Grines Cindy (Orcid ID: 0000-0003-1653-6443)
Gurm Hitinder (Orcid ID: 0000-0002-1646-0218)

The **DISCO** Study – **D**oes **I**nterventionalists' **S**ex impact **C**oronary **O**utcomes**?**

Prasanthi Yelavarthy, MD[1]; Milan Seth, MS[1]; Elizabeth Pielsticker, MD[2]; Cindy L. Grines, MD[3]; Claire S. Duvernoy, MD[1,4]; Devraj Sukul, MD[1,4]; Hitinder S. Gurm, MBBS[1,4]

Affiliations:

[1] Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

[2] Michigan Heart, St Joseph Mercy Health System, Jackson, Michigan

[3] Northside Cardiovascular Institute, Atlanta, GA

[4] Cardiovascular Medicine, Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Running Title: The DISCO Study

Address for Correspondence:

Hitinder S. Gurm

2A 192F, 1500 East Medical Drive

University of Michigan Frankel Cardiovascular Center

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-5853

hgurm@med.umich.edu

Phone: 734-232-4276 Fax: 734-764-4142

Disclosures: None of the authors have any relevant disclosures.

Total Word Count: 3477

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1002/ccd.29774

Tweet: Female interventionalists are scarce – while our study showed no difference in outcomes,♀□scored higher on appropriateness metrics + prescribed more GDMT. We need to find ways to encourage female trainees to pursue interventional cardiology. #womenincardiology #heforshe

Acknowledgements: We are indebted to the study coordinators, investigators and patients who participated in the Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan Cardiovascular Consortium registry. All authors listed meet the authorship criteria according to the latest guidelines of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, and all authors agree with the manuscript.

Abstract: (250 words)

Objectives: To examine the association of operator sex on appropriateness and outcomes of percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI).

Background: Recent studies suggest that physician sex may impact outcomes for specific patient cohorts. There are no data evaluating the impact of operator sex on PCI outcomes.

Methods: We studied the impact of operator sex on PCI outcome and appropriateness among all patients undergoing PCI between January 2010 and December 2017 at 48 non-federal hospitals in Michigan. We used logistic regression models to adjust for baseline risk among patients treated by male versus female operators in the primary analysis.

Results: During this time, 18 female interventionalists and 385 male interventionalists had performed at least one PCI. Female interventionalists performed 6,362 (2.7%) of 239,420 cases. There were no differences in the odds of mortality [1.48% versus 1.56%, adjusted OR (aOR) 1.138, 95% CI: 0.891–1.452], acute kidney injury [3.42% versus 3.28%, aOR 1.027, 95% CI: 0.819–1.288], transfusion [2.59% versus 2.85%, aOR 1.168, 95% CI: 0.980–1.390] or major bleeding [0.95% versus 1.07%, aOR 1.083, 95% CI: 0.825-1.420] between patients treated by female versus male interventionalist. While the absolute differences were small, PCIs performed by female interventional cardiologists were more frequently rated as appropriate (86.64% vs 84.45%, p-value <0.0001). Female interventional cardiologists more frequently prescribed guideline-directed medical therapy.

Conclusions: We found no significant differences in risk-adjusted in-hospital outcomes between PCIs performed by female versus male interventional cardiologists in Michigan. Female

interventional cardiologists more frequently performed PCI rated as appropriate and had a higher likelihood of prescribing guideline-directed medical therapy.

Condensed Abstract: (100 words)

Recent studies suggest that physician sex may impact patient outcomes for a variety of conditions. We evaluated the association between operator sex and PCI appropriateness and outcomes among 239,420 PCIs performed at 48 hospitals in Michigan between January 2010 and December 2017. There were no significant differences in the risk-adjusted odds of mortality, acute kidney injury, transfusion or major bleeding. While the absolute differences were small, procedures performed by a female interventional cardiologist were more likely to be rated as appropriate. Female interventional cardiologists prescribe guideline-directed medical therapy more frequently.

Key Words: Sex, Gender, Interventional, Outcomes, Appropriateness

Abbreviations List:

AKI: Acute Kidney Injury

AUC: Appropriate Use Criteria

PCI: Percutaneous Coronary Intervention

BMC 2: Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan Cardiovascular Consortium

OR: Odds Ratio

INTRODUCTION:

There is a large body of data demonstrating an association between patient gender and PCI outcomes. For instance, women with acute coronary syndromes are less likely to be hospitalized[1] and are less likely to have reperfusion therapy and coronary angiography[2, 3]. Female gender continues to be an independent predictor of in-hospital mortality after PCI for STEMI[4-6]. Although there is a large and growing body of research demonstrating the association between patient sex and outcomes after treatment for a number of medical conditions including acute myocardial infarction[7], congestive heart failure[8], and cancer[9, 10], there is a dearth of evidence evaluating the association between physician sex and patient outcomes.

Recently, Tsugawa et al demonstrated that for patients with eight common medical conditions (including heart failure and arrhythmia) and across patients' severity, patients treated by female physicians had a lower mortality rate and lower readmissions at 30 days[11]. There has also been new data to suggest that physician-patient gender concordance (i.e., male physicians treating male patients and female physicians treating female patients) may play a role in outcomes.

