

Table S1 Characteristics of Studies Included in the Network Meta-Analysis

Study/First author, year	Period	Center	Number of Patients	Stent Type	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Primary outcome	MACE definition	Maximum follow-up
IVUS versus CAG									
SIPS, <sup>1</sup> 2000	1996.02-	single	121/148	BMS	elective or urgent	emergency	minimal	death, MI, re-	2 years
	1996.05	center			PTCA or primary stenting in vessels of diameter 2.2 and 4.6 mm	intervention, planned atherectomy, CTO	lumen diameter	PTCA, and CABG	
CRUISE, <sup>2</sup> 2000	1996.04-	multicenter	290/253	BMS	symptomatic	revascularization of	minimal stent	death, MI, and	9 months
	1997.05				ischemic heart disease, new lesions or restenotic lesions, and planned implantation	lesions other than the stented lesion, aspirin, ticlopidine, or cumarin was contraindicated, LM disease, MI within 7 days, stroke/transient ischemic neurological attack within 3 months	dimensions	TVR	
OPTICUS, <sup>3</sup> 2001	1996.10-	multicenter	273/275	BMS	angina	or	acute angina at	restenosis	death, MI, 1 year
	1998.02				ischemia, no	rest, complete	rate, minimal	CABG, and	

						contraindication	akinesia	in the	lumen	repeat PCI		
						to antiplatelet	myocardium		diameter,			
						therapy, and	supplied by the		and percent			
						lesion length ≤25	target	artery,	diameter			
						mm	significant	LM	stenosis			
							lesion, bifurcation					
							lesion, and					
							involvement of a					
							side branch ≥2 mm					
							in diameter with					
							ostial stenosis					
Gaster, <sup>4, 5</sup> 2003	1997	single	54/54	BMS	male patients	follow-up	was	recurrence of	NA		2.5 years	
		center			referred for PCI	unlikely,	MI<3	stenosis				
						months, unstable						
						angina within a						
						month, left bundle						
						branch block, atrial						
						fibrillation, serum						
						creatinine >200						
						μmol/l,						
						thyrotoxicosis,						
						polycythemia, total						
						occlusion						
TULIP, <sup>6</sup> 2003	1998.06-	single	74/76	BMS	nonostial	MI within 2 weeks,	cardiac	cardiac	death,	1 year		

	2001.01	center			stenosis $\geq 20$ mm	total	occlusion,	death,	MI,	MI, TLR
					length with a	contraindications		TLR		
					reference	for	combined			
					diameter that	antiplatelet therapy				
					permitted					
					implantation of					
					$\geq 3$ -mm stents					
					without					
					involvement of					
					significant side					
					branches					
					(diameter $\geq 2.0$					
					mm).					
DIPOL, <sup>7</sup> 2007	2000.09- 2002.12	multicenter	83/80	BMS	stable angina	recent	MI or	MACE	death, MI, and	6 months
					pectoris, age	unstable	angina,		revascularization	
					between 18 and	LM stenosis, large				
					70 years, 1 or 2	calcifications, large				
					"de novo" vessel	(>2 mm in diameter)				
					disease, vessel	side branch, and				
					reference	CTO				
					diameter >2.75					
					mm, and lesion					
					length $\geq 25$ mm					
AVID, <sup>8</sup> 2009	1995-	multicenter	394/406	BMS	>18	years,	dissection	not	TLR	death, MI, stent 1 year

1999						scheduled for covered by stent,		thrombosis,	
						elective coronary TIMI <3 after stent		CABG	
						stent placement placement, CTO,			
						stent placement in a			
						sole remaining			
						circulation or LM			
						equivalent, stent			
						placement within an			
						aneurysmal portion			
						of a vessel, bypass			
						graft supplying a			
						native vessel <2.0			
						mm, cardiac			
						transplantation,			
						performance of			
						IVUS during the			
						index procedure			
						before stent			
						placement			
Jakabcin, <sup>9</sup> 2010	2004.01- 2005.12	single center	105/105	DES	lesion type B2 and C, proximal LAD, LM disease, reference vessel	NA	MACE	death, MI, and revascularization	1.5 years

