

1 Incidence and Predictors of In-stent Restenosis Following 2 Intervention for Pulmonary Vein Stenosis due to Fibrosing 3 Mediastinitis

4 **Running title:** Contributors toward ISR for PVS-FM

5 *Mengfei Jia^{1*}, Hongling Su^{2*}, Kaiyu Jiang², Aqian Wang², Zhaoxia Guo², Hai Zhu²,*
6 *Fu Zhang², Pan Xin^{3#}, Yunshan Cao^{2#}*

7 ^{*}Mengfei Jia and Hongling Su contributed equally to this work.

8 ¹The First Clinical Medical College of Gansu University of Chinese Medicine (Gansu
9 Provincial Hospital), Lanzhou, Gansu 730000, China;

10 ²Department of Cardiology, Pulmonary Vascular Disease Center, Gansu
11 Provincial Hospital, Lanzhou, Gansu 730000, China;

12 ³Department of Cardiology, Shanghai Chest Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University,
13 Shanghai 200030, China.

14 [#]Corresponding authors: Yunshan Cao, E-mail: yunshancao@126.com; Xin Pan, E-
15 mail: panxin805@163.com.

16 **Funding sources:** This work was supported by the National Natural Science
17 Foundation of China (82070052) and the Open Project of State Key Laboratory of
18 Respiratory Disease (SKLRD-OP-202301).

19 **Acknowledgments:** All individuals who contributed to this publication have been
20 included as authors.

Abstract Presentation: This abstract has been accepted for presentation at the European Society of Cardiology Congress 2023 on August 26, 2023, in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. It was also accepted for publication by the European Society of Cardiology.

Trial Registry: Chinese Clinical Trials Register; No.: ChiCTR2000033153. URL: <http://www.chictr.org.cn>

Disclosures: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Author contributions: Y.C. and X.P. conceptualized and designed the study. K.J. and A.W. searched the literature and collected data. M.J. undertook data analysis. Z.G. H.Z. and F.Z. provided clinical commentary on methods and interpretation. M.J. and H.S. drafted the initial manuscript, with critical revision of the article from all authors. Y.C. and X.P. reviewed the manuscript. Y.C. is responsible for the overall content as guarantor.

Word Count Abstract: 227

Word Count Text: 2982

Abbreviations: Cor-PA = corresponding pulmonary artery; FLD = final lumen diameter; FM = fibrosing mediastinitis; ISR = in-stent restenosis; LA = left atrium; MLD = minimal lumen diameter; PA = pulmonary artery; Pd = pressure gradient; PTPV = percutaneous transluminal pulmonary venoplasty; PV = pulmonary vein; PVFG = pulmonary venous flow grade; PVI = pulmonary vein isolation; PVS =

pulmonary vein stenosis; PVS-FM = pulmonary vein stenosis caused by fibrosing
mediastinitis; RVD = reference vessel diameter.

Keywords: fibrosing Mediastinitis; in-stent restenosis; predictor; pulmonary veins;
stenting

Abstract

Background: Percutaneous transluminal pulmonary venoplasty (PTPV) is an
emerging treatment for pulmonary vein stenosis (PVS) caused by fibrosing
mediastinitis (FM). However, the incidence and predictors of in-stent restenosis (ISR)
are elusive. We sought to identify the predictors of ISR in patients with PVS caused
by extraluminal compression due to FM.

Methods: We retrospectively enrolled patients with PVS-FM who underwent PTPV
between July 1, 2018, and December 31, 2022. According to ISR status, patients were
divided into two groups: the ISR group and the non-ISR group. Baseline
characteristics (demographics and lesions) and procedure-related information were
abstracted from patient records and analyzed. Univariate and multivariate analyses
were performed to determine the predictors of ISR.

Results: A total of 142 stents were implanted in 134 PVs of 65 patients with PVS-FM.
Over a median follow-up of 6.6 (3.4-15.7) months, 61 of 134 PVs suffered from ISR.
Multivariate analysis demonstrated a significantly lower risk of ISR in PVs with a
larger reference vessel diameter (RVD) (odds ratio (OR): 0.79; 95% confidence
interval [CI]: 0.64 to 0.98; $P=0.032$), and stenosis of the corresponding pulmonary

artery (Cor-PA) independently increased the risk of restenosis (OR: 3.41; 95% CI: 1.31 to 8.86; $P=0.012$). The cumulative ISR was 6.3%, 21.4%, and 39.2% at the 3-, 6-, and 12-month follow-ups, respectively.

Conclusion: ISR is very high in PVS-FM, which is independently associated with RVD and Cor-PA stenosis.

Introduction

Fibrosing mediastinitis (FM) is characterized by benign proliferative fibrous tissue in the mediastinum, often compressing the pulmonary artery (PA), pulmonary vein (PV), bronchi, and superior vena cava, presenting with cough, dyspnea, hemoptysis, pleural effusion, superior vena cava syndrome, pulmonary hypertension, and right heart failure.^[1] Pulmonary vein stenosis (PVS) caused by FM (PVS-FM) is a kind of typical extraluminal compressing stenosis that is rare but fatal. Percutaneous transluminal pulmonary venoplasty (PTPV) is an emerging alternative for PVS-FM.^[2-4]

The first balloon angioplasty (BA) reported by Massumi et al^[5] in 1981 was performed in a female patient with PVS-FM. However, early reports showed that BA was unsuccessful in the treatment of PVS, including a modified BA technique.^[6,7] The first report on stent venoplasty of PVS-FM was in 2001, which brought a new therapeutic modality for FM.^[8] Reviewing the progress of PV interventions, in the early stage, transcatheter angioplasty was mainly used to correct congenital or postoperative PVS in children.^[9] Since the report of PVS after pulmonary vein isolation (PVI) in 1998, catheter-based intervention has become increasingly common

in the treatment of PVS caused by PVI (PVS-PVI) during the next 20 years.^[10]

Nevertheless, detailed information is scarce about interventional treatment for PVS-FM, including hemodynamic changes, procedure-related complications, comprehensive follow-up data, incidence, and predictors of in-stent restenosis (ISR).^[11]

The pathogenesis of PVS-FM is different from that of PVS-PVI and congenital PVS. PVS-FM is attributed to extraluminal proliferative fibrous tissue compression,^[12] while other PVS are attributed to intimal hyperplasia.^[13,14] Hence, even though PTPV has been successfully used in PVS-PVI, PTPV in PVS-FM might be different. Our preliminary data showed that patients with PVS-FM who underwent interventions, both in terms of hemodynamics and exercise capacity, had clinical improvement but a high prevalence of restenosis during a very short-term follow-up.^[15] Therefore, identifying the clinical and procedural factors associated with ISR is critical to guide intervention and optimize postintervention surveillance strategies. Against this background, we sought to identify the predictors associated with ISR following PVS-FM intervention.

