



Supplementary material

Impact of the Everolimus-eluting Bioresorbable Scaffold in Coronary Atherosclerosis

Carlos M. Campos,^{a,b,c} Hector M. Garcia-Garcia,^{a,*} Takashi Muramatsu,^{a,d} Pedro de Araujo Goncalves,^{e,f,g} Yoshinobu Onuma,^a Dariusz Dudek,^h Leif Thuesen,ⁱ Mark WI Webster,^j Pieter Kitslaar,^{k,l} Susan Veldhof,^m Johan H. C. Reiber,^{k,l} Koen Nieman,^{a,n} John A. Ormiston,^j and Patrick W. Serruys^o

^a*Department of Cardiology, Erasmus University Medical Centre, Thoraxcenter, Rotterdam, The Netherlands*

^b*Heart Institute (InCor), University of São Paulo Medical School, Sao Paulo, Brazil*

^c*Department of Interventional Cardiology, Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein, Sao Paulo, Brazil*

^d*Department of Cardiology, Fujita Health University Hospital, Toyoake, Japan*

^e*Cardiology Department, Hospital de Santa Cruz, CHLO, Lisbon, Portugal*

^f*Hospital da Luz, Cardiovascular Center, ESS, Lisbon, Portugal*

^g*CEDOC, Chronic Diseases Research Center, FCM-NOVA, Lisbon, Portugal*

^h*Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland*

ⁱ*Department of Cardiology, Aarhus University Hospital, Skejby, Denmark*

^j*Auckland City Hospital, Auckland, New Zealand*

^k*Medis Medical Imaging Systems bv, Leiden, The Netherlands*

^l*Division of Image Processing, Department of Radiology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands*

^m*Abbott, Vascular, Diegem, Belgium*

ⁿ*Department of Radiology, Thoraxcenter, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, the Netherlands*

^o*International Centre for Circulatory Health, NHLI, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom*

Cluster Analysis

A K-mean cluster analysis was run using the segment name as a categorical variable and the change in percent atheroma volume (% PAV) as continuous variable. Two clusters were found, distributed as follows:

		Segment name							Total
		LCX distal	LCX proximal	LAD distal	LAD proximal	RCA distal	RCA proximal	Scaffold	
Cluster 1	Count	8	7	5	7	12	10	9	58
Number	% within cluster	13.8%	12.1%	8.6%	12.1%	20.7%	17.2%	15.5%	100.0%
Case number	% within segment name	66.7%	53.8%	55.6%	77.8%	85.7%	71.4%	50.0%	65.2%
	% of total	9.0%	7.9%	5.6%	7.9%	13.5%	11.2%	10.1%	65.2%
Cluster 2	Count	4	6	4	2	2	4	9	31
	% within cluster	12.9%	19.4%	12.9%	6.5%	6.5%	12.9%	29.0%	100.0%
Case number of Case	% within segment name	33.3%	46.2%	44.4%	22.2%	14.3%	28.6%	50.0%	34.8%
	% of total	4.5%	6.7%	4.5%	2.2%	2.2%	4.5%	10.1%	34.8%
Total	Count	12	13	9	9	14	14	18	89
	% within cluster	13.5%	14.6%	10.1%	10.1%	15.7%	15.7%	20.2%	100.0%
Case number of	% within 18 months.Segment_name	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of total	13.5%	14.6%	10.1%	10.1%	15.7%	15.7%	20.2%	100.0%

It can be noticed that in nonintervened segments, most segments were in cluster 1. Moreover, treated segments were divided equally between clusters 1 and 2. The most prevalent segments in cluster 2 were treated segments (29.0% of cluster 2 members).

LAD, left anterior descending coronary artery; LCX, left circumflex coronary artery; RCA, right coronary artery.

The changes in percent atheroma volume of the 2 clusters were the following:

	Cluster Number	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Standard error of the mean	<i>P</i>
Percent atheroma volume at 18 –mo	1	58	43.59	9.99	1.31	.010
	2	31	49.33	9.44	1.69	
Percent atheroma volume at 60-mo	1	58	49.42	11.01	1.44	.018
	2	31	43.88	8.89	1.59	
Change in percent atheroma volume	1	58	5.83	4.10	0.53	<.01
	2	31	-5.45	4.78	0.85	
Distance of case from its classification cluster center	1	58	3.19	2.54	0.33	.16
	2	31	3.99	2.52	0.45	

Cluster 1 had a mean increase of $5.83 \pm 4.10\%$ in %PAV while cluster 2 had a mean decrease of $5.45 \pm 4.78\%$ in %PAV ($P < .01$). The mean intracluster distance of case from its classification cluster center did not differ between the 2 groups ($P = .16$).