ACS

death, and TVR

Study	Year	Design	Patients (n)	Intervention	Comparison	Primary Endpoints	Secondary Endpoints	Follow-up
RESET, <sup>11</sup>	2009.04-2010.12	multicenter	269/274	DES	lesion requiring a stent ≥28 mm	bleeding within 3 months, hypersensitivity to heparin, aspirin, clopidogrel, or a limus-related drug, cerebral vascular accident, peripheral artery occlusive diseases, thromboembolic disease, stent thrombosis, cardiogenic shock, LVEF <40%, STEMI within 48 h,	MACE	cardiac death, 1 year MI, TVR, or stent thrombosis

NA

					aortic	balloon						
					pumping							
Tan <sup>13</sup> , 2015	2009.10-	single	61/62	DES	>70 years, LM	LVEF	<30%,	MACE	death, MI, and	2 years		
	2012.09	center			disease	cardiogenic shock,			TLR			
						MI, carcinoma.						
AIR-CTO <sup>14</sup> , 2015	2010.10-	multicenter	115/115	DES	18-80 years, age	>80 years,	in-stent late	NA		2 years		
	2011.11				silent ischaemia,	pregnant, liver	lumen loss					
					stable angina,	dysfunction,						
					unstable angina	creatinine	>2.5					
					or previous MI,	mg/dl,	major					
					CTO	bleeding or stroke						
						within six months,						
						platelet count						
						<8×10 <sup>9</sup> /L,	white					
						blood cells						
						<40×10 <sup>9</sup> /L,	life					
						expectancy	<12					
						months, allergy to						
						the study						
						medications, failure						
						of recanalisation in						
						a CTO lesion,						
						STEMI <24 hours,						
						and intolerance to						



						dual antiplatelet				
						therapy				
IVUS-XPL, <sup>15</sup> 2015	2010.10-2014.07	multicenter	700/700	DES	chest pain or MI, long coronary lesions (implanted stent ≥28 mm)	MI within 48 h, MACE		cardiac death, 1 year		
						contraindication for anti-platelet agents and bleeding within 3 months, cerebral vascular accident, peripheral artery occlusive disease, thromboembolic disease, stent thrombosis, >80 years, severe hepatic dysfunction, significant renal dysfunction, significant leucopenia, neutropenia, thrombocytopenia, anemia, or known bleeding diathesis,		MI, and TVR		

						cardiogenic shock,				
						LVEF <40%,				
						pregnant, life				
						expectancy <1				
						year, LM disease				
						requiring PCI,				
						bifurcation lesion,				
						CTO, implanting				
						DES within 6				
						months, in-stent				
						restenosis				
CTO-IVUS, <sup>16</sup>	2012.03-	multicenter	201/201	DES	CTO, 20 to 80	LM disease, in-	cardiac	cardiac death,	1 year	
2015	2013.08				years, typical	stent restenosis,	death	MI, and TVR		
					symptomatic	ACS, LVEF <30%,				
					angina or	IVUS use before				
					ischemia	randomization				
Wang, <sup>17</sup> 2015	2012.10-	single	38/42	DES	STEMI within 12	residual	MACE	cardiac death,	1 year	
	2013.08	center			h, preprocedural	stenosis >75% or		MI, TVR, and		
					TIMI grade 0/1	TIMI grade <3 flow		intractable		
					flow or thrombus	after aspiration		myocardial		
					grade ≥3 in the	thrombectomy, ≥2		ischemia		
					IRA, 50–75%	stents inserted, LM				
					residual stenosis	occlusion,				
					after aspiration	hemodynamic				

					thrombectomy	instability, old MI,				
					and a TIMI grade	prior				
					3 flow at the	cardiopulmonary				
					distal end of the	resuscitation,				
					IRA	hepatic and renal				
						dysfunction or				
						neoplastic disease,				
						valvular heart				
						disease, congenital				
						heart disease, or				
						cardiomyopathy,				
						coronary				
						angioplasty or				
						CABG, coagulation				
						disorders, no				
						tolerance for				
						aspirin, clopidogrel,				
						heparin and				
						contrast medium				
						allergies				
ULTIMATE, <sup>18</sup>	2014.08-	multicenter	724/724	DES	silent ischemia,	life expectancy <12	target-vessel	cardiac death,	1 year	
2018	2017.05				stable or	months, intolerant	failure	MI, and TVR		
					unstable angina,	of antithrombotic				
					MI >24 h, and a	therapy, significant				