Little is known about the association between the sex of the treating interventional cardiologist on PCI appropriateness and outcomes. Therefore, using the Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan Cardiovascular Consortium (BMC2) database, we compared clinical outcomes and appropriateness of PCI performed by female versus male interventional cardiologists at 48 hospitals in Michigan.

Methods:

Data Sources and Study Population:

We performed a retrospective analysis using data from the Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan Cardiovascular Consortium (BMC2)[12], a quality improvement group that maintains a regional registry of all patients undergoing PCI in the state of Michigan. A more detailed description of the registry, including data collection and auditing practices, has been described previously[13],[14]. Briefly, this is a prospective, multicenter, statewide registry of patients undergoing PCI at all non-federal hospitals in Michigan. Data is collected using the NCDR CathPCI data definitions[15] and is augmented by additional variables developed by BMC2. All data elements are prospectively defined, and a rigorous study coordinator training and education program is in place to ensure high data quality.

We included consecutive patients undergoing PCI at 48 hospitals between January 2010 and December 2017. PCI operator sex was determined using the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) full replacement National Provider Identifier (NPI) file (NPPES downloadable file[16]) reflecting physicians in practice between May 23, 2005 through July 8, 2018. 17 out of the 48 hospitals were academic hospitals; academic hospitals were defined as hospitals that have an associated cardiology fellowship. Out of the 48 hospitals, 6 were classified as rural, 24 were classified as suburban and 18 were classified as urban

Study Outcomes:

The primary clinical outcomes included in-hospital mortality, post-procedural acute kidney injury, post-procedural blood transfusion, and post-procedural major bleeding. Mortality was defined as death from any cause prior to discharge following PCI[15]. Acute kidney injury was defined as $\geq$ 0.5 mg/dl absolute increase in creatinine. Major bleeding was defined as a hemoglobin drop of $\geq$ 5g/dl.

For the risk-adjustment models, we estimated risks of mortality, AKI[13, 17], and transfusion[18] using BMC2 random forest risk models which incorporate baseline patient clinical and demographic characteristics[19, 20]. Risk-adjusted mortality, AKI, and transfusion were estimated for sub-groups by the overall collaborative outcome incidence multiplied by the ratio of observed to expected outcome rates for the subgroup (overall rate * observed/expected ratio for each subgroup). Risk-adjusted rates of major bleeding were estimated using a logistical regression model including predicted risks for mortality, AKI, need for transfusion and patient gender as covariates. In addition, the primary outcomes were further stratified by the sex of the patient to assess physician-patient gender concordance.

We also used BMC2 clinical data to calculate appropriateness using the AUC developed by the American College of Cardiology. A score of 7-9 is considered appropriate, 4-6 may be appropriate and 1-3 is rarely appropriate[21]. An algorithm previously developed by members of the Clinical Outcomes and Assessment Program and the Northern New England Cardiovascular Disease Study Group was used to automate calculation of the AUC based on clinical data elements within the BMC2 database[22, 23]. Finally, we assessed discharge medications including anti-platelet therapy, statin, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors or angiotensin II receptor blockers and beta-blockers. For the assessment of discharge medications, we excluded patients who died prior to discharge, had contraindications to the specified medications, or were discharged to hospice or against medical advice. All of the unclassifiable cases were included in the denominator as part of all cases; only the cases falling in the top 3 appropriateness categories per the ACC guidelines were reported in the numerator.

Statistical Analysis:

Pearson Chi-squared and Fisher's exact tests were used to compare categorical measures, and student T and Wilcoxon tests were used to compare continuous valued measures between patients treated by male and female operators. The absolute standardized difference (ASD)[24] was used to assess the magnitude and significance of the differences between male and female operators. A threshold of 10% was used for this purpose, with ASD greater than 10% used to identify baseline patient characteristics reflecting substantial imbalance. In contrast to statistical significance, ASD is not dependent upon sample size[25, 26]. Thus, in the case of the very large samples often seen in registry data, ASD provides a better measure of meaningful baseline differences. We used linear regression models to assess the impact of operator and patient gender and operator by patient gender interactions on outcomes adjusting for estimated baseline risk.

In a sensitivity analysis, propensity matching was used to compare patients treated by male operators to patients treated by female operators. Five to one matching (between cases performed by male and female operators) without replacement was performed using a caliper of 0.25 SD of the propensity score and with exact matching required on patient gender. The variables for the propensity score model included age, weight, height, diabetes and treatment, chronic lung disease, chronic heart failure within 2 weeks prior to PCI, NYHA class within prior 2 weeks, PCI status (elective, urgent, emergent, salvage), PCI indication, CAD presentation, pre-PCI LVEF, pre-PCI hemoglobin, pre-PCI CK-MB, pre-PCI troponin, pre-PCI creatinine, angina class, cardiogenic shock, cardiac arrest, pre-PCI vasopressor use and history of atrial fibrillation. All analyses were performed using R version 3.4 software.

The authors are unable to share the raw data, due to contractual agreements between participating institutions and the BMC2 registry that prohibit data sharing with external agencies.

However, the analysis code and metadata to support the study figures is available on request from Annmarie Forrest, Program Manager BMC2 (avassalo@med.umich.edu).