Methods

Study population

From July 1, 2018, to December 31, 2022, we identified 144 patients with FM according to history, symptoms, signs, and findings in enhanced computed tomography (CT) with contrast in our center. Patients with PVS caused by tumors and

other diseases were excluded. Patients were followed from PVS-FM diagnosis until the last follow-up or until May 2023 if receiving ongoing care. Patients were followed at set intervals with repeat CT imaging at 1-3, 3-6, 6-12, and 24 months after the intervention.

Data collection

Patient clinical data at baseline and follow-up periods were collected. If a patient with PVS-FM was analyzed as part of the ISR cohort and the patient also had normal veins, the patient might have had veins analyzed in 2 different cohorts. The procedure-related parameters collected included minimal lumen diameter (MLD), lesion length, and reference vessel diameter (RVD) (taken as the mean diameter of the normal-appearing proximal and distal segment; if the PV diameter at both ends of the stenotic site was greatly different, the diameter of the distal PV served as the reference diameter). Furthermore, the maximal balloon diameter (using the actual measured maximal balloon size), maximal balloon inflation pressure, stent diameter, stent length, maximal stent inflation pressure, final lumen diameter (FLD), balloon-to-vessel ratio (calculated as the largest diameter of the inflated balloon divided by RVD), vessel-to-stent ratio (calculated as the FLD divided by stent diameter), and diameter stenosis (%) (calculated as $[1-(\text{MLD}/\text{RVD})]\times 100\%$) were also included. In addition, PA narrowing in series with stenotic PV, pleural effusion, and postoperative anticoagulants was collected. The pulmonary venous flow grade (PVFG) was assigned using grades 0-3.^[15]

Outcomes

The primary endpoint of the study was the incidence of ISR following PTPV or pulmonary angiography during the follow-up period, and the secondary endpoints were the World Health Organization functional class (WHO-FC) and 6-minute walking distance (6MWD). We also analyzed the demographic, clinical and procedural variables associated with ISR.

Second, we sought to understand the outcomes of patients with PVS-FM who underwent pulmonary vein intervention only.

ISR was defined as stenosis $>50\%$ of the vessel size as confirmed by repeated angiography or an increase in pressure gradient (Pd) (≥ 5 mmHg) across the stenotic site compared to the last measurement.

Research ethics and patient consent

The ethics committee of Gansu Provincial Hospital reviewed and approved the study protocol (2022-302) on 25, August 2022 as well as granted exemption from obtaining informed consent from patients.

Data availability

Anonymized data used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request from any qualified investigator for the sole purpose of the study.

Statistical analysis

Categorical data are expressed as counts and proportions (%). Continuous data are reported as the mean \pm SD or as the median (interquartile range). The Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was used to determine the normality of the data distribution. For continuous variables, t tests or Wilcoxon rank sum tests were used as appropriate. For categorical variables, χ^2 tests or Fisher exact tests were used. A binary logistic analysis was used to construct an optimal model in multiple variables analysis. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analyses were used to determine the predictive power of variables for ISR. A 95% confidence interval (CI) is provided for all estimates. A P value < 0.05 was considered significant. The Kaplan–Meier method was used to estimate and plot the time curves for the appearance of restenosis in the initial intervention vessels, and the log-rank test was used to compare restenosis between the different sizes of RVD. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 25.0 (SPSS, Chicago, Illinois), and figures were plotted by GraphPad Prism software v.8.0 (GraphPad Software, San Diego, California USA).

Results

Baseline characteristics

The study flowchart is shown in **Figure 1**. Of 144 patients with FM during the study period, 43 patients who did not undergo PV intervention, 2 patients with unsuccessful PV intervention, and 7 patients who underwent balloon pulmonary venoplasty (BPV) alone were excluded. A total of 92 patients successfully underwent percutaneous transluminal stent venoplasty. Of them, twenty-five (27.2%) patients were lost to

follow-up, 2 (2.2%) had no imaging data at follow-up, and 65 patients (70.7%) with 142 stents implanted in 134 lesioned PVs during 72 sessions underwent CT and/or selective pulmonary venographic surveillance at a median of 6.6 (3.4-15.7) months of follow-up. Of the 65 patients ultimately included in the analysis, 2 veins were implanted with stents directly without ballooning, 8 veins were implanted with 2 overlapping stents due to long-segment lesions, and 126 veins were stented after initial balloon venoplasty failed to improve the Pd across the stenotic site. The baseline characteristics are shown in **Table 1**, and the procedural and lesion characteristics are shown in **Table 2**.

Incidence of in-stent restenosis (ISR)

At a median follow-up of 6.6 (3.4-15.7) months, ISR was found in 61 of 134 treated veins. The cumulative ISR was 6.3%, 21.4%, and 39.2% at the 3-, 6-, and 12-month follow-ups, respectively (**Figure 2**).

Univariate analysis

Patients with and without ISR had similar ages, sex distribution, body mass index, and medical histories, including chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes mellitus (DM), tuberculosis, etc. There were also no significant differences in the hemodynamic and laboratory parameters between the two groups. The analysis of clinical factors failed to identify any factors significantly correlated with ISR. Among procedure-related factors, MLD, RVD, FLD, stent diameter, stent length, stent-to-vessel ratio, and stenosis of the corresponding pulmonary artery (Cor-PA) were

associated with ISR (**Table 3**).