					de novo	anemia,					
					coronary lesion	thrombocytopenia,					
					eligible for DES	or leucopenia,					
					implantation	history of major					
						hemorrhage, CTO,					
						severe calcification					
						needing rotational					
						atherectomy					
SURF, <sup>19</sup> 2019	2012.11-	single	688/700	DES	>18 years	cardiogenic shock,	major		death, stroke, MI	30 days	
	2017.11	center			referred for CAG	dialysis, severe	bleeding,		or urgent TLR		
					and PCI	peripheral vascular	MACE				
						disease, previous					
						failed access, or a					
						failed Allen's test					
OCT versus CAG											
DOCTORS, <sup>20</sup>	2013.09-	multicenter	120/120	DES	18 to 80 years,	LM disease, in-	FFR		NA	6 months	
2016	2015.12				NSTEMI	stent restenosis,					
						presence of					
						coronary artery					
						bypass grafts,					
						cardiogenic shock					
						or severe					
						hemodynamic					
						instability, severely					

						calcified or tortuous				
						arteries, persistent				
						ST-segment				
						elevation, $\geq 1$				
						lesions considered				
						angiographically				
						significant, or				
						nonsignificant				
						diffuse disease,				
						severe renal				
						insufficiency,				
						bacteremia or				
						septicemia, severe				
						coagulation				
						disorders;				
						pregnancy				
ROBUST, <sup>21</sup> 2018	2011.02-	multicenter	105/96	DES	18 and 85 years,	cardiogenic shock,	MACE	death, MI, and	9 months	
	2012.10				STEMI	LM disease, and		TLR		
						ostial lesion				
OPTICO BVS, <sup>22</sup>	2016.06-	multicenter	19/19	BVS	$\geq 18$ years, stable	LM disease, ostial	in-scaffold	NA	6 months	
2020	2017.05				angina, or ACS	lesion, severe	minimal			
						calcified lesions,	lumen area			
						and bifurcation with				
						sidebranch $>2.5$				

mm or any  
sidebranch that  
possibly requires  
treatment

OFDI versus CAG

OPTIMUM, <sup>23</sup>	2017.06-	multicenter	56/54	DES	>18 years, CAD	pregnancy,	percentage	NA	1 year
2020	2018.09				involving a	intolerance to	of		
					bifurcation with	aspirin, clopidogrel,	malapposed		
					objective	heparin, cobalt	struts		
					evidence of	chromium,			
					ischemia,	sirolimus, contrast			
					bifurcation	material,			
					lesion, side	thrombocytopaenia,			
					branch >2.0mm	Contraindications to			
						PCI, stenting,			
						clopidogrel,			
						prasugrel or			
						ticagrelor,			
						cardiogenic shock,			
						planned surgery,			
						history of stenting in			
						the target			
						bifurcation lesion,			
						renal insufficiency,			

severely tortuous or  
angulated coronary  
anatomy

OCT versus IVUS

Habara, <sup>24</sup> 2012	2010.03-	single	35/35	BMS	symptomatic	LM disease, totally		stent	NA	in-
	2010.11	center		DES	ischemic heart disease, de novo lesion in the native coronary circulation, and planned stent implantation	occluded lesion, diffuse lesion, bifurcation lesion, lesion of large vessel, severe tortuous vessel, cardiogenic shock, LVEF <30%, serum creatinine >2 mg/dL, STEMI, and contraindication to aspirin, ticlopidine, or heparin	expansion			hospital