Results:

Our study population consisted of 243,610 PCI procedures performed between January 2010 and December 2017 at 48 hospitals in Michigan. A total of 4,188 patients were excluded due to incomplete/missing operator identification, inability to match NPI and missing operator sex, leaving 239,422 PCI procedures available for analysis (Supplemental Figure 1). During this time, there were 18 female interventionalists and 385 male interventionalists who performed at least one PCI using unique operator NPIs. Female operators represented 4.5% of all operators and performed 6,363 (2.66%) cases. Over the study period, female operators performed 2.5% to 3% of cases annually and performed a median of 340 cases (IQR 91 – 482) compared with a median of 508 cases (IQR 122 – 862) performed by male operators. Female operators were more likely to perform cases at hospitals associated with an ACGME accredited cardiology fellowship program (57.0% versus 52.6%, p <0.001).

Differences in baseline characteristics among patients who had a PCI performed by a male operator compared with a female operator are shown in Table 1. Compared with male interventional cardiologists, female interventional cardiologists performed PCI using radial access more frequently (37.4% versus 26.4%, p<0.0001). This was the only characteristic that exceeded the 10% ASD threshold for substantial imbalance. Female interventional cardiologists performed PCI on higher risk patients such as those presenting with STEMI, and patients with cardiogenic shock and *were more likely to perform multi-vessel PCI*. During the procedure, female interventional cardiologists had longer fluoroscopy times and higher fluoroscopy doses

but used less contrast volume. Female interventionalists were more likely to perform multi-vessel PCI.

Results of the risk-adjusted analysis are summarized in the Central Illustration and Figures 1-3. There were no significant differences between female and male interventional cardiologists in the risk-adjusted rates of mortality [1.48% versus 1.56%, aOR 1.138, 95% CI: 0.891–1.452], acute kidney injury [3.42% versus 3.28%, aOR 1.027, 95% CI: 0.819–1.288], transfusion [2.59% versus 2.85%, aOR 1.168, 95% CI: 0.980–1.390] or major bleeding [0.95% versus 1.07%, aOR 1.083, 95% CI: 0.825-1.420]. There were no significant differences in the outcomes of male patients treated by male versus female interventional cardiologists or female patients treated by male versus female interventional cardiologists. Of the 6,362 cases performed by female operators, 6,303 (99.07%) were successfully matched in a five to one fashion in the propensity-matched analysis (Supplemental table 1). Similar findings were observed in propensity-matched analysis (Figure 4).

While the absolute differences were small, procedures performed by female operators were more likely to be rated as appropriate compared with male operators (86.64% vs. 84.45%, p-value <0.0001) when assessed by Appropriate Use Criteria (Table 2). Female interventional cardiologists tended to more frequently prescribe guideline-directed medical therapies like statins (97.13% vs. 94.67%, p-value <0.0001) (Table 3).

Discussion:

Our study has two principal findings. First, there were only 18 (4.5%) female interventional cardiologists practicing in the state of Michigan, and accordingly, the number of

patients treated by them is small (2.66% of procedures). Secondly, there were no significant differences in in-hospital mortality, AKI, transfusion or major bleeding among patients treated by female versus male interventional cardiologists after adjusting for patient risk. Finally, PCIs performed by female interventional cardiologists were more frequently rated as appropriate and female interventional cardiologists more frequently prescribed guideline-medical therapy.

To our knowledge, this is the first study evaluating clinical outcomes based on the sex of the treating interventional cardiologist. This may be due to the fact that female interventional cardiologists continue to be markedly under-represented and only perform a small percentage of PCI cases[27]. While more than 50% of medical students and nearly 33% of practicing physicians are female, the percentage of females pursuing cardiology fellowship has remained stagnant between 21%-23% since 2007[28]. In interventional cardiology, this number is even lower. Only 4.5% of interventional cardiologists are women and perform 3% of procedures based on National Cardiovascular Data Registry of PCIs[27]. It is important and reassuring that we found no significant differences in important clinical outcomes. Female interventionalists are more likely to use radial access. While there was no statistically significant difference in bleeding rates, there was a trend towards fewer transfusions in patients who had female operators (p=0.065). Previous studies have raised the issue of gender concordance; Greenwood et al found that among female patients treated for acute myocardial infarction, those treated by female physicians had lower mortality[29]. We did not notice a similar signal in our study.

The Appropriate Use Criteria was developed by multiple organizations to provide a practical standard upon which to ensure the delivery of high-quality cardiovascular care[21]. It is generally accepted that appropriateness is an independent measure of healthcare value for PCI that needs to be considered separately when assessing the overall performance of the procedure[22,

While the absolute differences were small, procedures performed by female interventional cardiologists were more likely to be rated as appropriate. Female interventional cardiologists also prescribed more guideline-directed medical therapy. This is consistent with other previous studies showing that female physicians are more likely to follow guidelines based practice[30-32]. There have also been studies that showed the opposite – a study by Gupta et al showed that male clinicians may have higher adherence to cardiovascular performance than female clinicians in the ambulatory cardiology setting[33]. However, in this study, the overall adherence to some performance measures was low for both male and female practitioners. The level of adherence for recommended therapy was higher in our study for both male and female practitioners. Although the team prescribing the medications at discharge may be different than the operator performing the procedure, the operator is part of the "care team" in helping assess which medications are necessary. Jones et al have shown that cooperation tended to increase with a rising proportion of females in the Operating Room[34] – similar cooperation may also contribute to better post PCI care in our study. Female interventionalists were also more likely to perform PCIs at hospitals with an ACGME accredited cardiology fellowship program; these academic hospitals may be more likely to have pharmacists and other support staff to aid in prescribing appropriate guideline-directed medical therapy.