Multivariate analysis

To guarantee that there was no multicollinearity among the variables, the appropriate variables were selected by calculating the tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF). Then, a covariance diagnosis on the indicators that were significant in the results of univariate analysis and on the variables that might be clinically significant was performed. The variables with tolerances less than 0.1 and a VIF greater than 10 were excluded, while the remaining variables were analyzed through multivariate analysis. Procedure-related parameters that were independently associated with ISR included the RVD and the stenosis of Cor-PA (**central illustration**). For ISR, RVD was associated with an adjusted OR of 0.79 (95% CI, 0.64 to 0.98, $P=0.032$), while the stenosis of Cor-PA was associated with an adjusted OR of 3.41 (95% CI, 1.31 to 8.86, $P=0.012$). The results of the ROC analysis for procedure-related variables for ISR are depicted in **Figure 3**. RVD >8.4 mm could be used as the cutoff point to predict ISR, and its sensitivity and specificity were 0.84 and 0.38, respectively. The subgroup of vessels with a reference diameter >8.4 mm had a significantly lower risk of ISR than the subgroup with a reference diameter ≤ 8.40 mm (**Figure 3D**). Meanwhile, the sensitivity and specificity of Cor-PA stenosis were 0.89 and 0.69, respectively. When the positive and negative influencing factors were combined, the sensitivity and specificity were 0.77 and 0.55, respectively. Hence, we obtained the

regression equation of related variables and restenosis: $\text{Logit } (P)=0.614-0.236 \times \text{RVD}+1.226 \times \text{Cor-PA stenosis}$ (Cor-PA stenosis =1 if present, 0 absent).

Procedural complications

In the analysis of 72 sessions performed in 65 patients, there were 13 episodes of chest tightness (18%) and 14 episodes of cough (19%), which were the most common during the intervention (**Supplemental Table 1**). Mild hemoptysis and transient cardiac arrest/bradycardia occurred in 7% and 4% of sessions, respectively, with no requirement for additional intervention. There were 2 (3%) patients experiencing PV dissection/perforation who underwent balloon occlusion with low inflation pressure and recovered without any hemodynamic insults. One patient suffered from suspected acute pulmonary edema with acute onset of dyspnea and elevated left atrial pressure after stent implantation, high flow oxygen, and diuretics were administered, and these symptoms were relieved soon after. There were no cases of peri-procedure death or major hemoptysis occurred.

Immediate and short-term efficacy

The MLD, Pd, and PVFG in the recruited patients were evaluated pre- and postintervention and drastically improved after the intervention. The MLD increased from 2.2 (1.9, 2.9) mm to 6.6 (5.6, 8.1) mm, and PVFG and Pd were significantly improved ($P<0.001$ for all) (**Figure 4A-C**). Additionally, due to 17 patients undergoing PA intervention at the same time or later, the short-term efficacy of the remaining 43 (66.2%) patients with only PV intervention at follow-up was analyzed.

The median follow-up was 5.0 (3.1-11.2) months. Among the 43 patients, 23 underwent right heart catheterization during the follow-up. Comparisons of the baseline and follow-up data in patients with PV intervention are shown in **Table 4**. The pleural effusion decreased from 35 (81.3%) to 20 (46.5%) (3 of which were new pleural effusions) ($P<0.005$) during the follow-up. However, there was no improvement in the postoperative WHO-FC or 6MWD ($P>0.05$) (**Figure 4D-F**). The mean PAP had a significant improvement ($P=0.016$), and there was an increase in left atrial size ($P=0.439$) but with no statistical significance.

Discussion

In this study, we focused on the incidence and predictors of ISR in PVS-FM. The salient findings are as follows: 1) the incidence of ISR following stent implantation of PVS-FM is as high as 6.3%, 21.4%, and 39.2% at 3-, 6-, and 12-month follow-ups, respectively; 2) RVD is an independent factor for ISR, and the stenosis of the Cor-PA largely affects the occurrence of restenosis.

In-stent restenosis and associated factors in PV intervention of PVS-FM

Previously, Albers et al.^[4] reported a restenosis rate of 7/16 (44%) patients with PVS-FM during a median 115-month follow-up. Similarly, the Mayo Clinic experience described a restenosis rate of up to 4/8 (50%) patients with PVS-FM after the intervention.^[3] However, the incidence of restenosis in the above studies might not be accurate and underestimated for the following reasons: 1) the sample size of the above studies was small; 2) three patients were detected by routine CT angiography without

249 associated symptoms, and 4 patients had symptomatic restenosis in the study by
250 Albers et al.^[4] The overall median time of 115 months was the time to the symptom of
251 restenosis. 3) In the study from the Mayo Clinic, 2 of the remaining 4 patients died
252 shortly after the procedure.^[3] In our study, CT angiography was routinely performed
253 to surveil ISR in 134 PVs of 65 patients with PVS-FM. A total of 61/134 (45.5%) PVs
254 and 42/65 (64.6%) patients had ISR during a median of 6.6 months of follow-up. The
255 cumulative ISR was 6.3%, 21.4%, and 39.2% at the 3-, 6-, and 12-month follow-ups,
256 respectively. Accordingly, this study confirms the high ISR rate with more detailed
257 and accurate information in a larger cohort of PVS-FM patients. A high restenosis rate
258 was also reported in PVS with other etiologies, including PVI. In PVI-PVS, the rate
259 of restenosis is between 19%-39% after a median follow-up period of 6.0-55.2
260 months.^[16-20] Recently, a meta-analysis depicted that the total restenosis rate was 54%
261 in BA and 22.3% in stenting of PVS with different etiologies during a median follow-
262 up time of 13-69 months.^[21] Hence, ISR in PVS-FM is higher than that in PVI-PVS.
263 Furthermore, the factors associated with ISR were analyzed by a multiple variables
264 logistic model in this study. We found that RVD and Cor-PA stenosis were
265 independent predictors of ISR following PV intervention in patients with PVS-FM.
266 Previous studies have shown that stent size is associated with restenosis in PVI-PVS.
267 Prieto et al.^[20] reported that a stent diameter <10 mm may increase the risk of
268 restenosis. Furthermore, a stent size ≥ 7 mm was associated with lower restenosis,
269 which was described by Balasubramanian et al.^[22] Additionally, some scholars have

recommended that a stent diameter >8 mm may serve as the first choice of treatment for PV intervention.^[16] Our findings are consistent with previous results to some extent; however, this result is more rational because the choice of stent size is based on the RVD, which was speculated by Prieto et al.^[20] who suggested that smaller RVD could increase the rate of restenosis. Meanwhile, the explanation for the higher ISR in PVS-FM than in PVI-PVS is as follows. The involved PVs are often different in diameter. PVI-PVS is always located at the ostia of PV with a larger caliber, while PVS-FM is at the proximal 1st tributary of PV with a smaller caliber. In addition, different pathogeneses could be another attribute. PVI-PVS is intraluminal intimal hyperplasia by physicochemical injury, while PVS-FM is extraluminal by proliferative fibrous tissue compression. PVS-FM might be more easily injured by balloon or stent inflation than PVI-PVS. As expected, Cor-PA stenosis is an exclusive factor associated with ISR, which should be given more attention in PV intervention. Wang et al.^[12] previously classified FM into 3 types: only the artery involved, only the vein is compressed, and there is both artery and vein narrowing, which should be a mandatory evaluation for an interventional strategy of patients with FM. Overall, the ISR following PV intervention is significantly higher than that following PA intervention, regardless of the etiology of PVS, which may be attributed to the lower pressure in the venous system.^[19] A mismatch between the stent and the vessel might increase the occurrence of restenosis.^[23] Additionally, it was shown that PVS severity correlated with the severity of the corresponding lung segment in PVS in children.^[24]