FFR versus CAG

FAME, <sup>25-27</sup> 2015	2006.01-	multicenter	509/496	DES	MVD	MI within 5 days, LM disease, previous CABG, cardiogenic shock, extremely tortuous	MACE	death, MI, and revascularization	5 years
	2007.09								

						or calcified				
						coronary arteries,				
						life expectancy <2				
						years,				
						contraindication to				
						DES, and pregnant				
DEFER-DES <sup>28</sup> ,	2006.11-	multicenter	114/115	DES	intermediate	LM disease,	MACE	cardiac death,	5 years	
2015	2007.12				stenosis (40%–	cardiogenic shock,		MI, and TLR		
					70% diameter	chronic kidney				
					stenosis)	disease, life				
						expectancy <2				
						years, conduction				
						disturbance more				
						than first-degree AV				
						block, and				
						contraindication to				
						adenosine				
FAMOUS–	2011.10-	multicenter	176/174	BMS	recent NSTEMI	ischaemic	proportion of	cardiac death,	1 year	
NSTEMI, <sup>29</sup> 2015	2013.05			DES	and with at least	symptoms that	patients	MI, and heart		
					one risk factor for	were not controlled	allocated to	failure		
					CAD	by medical therapy,	medical			
						haemodynamic	management			
						instability, STEMI,				
						intolerance to anti-				



cardiac death, 1 year  
MI, and TVR

							antiplatelet therapy				
							interruption within 6				
							months post-PCI,				
							drug				
							contraindication or				
							intolerance,				
							glomerular filtration				
							rate <40 ml/min/				
							1.73 m <sup>2</sup> , platelet				
							count <10x10 <sup>9</sup> /L,				
							liver dysfunction,				
							pregnancy,				
							expected life span				
							<1 year				
Zhang, <sup>31</sup> 2016	2013.09-	single	110/110	DES	> 65	years,	ongoing ischemic	MACE	cardiovascular	1 year	
	2016.06	center			NSTEMI		symptoms,		death, MI, and		
							cardiogenic shock		heart failure		
							or hemodynamic				
							instability,				
							intolerance to				
							antiplatelet drugs,				
							ineligibility for PCI,				
							stenosis <30%				
							severity, highly				

							tortuous or calcified					
							coronary arteries,					
							noncoronary					
							cardiosurgery, and					
							life expectancy <1					
							year					
Quintella, <sup>32</sup> 2019	2011.04-	single	34/35	DES	>21 years, MVD,	severe	left	MACE	death, angina,	<	12	
	2016.05	center			at day 7 after	ventricular			and restenosis		months	
					ACS	dysfunction						
FLOWER-MI, <sup>33</sup>	2016.12-	multicenter	586/577	DES	≥18 years,	single-vessel		MACE	death, nonfatal		1 year	
2021	2018.12				STEMI, MVD,	disease,			MI, or unplanned			
					successful PCI	hemodynamic			hospitalization			
					of IRA	instability, previous			leading to urgent			
						CABG, coronary-			revascularization			
						artery calcification						
						or CTO, failed						
						culprit-lesion PCI,						
						and referral for						
						CABG						
OFDI versus												
IVUS												
OPINION, <sup>34</sup> 2017	2013.06-	multicenter	412/405	DES	20-85 years	MI within 3 months,	target vessel	cardiac death,			1 year	
	2014.07				scheduled for	cardiogenic shock,	failure	MI, and TLR				
					PCI	congestive heart						

						failure, chronic				
						kidney disease,				
						haemodialysis or				
						peritoneal dialysis,				
						planned surgery				
						within 1 year after				
						PCI, scheduled PCI				
						with BMS, triple-				
						vessel disease, LM				
						disease, aorto-				
						ostial lesion, CTO,				
						small vessel				
						disease, CABG, in-				
						stent restenosis				
MISTIC-1, <sup>35</sup> 2020	2014.06-	multicenter	54/55	DES	>20 years, stable	renal insufficiency,	in-segment	cardiovascular	3 years	
	2016.08			CAD		LVEF <30%,	minimum	mortality, MI, or		
						congestive heart	lumen area	TLR		
						failure, ACS within				
						7 days,				
						nonsuitability for				
						DES use or dual				
						antiplatelet therapy,				
						life expectancy <1				
						year, lesion				

length >28 mm,  
CTO, LM lesion,  
bifurcation lesion,  
or severely calcified  
lesion