Although there are many perceived barriers for females to enter the field of interventional cardiology including uncontrollable or unpredictable lifestyle, concern over long work hours and poor work/life balance[35], these data suggest that females who are in this field provide excellent clinical care. While there were no significant differences in clinical outcomes, female interventional cardiologists tended to perform more appropriate PCI and more frequently prescribed guideline-directed medical therapy, both indicators of high-quality care. Having more

female interventionalists creates a more diverse workforce, which has been shown in other areas of business and in surgical operating rooms[34] to be beneficial. Diversity enriches the workplace by broadening employee perspectives, strengthening their teams and offering greater resources for problem resolution[36].

The exceedingly small number of women in the field of interventional cardiology should serves as a wakeup call for our profession. There needs to be a focus on gender equity, and we need to develop strategies to encourage female trainees to pursue a career in interventional cardiology.

Limitations:

Our study should be interpreted in the context of important limitations. First, the BMC2-PCI registry is a regional database from the state of Michigan with an active focus on multicenter quality improvement and might or might not be representative of the wider population of patients undergoing PCI in the United States[37]. Our findings, however, reflect the work across the entire state of Michigan, and comprise the experience of both academic and community hospitals, which makes our findings more generalizable. Despite a rigorous analytical approach, our study if limited by the potential for selection bias due to unmeasured confounding inherent to observational studies.

Conclusion:

Female interventional cardiologists are scarce and perform a small percentage of PCI cases in Michigan. There was no significant difference in risk-adjusted outcomes of procedures performed by male versus female interventional cardiologists in Michigan. Female operators

scored higher on appropriateness metrics and prescribed more guideline-directed medical therapy. Taken together, these findings underscore the importance of the cardiovascular community's focus[35] on developing strategies to encourage female trainees to pursue a career in interventional cardiology.

Funding:

This work was supported by the Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan and Blue Care Network as part of the Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan Value Partnerships program. The funding source supported data collection at each site and funded the data-coordinating center but had no role in study concept, interpretation of findings, or in the preparation, final approval or decision to submit the manuscript.

Acknowledgements:

We are indebted to the study coordinators, investigators and patients who participated in the Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan Cardiovascular Consortium registry. All authors listed meet the authorship criteria according to the latest guidelines of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, and all authors agree with the manuscript.

Disclaimer:

Although Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan (BCBSM) and BMC2 work collaboratively, the opinions, beliefs and viewpoints expressed by the author do not necessarily reflect the opinions, beliefs and viewpoints of BCBSM or any of its employees.

Perspectives:

Core clinical competency: There was no significant difference in outcomes of PCIs based on the gender of the interventional cardiologist.

Translational Outlook: Future studies should examine and validate the outcomes of female interventional cardiologists in an effort to encourage females to pursue interventional cardiology.

Conflict of Interest:

Hitinder S. Gurm receives research support from Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Michigan, the National Institutes of Health Center for Accelerated Innovations, and Michigan Translational Research and Commercialization for Life Sciences Innovation Hub. He is the co-founder of, owns equity in, and is a consultant to Amplitude Vascular Systems. He also owns equity in Jiaxing Bossh Medical Technology Partnership and is a consultant for Osprey Medical. None of the authors have any conflicts directly relevant to this study.

Authors' Contributions:

Hitinder Gurm and Milan Seth had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Study concept and design: Seth, Gurm

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: Gurm

Drafting of the manuscript: Yelavarthy

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Seth, Pielsticker, Grines, Duvernoy, Sukul, Gurm,

Statistical analysis: Seth

Obtained funding: Gurm

Study supervision: Gurm

References:

1. Pope JH, Aufderheide TP, Ruthazer R, et al. Missed diagnoses of acute cardiac ischemia in the emergency department. *N Engl J Med*. Apr 2000;342(16):1163-70. doi:10.1056/NEJM200004203421603
2. Vaccarino V, Rathore SS, Wenger NK, et al. Sex and racial differences in the management of acute myocardial infarction, 1994 through 2002. *N Engl J Med*. Aug 2005;353(7):671-82. doi:10.1056/NEJMsa032214
3. Kim LK, Looser P, Swaminathan RV, et al. Sex-Based Disparities in Incidence, Treatment, and Outcomes of Cardiac Arrest in the United States, 2003-2012. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 06 2016;5(6)doi:10.1161/JAHA.116.003704
4. Potts J, Sirker A, Martinez SC, et al. Persistent sex disparities in clinical outcomes with percutaneous coronary intervention: Insights from 6.6 million PCI procedures in the United States. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(9):e0203325. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0203325
5. Zachura M, Wilczek K, Janion M, Gąsior M, Gierlotka M, Sadowski M. Long-term outcomes in men and women with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction and incomplete reperfusion after a primary percutaneous coronary intervention: a 2-year follow-up. *Coron Artery Dis*. May 2019;30(3):171-176. doi:10.1097/MCA.0000000000000703
6. Benamer H, Tafflet M, Bataille S, et al. Female gender is an independent predictor of in-hospital mortality after STEMI in the era of primary PCI: insights from the greater Paris area PCI Registry. *EuroIntervention*. Apr 2011;6(9):1073-9. doi:10.4244/EIJV6I9A187
7. Mehta LS, Beckie TM, DeVon HA, et al. Acute Myocardial Infarction in Women: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. Mar 2016;133(9):916-47. doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000351
8. Lakshmanan S, Jankowich M, Wu WC, Blackshear C, Abbasi S, Choudhary G. Gender Differences in Risk Factors Associated With Pulmonary Artery Systolic Pressure, Heart Failure, and Mortality in Blacks: Jackson Heart Study. *J Am Heart Assoc*. Jan 2020;9(1):e013034. doi:10.1161/JAHA.119.013034
9. Schmuck R, Gerken M, Teegen EM, et al. Gender comparison of clinical, histopathological, therapeutic and outcome factors in 185,967 colon cancer patients. *Langenbecks Arch Surg*. Jan 2020;doi:10.1007/s00423-019-01850-6
10. Meltzer S, Bakke KM, Rød KL, et al. Sex-related differences in primary metastatic site in rectal cancer; associated with hemodynamic factors? *Clin Transl Radiat Oncol*. Mar 2020;21:5-10. doi:10.1016/j.ctro.2019.11.006
11. Tsugawa Y, Jena AB, Figueroa JF, Orav EJ, Blumenthal DM, Jha AK. Comparison of Hospital Mortality and Readmission Rates for Medicare Patients Treated by Male vs Female Physicians. *JAMA Intern Med*. 02 2017;177(2):206-213. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.7875
12. Moscucci M, Share D, Kline-Rogers E, et al. The Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan Cardiovascular Consortium (BMC2) collaborative quality improvement initiative in percutaneous coronary interventions. *J Interv Cardiol*. Oct 2002;15(5):381-6.
13. Gurm HS, Seth M, Dixon SR, et al. Contemporary use of and outcomes associated with ultra-low contrast volume in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary interventions. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. Feb 2019;93(2):222-230. doi:10.1002/ccd.27819
14. Kline-Rogers E, Share D, Bondie D, et al. Development of a multicenter interventional cardiology database: the Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan Cardiovascular Consortium

(BMC2) experience. *J Interv Cardiol*. Oct 2002;15(5):387-92. doi:10.1111/j.1540-8183.2002.tb01072.x
15. NCDR CathPCI Registry v4.4 Coder's Data Dictionary. https://www.ncdr.com/WebNCDR/docs/default-source/public-data-collection-documents/cathpci_v4_codersdictionary_4-4.pdf?sfvrsn=b84d368e_2
16. NPI Files. http://download.cms.gov/nppes/NPI_Files.html
17. Gurm HS, Seth M, Kooiman J, Share D. A novel tool for reliable and accurate prediction of renal complications in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jun 2013;61(22):2242-8. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2013.03.026
18. Gurm HS, Kooiman J, LaLonde T, Grines C, Share D, Seth M. A random forest based risk model for reliable and accurate prediction of receipt of transfusion in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(5):e96385. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0096385
19. BMC2. PCI risk calculator for multiple outcomes. www.bmc2.org/calculators/multi
20. PCI Risk Assessment Tools. Accessed 1/1/2019, http://www.scai.org/PCIRiskAssessmentTools/default.aspx
21. Patel MR, Calhoon JH, Dehmer GJ, et al. ACC/AATS/AHA/ASE/ASNC/SCAI/SCCT/STS 2017 Appropriate Use Criteria for Coronary Revascularization in Patients With Stable Ischemic Heart Disease : A Report of the American College of Cardiology Appropriate Use Criteria Task Force, American Association for Thoracic Surgery, American Heart Association, American Society of Echocardiography, American Society of Nuclear Cardiology, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, Society of Cardiovascular Computed Tomography, and Society of Thoracic Surgeons. *J Nucl Cardiol*. 10 2017;24(5):1759-1792. doi:10.1007/s12350-017-0917-9
22. Alyesh DM, Seth M, Miller DC, et al. Exploring the Healthcare Value of Percutaneous Coronary Intervention: Appropriateness, Outcomes, and Costs in Michigan Hospitals. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes*. 06 2018;11(6):e004328. doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.117.004328
23. Bradley SM, Maynard C, Bryson CL. Appropriateness of percutaneous coronary interventions in Washington State. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes*. Jul 2012;5(4):445-53. doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.111.964320
24. Austin PC. Balance diagnostics for comparing the distribution of baseline covariates between treatment groups in propensity-score matched samples. *Stat Med*. Nov 2009;28(25):3083-107. doi:10.1002/sim.3697
25. Austin PC. Using the Standardized Difference to Compare the Prevalence of a Binary Variable Between Two Groups in Observational Research. 2009;(38):1228-34.
26. Sullivan GM, Feinn R. Using Effect Size-or Why the P Value Is Not Enough. *J Grad Med Educ*. Sep 2012;4(3):279-82. doi:10.4300/JGME-D-12-00156.1
27. Wang TY, Grines C, Ortega R, et al. Women in interventional cardiology: Update in percutaneous coronary intervention practice patterns and outcomes of female operators from the National Cardiovascular Data Registry®. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. Mar 2016;87(4):663-8. doi:10.1002/ccd.26118
28. Medicine ABoI. Percentage of First-Year Fellows by Gender and Type of Medical School Attended. https://www.abim.org/about/statistics-data/resident-fellow-workforce-data/first-year-fellows-by-gender-type-of-medical-school-attended.aspx