Either over- or underinflation of the balloon or stent may affect restenosis, which has been demonstrated in coronary artery intervention.^[25-27] Earlier studies documented some factors of restenosis after percutaneous coronary intervention, including vessel size, maximal balloon pressure, stent type, final diameter stenosis, DM, etc.^[28] Endoluminal imaging techniques (e.g., optical coherence tomography, OCT; intravenous ultrasound, IVUS) with existing imaging techniques (e.g., CT angiography, pulmonary venography) may promote standardized management by allowing for intraoperative guidance of stent deployment and postoperative assessment of luminal changes (e.g., thrombosis, intimal hyperplasia) in coronary artery intervention;^[29] however, they are limited in PV intervention. Drug-eluting stents have been widely used in coronary artery disease to prevent restenosis.^[23] Moreover, Masaki and his team revealed that rapamycin-eluting films could suppress pulmonary vein obstruction progression,^[30] which is promising for ISR in PV intervention. In other words, further study is necessary.

Safety and efficacy of PV intervention of the PVS-FM

A previous study in 8 patients with PVS-FM demonstrated that the incidence of peri-procedure complications and mortality are as high as 3/8 (37.5%) and 3/8 (37.5%), respectively.^[3] Another study showed that overall procedure-related complications in patients with FM, including PA, PV, and SVC intervention, were 15/58 (26%) minor and 6/58 (10%) severe.^[4] In the present large cohort study, we found that some patients had a cough (19%), chest tightness (18%) and other discomfort (18%),

including palpitations, dizziness, nausea, etc. No major hemoptysis or periproced death occurred. The incidence and severity of complications in this study are different from the previous description, which could be attributed to concomitant conditions, inflation pressure, location of PV lesion, and patient status.

In this study, there were immediate improvements in PV caliber, Pd across lesions, and PVFG after the intervention compared with before the intervention, which further supported the findings in previous small sample-sized studies.^[3,4] The PAP evaluated by right heart catheterization decreased in the follow-up period. Notably, the lack of improvement in exercise capacity (6MWD, WHO-FC) but having a trend of increase may be attributed to the fact that some of the patients had a recurrence of symptoms or needed further intervention (nearly 50%) during follow-up. On the other hand, remaining PA stenosis may have a negative influence on the overall efficacy. Hence, further long-term follow-up is needed to analyze the efficacy of PV intervention with the PVS-FM.

Limitations

There are some limitations in this study. First, most ISRs were evaluated by CT venography, which might underestimate or overestimate the degree of restenosis. Second, the sample size was small, and the data were from a single center, which might unavoidably have some bias, even though it was the largest cohort study to date. Third, the follow-up data were not complete, and some patients were lost to

follow-up. Finally, no long-term efficacy was followed up because most patients underwent subsequent PA intervention.

Conclusions

The ISR is very high after the initial intervention of PVS-FM, which is independently associated with RVD and the stenosis of Cor-PA.

References

- 353 1. Rossi SE, McAdams HP, Rosado-de-Christenson ML, Franks TJ, Galvin JR.
354 Fibrosing mediastinitis. *Radiographics* 2001;21(3):737-571.
355 doi:org/10.1148/radiographics.21.3.g01ma17737.
- 356 2. Fender EA, Widmer RJ, Knavel Koepsel EM, Welby JP, Kern R, Peikert T, et al.
357 Catheter based treatments for fibrosing mediastinitis. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*
358 2019;94(6):878-8851. doi:org/10.1002/ccd.28152.
- 359 3. Ponamgi SP, DeSimone CV, Lenz CJ, Coylewright M, Asirvatham SJ, Holmes DR,
360 et al. Catheter-based intervention for pulmonary vein stenosis due to fibrosing
361 mediastinitis: The Mayo Clinic experience. *Int J Cardiol Heart Vasc* 2015;8:103-1071.
362 doi:org/10.1016/j.ijcha.2015.06.005.
- 363 4. Albers EL, Pugh ME, Hill KD, Wang L, Loyd JE, Doyle TP. Percutaneous vascular
364 stent implantation as treatment for central vascular obstruction due to fibrosing
365 mediastinitis. *Circulation* 2011;123(13):1391-91.
366 doi:org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.110.949180.
- 367 5. Massumi A, Woods L, Mullins CE, Nasser WK, Hall RJ. Pulmonary venous
368 dilatation in pulmonary veno-occlusive disease. *Am J Cardiol* 1981;48(3):585-91.
369 doi:org/10.1016/0002-9149(81)90092-8.
- 370 6. Driscoll DJ, Hesslein PS, Mullins CE. Congenital stenosis of individual pulmonary
371 veins: clinical spectrum and unsuccessful treatment by transvenous balloon dilation.
372 *Am J Cardiol* 1982;49(7):1767-721. doi:org/10.1016/0002-9149(82)90257-0.
- 373 7. Lock JE, Bass JL, Castaneda-Zuniga W, Fuhrman BP, Rashkind WJ, Lucas RV, Jr.

374 Dilation angioplasty of congenital or operative narrowings of venous channels.
375 Circulation 1984;70(3):457-641. doi:org/10.1161/01.cir.70.3.457.

376 8. Doyle TP, Loyd JE, Robbins IM. Percutaneous pulmonary artery and vein stenting:
377 a novel treatment for mediastinal fibrosis. Am J Respir Crit Care Med
378 2001;164(4):657-601. doi:org/10.1164/ajrccm.164.4.2012132.