OCT versus FFR

FORZA, <sup>36</sup> 2020	2013.03-	single	174/176	DES	>18 years,	pregnant, life	significant	death, MI, and	13
	2018.05	center			ischemic heart	expectancy <12	residual	TVR	months
					disease, SVD	months, follow up	angina		
					with intermediate	difficult, LVEF			
					coronary lesion,	≤30%, STEMI <7			
					MVD with only	days, NSTEMI <48			
					intermediate	hours, prior STEMI			
					coronary lesion,	in the territory			
					MVD with ≥1	supplied by the			
					intermediate	vessel with the			
					coronary lesion	intermediate under			
					and already	investigation,			
					treated	severe myocardial			
					angiographically	hypertrophy,			
					critical stenosis	severe valvular			
						heart disease,			
						significant platelet			
						count alteration,			

gastrointestinal  
bleeding, clotting  
pathology,  
hypersensitivity to  
aspirin, heparin, or  
contrast dye,  
glomerular filtration  
rate <30 ml/min,  
MVD with ≥1  
untreated  
angiographically  
critical stenosis or  
coronary occlusion,  
lesions in coronary  
artery bypass  
grafts, and MVD  
requiring CABG

FFR versus iFR									
DEFINE-FLAIR, <sup>37</sup>	2014.01-	multicenter	1242/1250	DES	>18 years,	previous CABG,	MACE	death, MI, and	1 year
2017	2015.12				eligible for PCI,	LM disease,		revascularization	
					CAD, ≥1 native	tandem stenoses,			
					artery with	CTO, restenotic			
					physiological	lesions,			
					severity, stable	haemodynamic			

					angina or ACS	instability, contraindication to adenosine administration, PCI, or DES, calcified or tortuous vessels, hepatic or lung disease, pregnancy, STEMI within 48 hours, valvular heart disease, ≥ 1 target vessel			
iFR-	2014.05-	multicenter	1019/1018	DES	≥ 18 years,	previous CABG	MACE	death, MI, and	1 year
SWEDHEART, <sup>38</sup>	2015.10				stable angina	with patent grafts to		revascularization	
2017					pectoris or	the interrogated			
					unstable angina	vessel, life			
					pectoris/NSTEMI	expectancy <1			
						year, MVD, Killip			
						class III-IV, inability			
						to tolerate			
						adenosine, calcified			
						or tortuous vessels			

OCT versus IVUS versus CAG										
ILUMIEN III, <sup>39, 40</sup>	2015.05-2016.04	multicenter	158/146/146	DES	>18 years,	LM or ostial RCA	post-PCI	death, MI, stent	1 year	
2021					angina, silent	stenoses, bypass	minimum	thrombosis, or		
					ischaemia,	graft stenoses,	stent area	repeat		
					NSTEMI, recent	CTO, planned two-		revascularisation		
					STEMI >24 h	stent bifurcations,				
					from initial	and in-stent				
					presentation,	restenosis				
					vessel diameter					
					of 2.25–3.50					
					mm, length < 40					
					mm					

ACS: acute coronary syndrome; BMS: bare metal stent; BVS: bioresorbable vascular scaffolds; CABG: coronary artery bypass graft; CAD: coronary artery disease; CAG: coronary angiography; CTO: chronic total occlusion; DES: drug-eluting stents; FFR: fractional flow reserve; iFR: instantaneous wave-free ratio; IRA: infarct related artery; IVUS: intravenous ultrasound; LAD: left anterior descending artery; LM: left main coronary artery; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fractions; MACE: major adverse cardiovascular events; MI: myocardial infarction; MVD: multivessel coronary artery disease; NSTEMI: non-ST segment elevation myocardial infarction; PCI: percutaneous coronary intervention; OCT: optical coherence tomography; OFDI: optical frequency domain imaging; PTCA: percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty; RCA: right coronary artery; STEMI: ST elevation myocardial infarction; SVD: single vessel disease; TIMI: thrombolysis in myocardial infarction; TLR: target lesion revascularization; TVR: target vessel revascularization



Table S2 Clinical Characteristics of Patients Across Studies Included in the Network Meta-Analysis