29. Greenwood BN, Carnahan S, Huang L. Patient-physician gender concordance and increased mortality among female heart attack patients. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 08 2018;115(34):8569-8574. doi:10.1073/pnas.1800097115
30. Baumhäkel M, Müller U, Böhm M. Influence of gender of physicians and patients on guideline-recommended treatment of chronic heart failure in a cross-sectional study. *Eur J Heart Fail*. Mar 2009;11(3):299-303. doi:10.1093/eurjhf/hfn041
31. Berthold HK, Gouni-Berthold I, Bestehorn KP, Böhm M, Krone W. Physician gender is associated with the quality of type 2 diabetes care. *J Intern Med*. Oct 2008;264(4):340-50. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2796.2008.01967.x
32. Solomon DH, Brookhart MA, Gandhi TK, et al. Adherence with osteoporosis practice guidelines: a multilevel analysis of patient, physician, and practice setting characteristics. *Am J Med*. Dec 2004;117(12):919-24. doi:10.1016/j.amjmed.2004.06.040
33. Gupta D, Tang F, Masoudi FA, Jones PG, Chan PS, Daugherty SL. Practitioner Gender and Quality of Care in Ambulatory Cardiology Practices: A Report From the National Cardiovascular Data Practice Innovation and Clinical Excellence (PINNACLE) Registry. *J Cardiovasc Nurs*. 2018 May/Jun 2018;33(3):255-260. doi:10.1097/JCN.0000000000000443
34. Jones LK, Jennings BM, Higgins MK, de Waal FBM. Ethological observations of social behavior in the operating room. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 07 2018;115(29):7575-7580. doi:10.1073/pnas.1716883115
35. Yong CM, Abnousi F, Rzeszut AK, et al. Sex Differences in the Pursuit of Interventional Cardiology as a Subspecialty Among Cardiovascular Fellows-in-Training. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. Feb 2019;12(3):219-228. doi:10.1016/j.jcin.2018.09.036
36. Herring C. Does Diversity Pay?: Race, Gender, and the Business Case for Diversity. American Sociological Review2009. p. 208-224.
37. Share DA, Campbell DA, Birkmeyer N, et al. How a regional collaborative of hospitals and physicians in Michigan cut costs and improved the quality of care. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. Apr 2011;30(4):636-45. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2010.0526

Figure Legends:

Central Illustration:

Title: Risk Adjusted In-Hospital Mortality – All PCI Patients 2010-2017

Legend: The risk adjusted in-hospital mortality of patients treated by female (maize bars) or male interventional cardiologists (blue bars) among male patients, female patients and overall population. Mortality was defined as death from any cause prior to discharge following PCI.

Figure 1:

Title: Risk Adjusted In-Hospital AKI – All PCI Patients 2010-2017

Legend: The risk-adjusted incidence of AKI (acute kidney injury) of patients treated by female (maize bars) or male interventional cardiologists (blue bars) among male patients, female patients and overall population. AKI was defined as $\geq$ 0.5mg/dL increase in creatinine.

Figure 2:

Title: Risk Adjusted In-Hospital Transfusion – All PCI Patients 2010-2017

Legend: The risk adjusted in-hospital transfusions of patients treated by female (maize bars) or male interventional cardiologists (blue bars) among male patients, female patients and overall population.

Figure 3:

Title: Risk Adjusted Major Bleeding – All PCI Patients 2010-2017

Legend: The risk adjusted in-hospital major bleeding of patients treated by female (maize bars) or male interventional cardiologists (blue bars) among male patients, female patients and overall population. Major bleeding was defined as a hemoglobin drop of >5g/dl.

Figure 4:

Title: Risk Adjusted Outcome Rates

Legend: Study Outcomes using 5:1 Propensity Matching. Major bleeding was defined as hemoglobin drop of >5g/dl. Acute kidney injury was defined as ≥0.5 mg/dl absolute increase in creatinine.

Supplemental Figure 1:

Title: Patient inclusion diagram for study cohort

Legend: PCI, primary percutaneous coronary intervention; NPI, national provider identifier.

Table 1. Baseline Characteristics Stratified by Gender of Operator

Values are mean +/- SD or n/N (%). MI = myocardial infarction; PCI = percutaneous coronary intervention; CAD = coronary artery disease; NSTEMI = non ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction; STEMI = ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction; LV = left ventricle.