379 9. Mendelsohn AM, Bove EL, Lupinetti FM, Crowley DC, Lloyd TR, Fedderly RT, et
380 al. Intraoperative and percutaneous stenting of congenital pulmonary artery and vein
381 stenosis. Circulation 1993;88(5 Pt 2):II210-71.

382 10. Robbins IM, Colvin EV, Doyle TP, Kemp WE, Loyd JE, McMahon WS, et al.
383 Pulmonary vein stenosis after catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation. Circulation
384 1998;98(17):1769-751. doi:org/10.1161/01.cir.98.17.1769.

385 11. Duan Y, Zhou X, Su H, Jiang K, Wu W, Pan X, et al. Balloon angioplasty or stent
386 implantation for pulmonary vein stenosis caused by fibrosing mediastinitis: a
387 systematic review. Cardiovasc Diagn Ther 2019;9(5):520-5281.
388 doi:org/10.21037/cdt.2019.09.14.

389 12. Wang A, Su H, Duan Y, Jiang K, Li Y, Deng M, et al. Pulmonary Hypertension
390 Caused by Fibrosing Mediastinitis. JACC: Asia 2022;2(3_Part_1):218-2341.
391 doi:org/doi:10.1016/j.jacasi.2021.11.016.

392 13. Nasr VG, Callahan R, Wichner Z, Odegard KC, DiNardo JA. Intraluminal
393 Pulmonary Vein Stenosis in Children: A "New" Lesion. Anesth Analg 2019;129(1):27-
394 401. doi:org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000003924.

- 395 14. Suntharos P, Worley SE, Liu W, Siperstein M, Prieto LR. Long-term outcome of
396 percutaneous intervention for pulmonary vein stenosis after pulmonary vein isolation
397 procedure. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv* 2020;95(3):389-397.
398 doi:org/10.1002/ccd.28628.
- 399 15. Duan YC, Su HL, Wei R, Jiang KY, Wang AQ, Yang YH, et al. Short-term
400 efficacy and perioperative safety of catheter-based intervention for pulmonary vein
401 stenosis caused by fibrosing mediastinitis. *Zhonghua Xin Xue Guan Bing Za Zhi*
402 2022;50(1):55-61. doi:org/10.3760/cma.j.cn112148-20210507-00398.
- 403 16. Schoene K, Arya A, Jahnke C, Paetsch I, Nedios S, Hilbert S, et al. Acquired
404 Pulmonary Vein Stenosis After Radiofrequency Ablation for Atrial Fibrillation:
405 Single-Center Experience in Catheter Interventional Treatment. *JACC Cardiovasc*
406 *Interv* 2018;11(16):1626-1632. doi:org/10.1016/j.jcin.2018.05.016.
- 407 17. Widmer RJ, Fender EA, Hodge DO, Monahan KH, Peterson LA, Holmes DR, Jr.,
408 et al. Contributors Toward Pulmonary Vein Restenosis Following Successful
409 Intervention. *JACC Clin Electrophysiol* 2018;4(4):547-552.
410 doi:org/10.1016/j.jacep.2017.10.001.
- 411 18. Fender EA, Widmer RJ, Hodge DO, Cooper GM, Monahan KH, Peterson LA, et
412 al. Severe Pulmonary Vein Stenosis Resulting From Ablation for Atrial Fibrillation:
413 Presentation, Management, and Clinical Outcomes. *Circulation* 2016;134(23):1812-
414 1821. doi:org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.116.021949.
- 415 19. Fink T, Schluter M, Heeger CH, Lemes C, Lin T, Maurer T, et al. Pulmonary vein

416 stenosis or occlusion after catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation: long-term comparison
417 of drug-eluting versus large bare metal stents. *Europace* 2018;20(10):e148-e155l.
418 doi:org/10.1093/europace/eux291.

419 20. Prieto LR, Schoenhagen P, Arruda MJ, Natale A, Worley SE. Comparison of stent
420 versus balloon angioplasty for pulmonary vein stenosis complicating pulmonary vein
421 isolation. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol* 2008;19(7):673-8l. doi:org/10.1111/j.1540-
422 8167.2008.01110.x.

423 21. Almakadma AH, Sarma D, Hassett L, Miranda W, Alkhouli M, Reeder GS, et al.
424 Pulmonary Vein Stenosis-Balloon Angioplasty Versus Stenting: A Systematic Review
425 and Meta-Analysis. *JACC Clin Electrophysiol* 2022;8(10):1323-1333l.
426 doi:org/10.1016/j.jacep.2022.08.008.

427 22. Balasubramanian S, Marshall AC, Gauvreau K, Peng LF, Nugent AW, Lock JE, et
428 al. Outcomes after stent implantation for the treatment of congenital and postoperative
429 pulmonary vein stenosis in children. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 2012;5(1):109-17l.
430 doi:org/10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.111.964189.

431 23. Prieto LR. The State of the Art in Pulmonary Vein Stenosis -Diagnosis &
432 Treatment. *J Atr Fibrillation* 2010;2(4):228l. doi:org/10.4022/jafib.228.

433 24. Sena L, Callahan R, Sleeper LA, Beroukhi RS. Prognostic Significance of
434 Computed Tomography Findings in Pulmonary Vein Stenosis. *Children (Basel)*
435 2021;8(5)doi:org/10.3390/children8050402.

436 25. Aziz S, Morris JL, Perry RA, Stables RH. Stent expansion: a combination of

437 delivery balloon underexpansion and acute stent recoil reduces predicted stent
438 diameter irrespective of reference vessel size. *Heart* 2007;93(12):1562-61.
439 doi:org/10.1136/hrt.2006.107052.

440 26. Shlofmitz E, Iantorno M, Waksman R. Restenosis of Drug-Eluting Stents: A New
441 Classification System Based on Disease Mechanism to Guide Treatment and State-of-
442 the-Art Review. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 2019;12(8):e0070231.
443 doi:org/10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.118.007023.

444 27. Alfonso F, Coughlan JJ, Giacoppo D, Kastrati A, Byrne RA. Management of in-
445 stent restenosis. *EuroIntervention* 2022;18(2):e103-e1231. doi:org/10.4244/EIJ-D-21-
446 01034.

447 28. Cassese S, Byrne RA, Tada T, Pinieck S, Joner M, Ibrahim T, et al. Incidence and
448 predictors of restenosis after coronary stenting in 10 004 patients with surveillance
449 angiography. *Heart* 2014;100(2):153-91. doi:org/10.1136/heartjnl-2013-304933.

