.034.
- [17] Kheifets M, Vaknin-Assa H, Greenberg G, et al. Outcomes of primary percutaneous cardiac intervention for ST elevation myocardial infarction with a saphenous vein graft culprit[J]. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv, 2020, 96(1): E75–E83. DOI: 10.1002/cdi.28662.
- [18] Dianati Maleki N, Ehteshami Afshar A, Parikh PB. Management of saphenous vein graft disease in patients with prior coronary artery bypass surgery[J]. Curr Treat Options Cardiovasc Med, 2019, 21(2): 12. DOI: 10.1007/s11936-019-0714-7.
- [19] Caiazzo G, Musci RL, Frediani L, et al. State of the art no-reflow phenomenon[J]. Cardiol Clin, 2020, 38(4): 563–573. DOI: 10.1016/j.ccl.2020.07.001.
- [20] Paul TK, Bhatheja S, Panchal HB, et al. Outcomes of saphenous vein graft intervention with and without embolic protection device: a comprehensive review and Meta-analysis[J]. Circ Cardiovasc Interv, 2017, 10(12): e005583. DOI: 10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.117.005538.

(编辑: 郑真真)