Characteristic	Male Operator N=233,060	Female Operator N=6,362	p-value	Abs. Std. diff
Demographics				
Age	65.32 ± 11.98	64.79 ± 11.85	p < 0.001	4.48
Male	155,814 (66.9%)	4,155 (65.3%)	p = 0.010	3.27
White	200,688 (86.1%)	5,350 (84.1%)	p < 0.001	5.67
History & Risk Factors				
Hypertension	199,145 (85.5%)	5,364 (84.4%)	p = 0.012	3.13
Diabetes Mellitus	90,708 (38.9%)	2,532 (39.8%)	p = 0.161	1.78
Dyslipidemia	189,377 (81.3%)	5,220 (82.2%)	p = 0.062	2.39
Cerebrovascular Disease	36,281 (15.6%)	971 (15.3%)	p = 0.508	0.84
Peripheral Arterial Disease	36,708 (15.8%)	983 (15.5%)	p = 0.522	0.82
Chronic Lung Disease	44,699 (19.2%)	1,104 (17.4%)	p < 0.001	4.72
Current/Recent Smoker (w/in 1 year)	66,779 (28.7%)	1,778 (28.0%)	p = 0.216	1.58
Prior MI	81,676 (35.1%)	2,258 (35.5%)	p = 0.469	0.92
Prior Heart Failure	40,506 (17.4%)	1,089 (17.1%)	p = 0.584	0.7
Prior Valve Surgery/Procedure	4,307 (1.8%)	143 (2.2%)	p = 0.020	2.82
Prior PCI	106,867 (45.9%)	2,741 (43.1%)	p < 0.001	5.58

CAD Presentation				
No symptoms, no angina	10,980 (4.7%)	213 (3.3%)	p < 0.001	6.94
Symptoms unlikely ischemic	5,817 (2.5%)	177 (2.8%)	p = 0.150	1.78
Stable angina	28,501 (12.2%)	747 (11.7%)	p = 0.239	1.51
Unstable angina	98,225 (42.2%)	2,547 (40.0%)	p < 0.001	4.31
NSTEMI	52,193 (22.4%)	1,511 (23.8%)	p = 0.011	3.21
STEMI or equivalent	37,290 (16.0%)	1,167 (18.3%)	p < 0.001	6.21
Arterial Access Site				
Femoral	170,680 (73.2%)	3,934 (61.9%)	p < 0.001	24.49
Radial	61,588 (26.4%)	2,379 (37.4%)	p < 0.001	23.72
Other				
Pre-PCI LV Ejection Fraction	51.84 ± 12.92	52.56 ± 13.01	p < 0.001	5.49
Cardiogenic Shock at Start of PCI	4,923 (2.1%)	186 (2.9%)	p < 0.001	5.17
CTO	8211 (3.5%)	208 (3.3%)	p = 0.298	1.40
Multi-vessel PCI	28261 (12.4%)	900 (14.2%)	p < 0.001	5.60

Table 2 – Proportion of Procedures Rated as Appropriate in Female, Male and All Patients by Operator Gender.

	Female Operator	Male Operator	p-value
Male Patients	86.47%	83.82%	p <0.001
Female Patients	86.95%	85.73%	p = 0.108
Combined	86.64%	84.45%	p <0.001

Table 3 – Discharge Medications Stratified by Sex of Interventional Cardiologist.

	Female Operator	Male Operator	p-value	Absolute std. Difference (%)
Aspirin	99.16%	98.66%	0.0009	4.82%
Clopidogrel	68.21%	68.32%	0.8599	0.23%
Prasugrel or Ticagrelor	30.61%	30.03%	0.3295	1.26%
Statin	97.13%	94.67%	<0.0001	12.42%
ACE/ARB (LVEF <40)	86.79%	86.50%	0.8272	0.85%
Beta-Blocker (LVEF <40)	95.37%	96.60%	0.0654	6.29%

Figures:

Central Illustration:



Figure 1:



Figure 2:



Figure 3:



Figure 4:



Supplemental Figure 1:



Supplemental Table 1 – Characteristics of Propensity Matched Cohort Stratified by Gender of Operator

Values are mean +/- SD or n/N (%). MI = myocardial infarction; PCI = percutaneous coronary intervention; CAD = coronary artery disease; NSTEMI = non ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction; STEMI = ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction; LV = left ventricle.

Characteristic	Male Operator N=31,515	Female Operator N=6,303	p-value	Abs. Std. diff

Demographics				
Age	64.75 +/- 12.16	64.74 +/- 11.83	p = 0.951	0.08
Male	20,635 (65.5%)	4,127 (65.5%)	p = 1.000	0.00
White	26,966 (85.6%)	5,300 (84.1%)	p = 0.003	4.12
History & Risk Factors				
Hypertension	26,643 (84.6%)	5,313 (84.3%)	p = 0.624	0.68
Diabetes Mellitus	12,428 (39.4%)	2,505 (39.7%)	p = 0.648	0.63
Dyslipidemia	25,367 (80.6%)	5,183 (82.4%)	p < 0.001	4.80
Cerebrovascular Disease	4,913 (15.6%)	960 (15.2%)	p = 0.470	1.00
Peripheral Arterial Disease	4,845 (15.4%)	971 (15.4%)	p = 0.948	0.09
Chronic Lung Disease	5,519 (17.5%)	1,101 (17.5%)	p = 0.931	0.12
Current/Recent Smoker (w/in 1 year)	9,233 (29.3%)	1,757 (27.9%)	p = 0.023	3.16
Prior MI	10,752 (34.1%)	2,240 (35.5%)	p = 0.030	2.98
Prior Heart Failure	5,385 (17.1%)	1,079 (17.1%)	p = 0.955	0.08
Prior Valve Surgery/Procedure	623 (2.0%)	141 (2.2%)	p = 0.181	1.81
Prior PCI	13,888 (44.1%)	2,725 (43.2%)	p = 0.224	1.68
CAD Presentation				
No symptoms, no angina	1,049 (3.3%)	209 (3.3%)	p = 0.959	0.07
Symptoms unlikely ischemic	904 (2.9%)	173 (2.7%)	p = 0.590	0.75
Stable angina	3,835 (12.2%)	747 (11.9%)	p = 0.481	0.98
Unstable angina	12,637 (40.1%)	2,545 (40.4%)	p = 0.680	0.57
NSTEMI	7,497 (23.8%)	1,503 (23.8%)	p = 0.923	0.13
STEMI or equivalent	5,593 (17.7%)	1,126 (17.9%)	p = 0.824	0.31
Arterial Access Site				
Femoral	22,892 (72.7%)	3,880 (61.6%)	p < 0.001	23.73
Radial	8,510 (27.0%)	2,375 (37.7%)	p < 0.001	23.00
Other				
Pre-PCI LV Ejection Fraction	52.47 +/- 12.70	52.61 +/- 12.97	p = 0.513	1.10
Cardiogenic Shock at Start of PCI	715 (2.3%)	150 (2.4%)	p = 0.592	0.73