450 29. Mehran R, Dangas G, Abizaid AS, Mintz GS, Lansky AJ, Satler LF, et al.
451 Angiographic patterns of in-stent restenosis: classification and implications for long-
452 term outcome. *Circulation* 1999;100(18):1872-81. doi:org/10.1161/01.cir.100.18.1872.

453 30. Masaki N, Adachi O, Katahira S, Saiki Y, Horii A, Kawamoto S, et al. Progression
454 of vascular remodeling in pulmonary vein obstruction. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*
455 2020;160(3):777-790 e51. doi:org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2020.01.098.

456

457

458

459

460

461

462 **Table 1 Baseline characteristics**

	Total (N=65)	ISR (n=42)	Non-ISR (n=23)	P Value
<i>Demographics</i>				
Age, years	66.0 (60.0, 70.0)	64.5 (59.8, 69.3)	67.0 (60.0, 72.0)	0.38
Body mass index, kg/m ² (N=64)	22.4 ± 3.6	22.2 ± 3.5	22.7 ± 3.7	0.53
Female	29 (44.6)	20 (47.6)	9 (39.1)	0.51
Duration of symptoms, months	37.0 (24.0, 72.0)	38.0 (24.0, 72.0)	36.0 (14.0, 96.0)	0.83
<i>Clinical presentation</i>				
Dyspnea	61 (93.8)	38 (90.5)	23 (100.0)	0.29
Cough	20 (30.8)	15 (35.7)	5 (21.7)	0.24
Hemoptysis	4 (6.2)	4 (9.5)	0 (0.0)	0.29
Chest distress	40 (61.5)	22 (52.4)	18 (78.3)	0.040
Palpitations	3 (4.6)	2 (4.8)	1 (4.3)	1.00
Edema of lower limbs	17 (26.2)	12 (28.6)	5 (21.7)	0.55
Pleural effusion	49 (75.4)	32 (76.2)	17 (73.9)	0.84
<i>Comorbidity</i>				
Hypertension	21 (32.3)	14 (33.3)	7 (30.4)	0.81
Diabetes mellitus	14 (21.5)	7 (16.7)	7 (30.4)	0.22
COPD	48 (73.8)	29 (69.0)	19 (82.6)	0.23

Atelectasis	42 (64.6)	29 (69.0)	13 (56.5)	0.31
Tuberculosis	39 (60.0)	26 (61.9)	13 (56.5)	0.67
<i>Hemodynamics (n=64)</i>				
SaO ₂ , %	89.0 (87.3, 92.0)	89.0 (87.0, 92.0) (n=41)	90.0 (88.0, 91.0)	0.83
mRAP, mmHg	3.0 (2.0, 5.0)	3.0 (2.0, 4.5) (n=41)	5.0 (2.0, 7.0)	0.067
sPAP, mmHg	70.5 (54.0, 80.8)	71.0 (53.5, 81.0) (n=41)	68.0 (54.0, 78.0)	0.70
dPAP, mmHg	27.0 (22.0, 33.0)	27.0 (22.0, 33.0) (n=41)	27.0 (20.0, 34.0)	0.80
mPAP, mmHg	39.5 (33.0, 50.0)	40.0 (33.0, 49.5) (n=41)	39.0 (30.0, 53.0)	0.88
PAWP, mmHg (n=63)	7.0 (6.0, 9.0)	7.0 (6.0, 9.0) (n=40)	7.0 (6.0, 7.0)	0.97
PVR, WU	6.3 (5.3, 9.9)	6.3 (5.2, 9.6) (n=41)	6.8 (5.5, 10.0)	0.48
CO, L/min	4.6 (3.8, 5.4)	4.8 (3.9, 5.5) (n=41)	4.4 (3.7, 5.3)	0.34
CI, L/min/m ²	2.8 ± 0.6	3.0 ± 0.7 (n=41)	2.8 ± 0.6	0.23
SvO ₂ , %	62.9 ± 9.0	63.6 ± 9.1 (n=41)	61.7 ± 9.0	0.52
<i>Echocardiographic</i>				
LA size, mm	32.4 ± 5.0	32.4 ± 4.9	32.3 ± 5.2	0.94
TAPSE, mm (n=50)	19.2 ± 4.6	19.7 ± 4.0 (n=33)	18.2 ± 5.5 (n=17)	0.30
RAA, end-systolic, cm ² (n=42)	16.5 (14.0, 20.6)	15.8 (14.0, 22.5) (n=27)	17.5 (14.3, 20.4) (n=15)	0.66
RVA, end-diastolic, cm ² (n=42)	24.4 ± 9.2	23.5 ± 9.0 (n=27)	26.0 ± 9.7 (n=15)	0.41
<i>Exercise capacity</i>				

WHO-FC, I/II/III/IV	0/25/32/8	0/17/19/6	0/8/13/2	0.64
6MWD, m (n=42)	306.4 ± 97.8	287.6 ± 100.1 (n=27)	340.2 ± 86.6 (n=15)	0.16
<i>Laboratory values</i>				
NT-proBNP, pg/ml	732.6 (163.5, 1568.5)	714.0 (128.3, 1374.3)	732.6 (203.0, 2678.0)	0.88
NLR (n=62)	4.7 (3.8, 6.8)	4.6 (3.8, 5.8) (n=41)	5.2 (3.3, 8.9) (n=21)	0.48
CRP, mg/L (n=59)	5.8 (1.7, 14.1)	6.3 (1.7, 16.9) (n=40)	5.6 (1.7, 9.4) (n=19)	0.75
D-Dimer, ug/ml (n=58)	1.0 (0.6, 1.5)	1.0 (0.7, 1.5) (n=36)	0.9 (0.3, 1.4) (n=22)	0.22
With PAS	63 (96.9)	41 (97.6)	22 (95.7)	1.00

Values are mean ± SD, n (%), or M (Q1, Q3). 6MWD = 6-minute walking distance; CI = cardiac index, CO = cardiac output; COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CRP = C-reactive protein; dPAP = diastolic pulmonary artery pressure; ISR = in stent restenosis; LA = left atrial; mPAP = mean pulmonary artery pressure; NLR = Neutrophil-to-Lymphocyte ratio; NT-proBNP = N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide; PAS = pulmonary artery stenosis; PAWP = pulmonary artery wedge pressure; PVR = pulmonary vascular resistance; RA = right atrial; mRAP = mean right atrial pressure; RV = right ventricle; SaO₂ = arterial oxygen saturation; sPAP = systolic pulmonary artery pressure; SvO₂ = mixed venous oxygen saturation; TAPSE = tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion; WHO-FC = World Health Organization functional class.

475

476 **Table 2 Lesion characteristics and procedural-related information**

	Total (N=134)	ISR (n=61)	Non-ISR (n=73)	P Value
<i>The lesion distribution, n (%)</i>				0.21
LSPV	54 (40.3)	29 (47.5)	25 (34.2)	
LIPV	35 (26.1)	14 (23.0)	21 (28.8)	
RSPV	38 (28.4)	17 (27.9)	21 (28.8)	
RIPV	7 (5.2)	1 (1.6)	6 (8.2)	
Cor-PA stenosis	104 (77.6)	54 (88.5)	50 (68.5)	0.006
<i>Stenosis severity of the Cor-PA</i>				0.004
Normal	30 (22.4)	7 (11.5)	23 (31.5)	
Mild	36 (26.9)	13 (21.3)	23 (31.5)	
Moderate	23 (17.2)	14 (23.0)	9 (12.3)	
Severe	45 (33.6)	27 (44.3)	18 (24.7)	
MLD, mm	2.2 (1.9, 2.9)	2.1 (1.4, 2.8)	2.4 (2.1, 3.3)	0.003
RVD, mm	7.1 (6.3, 8.6)	7.0 (6.1, 8.2)	7.6 (6.6, 9.6)	0.019
Lesion length, mm (N=113)	20.1 (15.6, 25.1)	18.5 (15.2, 24.7)	20.8 (16.2, 26.3)	0.35
Diameter stenosis, %	68.1 (60.2, 75.3)	69.7 (62.1, 79.0)	67.1 (59.6, 73.9)	0.080
FLD, mm	6.6 (5.6, 8.1)	6.4 (5.4, 7.4)	7.0 (5.8, 9.0)	0.030

FLD/RVD	0.9 (0.8, 1.0)	0.9 (0.8, 1.0)	0.9 (0.8, 1.0)	0.78
Maximal balloon diameter, mm (N=132)	7.0 (5.0, 7.0)	6.0 (5.0, 7.0) (n=59)	7.0 (5.0, 8.0)	0.18
Maximal balloon length, mm (N=132)	20.0 (20.0, 20.0)	20.0 (20.0, 20.0) (n=59)	20.0 (20.0, 20.0)	0.94
Maximal balloon pressure, atm (N=129)	6.0 (6.0, 10.0)	6.0 (6.0, 10.0) (n=58)	6.0 (6.0, 8.0) (n=71)	0.13
Balloon-to-vessel ratio (N=132)	0.8 (0.8, 1.0)	0.9 (0.8, 1.0)	0.8 (0.7, 0.9)	0.006
Stent diameter, mm	7.0 (7.0, 9.0)	7.0 (6.0, 8.0)	7.0 (7.0, 9.0)	0.040
Stent length, mm	19.0 (19.0, 25.0)	19.0 (18.0, 25.0)	20.0 (19.0, 26.0)	0.035
Maximal stent pressure, atm (N=131)	10.0 (10.0, 12.0)	10.0 (10.0, 12.0) (n=59)	10.0 (10.0, 12.0) (n=72)	0.22
Stent-to-vessel ratio	1.0 (1.0, 1.0)	1.0 (1.0, 1.1)	1.0 (1.0, 1.0)	0.023
FLD/Stent	0.9 (0.8, 1.0)	0.9 (0.8, 1.0)	1.0 (0.9, 1.0)	0.069
Overlapping stents, n (%)	8 (6.0)	3 (4.9)	5 (6.8)	0.73
<i>PVFG, 0/1/2/3 (N=133)</i>				
Preoperative	10/41/82/0	6/21/34/0	4/20/48/0	0.38
Postoperative	0/0/0/133	0/0/0/61	0/0/0/72	1.00
<i>Pressure gradient, mmHg</i>				
Pd-pre (N=126)	24.0 (17.8, 30.0)	24.0 (18.3, 29.8) (n=56)	25.0 (16.8, 30.0) (n=70)	0.44
Pd-post (N=128)	0.0 (0.0, 3.0)	0.0 (0.0, 1.8) (n=56)	0.0 (0.0, 3.0) (n=72)	0.34

477 Values are mean ± SD, n (%), or M (Q1, Q3). Cor-PA = corresponding pulmonary artery; DS (%) = percentage diameter stenosis; FLD = final
478 lumen diameter; ISR = in-stent restenosis; LIPV = left inferior pulmonary vein; LSPV = left supper pulmonary vein; MLD = minimal lumen

479 diameter; PA = pulmonary artery; PVFG = pulmonary venous flow grade; RIPV = right inferior pulmonary vein; RSPV = right supper
 480 pulmonary vein; RVD = reference vessel diameter.

481

482 **Table 3 Per-vessel univariate and multivariate analysis associated with in-stent restenosis**

	Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis	
	OR (95% CI)	P Value	OR (95% CI)	P Value
<i>The lesion distribution, n (%)</i>				
LSPV	1 (Ref)			
LIPV	0.58 (0.24-1.36)	0.21		
RSPV	0.70 (0.30-1.61)	0.40		
RIPV	0.14 (0.02-1.28)	0.082		
Cor-PA stenosis	3.55 (1.40-8.99)	0.008	3.41 (1.31-8.86)	0.012
<i>Stenosis severity of the Cor-PA</i>				
Normal	1 (Ref)			
Mild	1.86 (0.63-5.50)	0.26		
Moderate	5.11 (1.55-16.81)	0.007		
Severe	4.93 (1.75-13.88)	0.003		
MLD, mm	0.67 (0.48-0.92)	0.013		
RVD, mm	0.78 (0.64-0.96)	0.019	0.79 (0.64-0.98)	0.032