Table I. Baseline Characteristics Stratified by Gender of Operator

Values are mean +/- SD or n/N (%). MI = myocardial infarction; PCI = percutaneous coronary intervention; CAD = coronary artery disease; NSTEMI = non ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction; STEMI = ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction; LV = left ventricle.

Characteristic	Male Operator N=233,060	Female Operator N=6,362	p-value	Abs. Std. diff
Demographics				
Age	65.32 ± 11.98	64.79 ± 11.85	p < 0.001	4.48
Male	155,814 (66.9%)	4,155 (65.3%)	p = 0.010	3.27
White	200,688 (86.1%)	5,350 (84.1%)	p < 0.001	5.67
History & Risk Factors				
Hypertension	199,145 (85.5%)	5,364 (84.4%)	p = 0.012	3.13
Diabetes Mellitus	90,708 (38.9%)	2,532 (39.8%)	p = 0.161	1.78
Dyslipidemia	189,377 (81.3%)	5,220 (82.2%)	p = 0.062	2.39
Cerebrovascular Disease	36,281 (15.6%)	971 (15.3%)	p = 0.508	0.84
Peripheral Arterial Disease	36,708 (15.8%)	983 (15.5%)	p = 0.522	0.82
Chronic Lung Disease	44,699 (19.2%)	1,104 (17.4%)	p < 0.001	4.72
Current/Recent Smoker (w/in 1 year)	66,779 (28.7%)	1,778 (28.0%)	p = 0.216	1.58
Prior MI	81,676 (35.1%)	2,258 (35.5%)	p = 0.469	0.92
Prior Heart Failure	40,506 (17.4%)	1,089 (17.1%)	p = 0.584	0.7
Prior Valve Surgery/Procedure	4,307 (1.8%)	143 (2.2%)	p = 0.020	2.82
Prior PCI	106,867 (45.9%)	2,741 (43.1%)	p < 0.001	5.58
CAD Presentation				
No symptoms, no angina	10,980 (4.7%)	213 (3.3%)	p < 0.001	6.94
Symptoms unlikely ischemic	5,817 (2.5%)	177 (2.8%)	p = 0.150	1.78
Stable angina	28,501 (12.2%)	747 (11.7%)	p = 0.239	1.51
Unstable angina	98,225 (42.2%)	2,547 (40.0%)	p < 0.001	4.31
NSTEMI	52,193 (22.4%)	1,511 (23.8%)	p = 0.011	3.21
STEMI or equivalent	37,290 (16.0%)	1,167 (18.3%)	p < 0.001	6.21
Arterial Access Site				
Femoral	170,680 (73.2%)	3,934 (61.9%)	p < 0.001	24.49
Radial	61,588 (26.4%)	2,379 (37.4%)	p < 0.001	23.72
Other				
Pre-PCI LV Ejection Fraction	51.84 ± 12.92	52.56 ± 13.01	p < 0.001	5.49

Cardiogenic Shock at Start of PCI	4,923 (2.1%)	186 (2.9%)	p < 0.001	5.17

Table II – Proportion of Procedures Rated as Appropriate in Female, Male and All Patients by Operator Gender.

	Female Operator	Male Operator	p-value
Male Patients	86.47%	83.82%	p <0.001
Female Patients	86.95%	85.73%	p = 0.108
Combined	86.64%	84.45%	p <0.001

Table III – Discharge Medications Stratified by Sex of Interventional Cardiologist.

	Female Operator	Male Operator	p-value	Absolute std. Difference (%)
Aspirin	99.16%	98.66%	0.0009	4.82%
Clopidogrel	68.21%	68.32%	0.8599	0.23%
Prasugrel or Ticagrelor	30.61%	30.03%	0.3295	1.26%
Statin	97.13%	94.67%	<0.0001	12.42%
ACE/ARB (LVEF <40)	86.79%	86.50%	0.8272	0.85%
Beta-Blocker (LVEF <40)	95.37%	96.60%	0.0654	6.29%



CCD_29774_figure-1.tif



CCD_29774_figure-2.tif



CCD_29774_figure-3.tif



CCD_29774_figure-4.tif



CCD_29774_figure-5.tif