Lesion length, mm	0.98 (0.93-1.03)	0.40
Diameter stenosis, %	1.02 (0.99-1.05)	0.13
FLD, mm	0.79 (0.65-0.97)	0.021
FLD/RVD	0.44 (0.03-7.26)	0.56
Maximal balloon diameter, mm	0.86 (0.67-1.09)	0.20
Maximal balloon length, mm	1.00 (0.93-1.09)	0.92
Maximal balloon pressure, atm	1.14 (0.98-1.34)	0.093
Balloon-to-vessel ratio	6.62 (0.79-55.82)	0.082
Stent diameter	0.79 (0.62-0.99)	0.047
Stent length, mm	0.93 (0.87-0.99)	0.042
Maximal stent pressure, atm	1.13 (0.96-1.33)	0.14
FLD/Stent	0.05 (0.00-1.05)	0.053
Stent-to-vessel ratio	22.62 (0.63-817.65)	0.088
Overlapping stents, n (%)	0.70 (0.16-3.07)	0.64
<i>Pre-PVFG, 0/1/2/3</i>		
0	1 (Ref)	
1	0.70 (0.17-2.85)	0.62
2	0.47 (0.12-1.80)	0.27

Pressure gradient, mmHg

Pd-pre	0.99 (0.96-1.02)	0.53
Pd-post	0.89 (0.76-1.04)	0.13

CI: Confidence interval; OR: Odds ratio. Abbreviations as in Table 2.

Table 4 Short-term efficacy of percutaneous pulmonary venoplasty in patients with PVS-FM

	Baseline	Follow up	N	P Value
<i>Exercise capacity</i>				
6MWD, m	307.6 ± 107.1	326.1 ± 78.2	18	0.28
WHO-FC, I/II/III/IV	0/14/19/2	1/15/18/1	35	0.49
<i>Hemodynamics</i>				
sPAP, mmHg	69.3 ± 22.8	58.9 ± 19.0	23	0.024
dPAP, mmHg	27.0 (23.0, 36.0)	27.0 (17.0, 33.0)	23	0.008
mPAP, mmHg	39.0 (33.0, 52.0)	34.0 (30.0, 44.0)	23	0.016
PAWP, mmHg	7.0 (6.0, 9.3)	8.0 (4.0, 11.0)	23	0.39
mRAP, mmHg	3.0 (2.0, 6.0)	3.0 (2.0, 4.0)	23	0.54
PVR, WU	6.9 (5.3, 10.0)	6.3 (3.9, 9.5)	23	0.32
SvO ₂ , %	62.0 (57.0, 68.0)	66.0 (58.0, 70.0)	23	0.69
CO, L/min	4.3 ± 1.3	4.4 ± 1.2	23	0.69
CI, L/min/m ²	2.7 ± 0.7	2.8 ± 0.7	23	0.57

Echocardiographic

LA size, mm	32.2 ± 5.4	32.8 ± 3.8	39	0.44
TAPSE, mm	17.3 ± 4.5	19.5 ± 3.9	30	0.016
RAA, end-systolic, cm ²	16.2 (14.1, 20.3)	17.0 (14.0, 21.8)	21	0.73
RVA, end-diastolic, cm ²	25.1 (16.3, 34.9)	28.5 (19.9, 37.7)	20	0.018

Others

SaO ₂ , %	89.3 ± 4.9	88.1 ± 5.9	38	0.38
NT-proBNP, pg/ml	738.0 (203.0, 2678.0)	360.1 (145.3, 1602.5)	41	0.74
Refractory pleural effusion, n (%)	35 (81.3)	20 (46.5)	43	<0.005
CRP, mg/L	6.3 (2.5, 29.5)	4.0 (1.4, 16.1)	37	0.054
D-Dimer, ug/ml	1.2 ± 0.7	1.3 ± 1.0	36	0.67

486 Abbreviations as in Table 1.

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495 **Figure Legends**

496 **Figure 1. Flowchart of patient enrollment**

497 **Figure 2. Cumulative incidence of ISR**

498 Kaplan–Meier curve depicting the probability of ISR over a median of 6.6 (3.4-15.7)
499 months.

500 **Figure 3. ROC analysis for the determination of ISR in the PVS-FM**

501 (A) RVD had a sensitivity and specificity of 0.84 and 0.38, respectively, for a cutoff
502 point of 8.4 mm (AUC, 0.62; 95% CI, 0.52 to 0.71; $P=0.019$) (blue line). (B) Cor-PA
503 stenosis had a sensitivity and specificity of 0.89 and 0.69, respectively (AUC, 0.60;
504 95% CI, 0.51 to 0.70; $P=0.046$) (yellow line). (C) Binary logistic regression analysis
505 rendered the following formula for the prediction of ISR: $\text{Logit } (P)=0.614-$
506 $0.236 \times \text{RVD} + 1.226 \times \text{Cor-PA stenosis}$ (AUC, 0.68; 95% CI, 0.59 to 0.77; $P<0.001$)
507 (green line). (D) Kaplan–Meier survival plot comparing freedom from restenosis
508 stratified by RVD. There was a significant difference ($P<0.005$ for a log-rank test)
509 between the $\text{RVD} \leq 8.4$ mm (orange solid line) and >8.4 mm (purple dashed line)
510 groups.

511 **Figure 4. Immediate and short-term efficacy**

512 A-C show the immediate effects of the intervention. D-F show the short-term effects
513 of PV intervention alone. When the pre- and postintervention data were compared,
514 there was a significant improvement in MLD, Pd, and PVFG ($P<0.001$ for all). There
515 was a significant improvement in pleural effusion but no changes in WHO-FC and

516 6MWD after PV intervention compared with baseline ($P<0.005$, $P>0.05$, and $P>0.05$,
517 respectively).

518 **Central illustration**

519 Based on the constructed prediction model, the RVD and stenosis of Cor-PA were
520 found to be independently associated with ISR, and their sensitivity and optimal
521 cutoff values for the prediction of restenosis are shown in (a) and (b), respectively.
522 The risk of ISR significantly increased when PA stenosis occurred; the risk of
523 restenosis decreased significantly when the RVD was larger than 8.4 mm.

Figure 1. Flowchart of patient enrollment




Figure 2. Cumulative incidence of ISR




Figure 3. ROC analysis for the determination of ISR in PVS-FM






Figure 4 Immediate and short-term efficacy



Incidence and predictors of ISR following intervention for PVS-FM

Part 1 Incidence of ISR



Conclusions

- ISR is very high in PVS-FM patients.
- The RVD and the stenosis of Cor-PA could be independent factors of ISR.

Part 3

Part 2