Study/First author, year	Age	Male, %	Diabetes, %	Hypertension, %	Dyslipidemia, %	Smoker, %	Previous MI, %	Previous PCI, %	Previous CABG, %	ACS, %	LVEF, %	LM, %	LAD, %	LCX, %	RCA, %
IVUS versus CAG															
SIPS, <sup>1</sup> 2000	61.2±8.1/60.7±9.6	82/76	16/16	64/56	88/87	47/45	58/52	NA	11/10	NA	NA	0	38/41	27/27	30/30
CRUISE, <sup>2</sup> 2000	60±11/ 61±11	69/72	23/18	52/59	39/33	NA	32/41	NA	9/7	0	55±10 54±12	0	43/46	24/18	33/36
OPTICUS, <sup>3</sup> 2001	60.1±10.0/61.5±9.5	77/78	17/17	48/52	61/67	69/66	32/32	20/20	3/4	13/12	56.5±14.0/57.7±14.3	0	51/50	18/14	30/35
Gaster, <sup>4, 5</sup> 2003	57/57	NA	4/11	20/24	96/93	30/15	54/44	6/15	7/4	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
TULIP, <sup>6</sup> 2003	61±10/63±10	71/72	16/21	27/30	61/62	40/53	NA	NA	NA	0	<40% (0)	0	39/38	10/21	51/41
DIPOL, <sup>7</sup> 2007	56±8/54±8	81/83	10/11	NA	47/40	47/52	44/40	NA	NA	0	52±9/48±10	0	41/46	26/24	33/30
AVID, <sup>8</sup> 2009	62±12/63±11	73/68	15/17	46/45	40/44	NA	35/29	24/25	18/20	0	53±13/55±13	0.8/0.5	40/37	15/18	35/32
Jakabcin, <sup>9</sup> 2010	59.4±13/60.2±11	73/71	42/45	67/71	63/66	40/35	37/32	17/14	14/10	62/60	NA	3/4	56/54	11/15	29/24
AVIO, <sup>10</sup> 2013	63.9±10.1/63.6±11.0	82.4/76.8	23.9/26.8	70.4/66.9	70.4/76.8	34.5/31.0	NA	NA	NA	0	55.3±8.5/55.9±8.6	0	53.3/48.6	NA	NA
RESET, <sup>11</sup> 2013	62.8±9.3/64.3±8.7	65.8/54.7	31.6/29.9	61.3/65.8	61.3/61.7	21.6/17.2	1.1/2.9	NA	NA	8.9/9/9	55.3±23.9/54.0±25.0	0	50.0/57.5	20.7/18.4	29.3/24.1
MOZART, <sup>12</sup> 2014	67.1/62.1	61.0/57.7	73.2/81.0	97.6/100	NA	41.5/40.4	NA	26.8/11.9	14.6/16.7	14.6/16.7	NA	4.9/7.1	34.1/52.3	46.3/46.3	22.0/22.0

		1								7			4	28.6	35.7
Tan <sup>13</sup> , 2015	76.54±4.95/	62.3/69.	34.4/ 29.5	41.0/ 46.8	NA	44.3/ 46.8	16.4/	NA	NA	70.5/66.	55.32±5.02/	100/10	0	0	0
	75.85±3.49	4					21.0			1	53.33±7.14	0			
AIR-CTO <sup>14</sup> , 2015	67/66	88.7/80.	29.6/27.0	74.8/70.4	21.7/27.8	39.1/39.1	NA	NA	NA	28.7/24.	55/56	0/2.6	44.3/36.	20.9/14.	34.8/46.
		0								4			5	8	1
IVUS-XPL, <sup>15</sup> 2015	64±9/64±9	69/69	36/37	65/63	67/65	22/26	5/4	11/10	3/2	14/17	62.9±9.8/62.4±10.2	0	65/60	14/15	21/25
CTO-IVUS, <sup>16</sup> 2015	61.0±11.1/ 61.4±10.1	80.6/	34.8/ 33.8	62.7/ 63.7	NA	35.3/ 34.3	8.0/ 8.0	15.4/	1.5/.5	0	56.9±13.1/	0	41.8/	14.4/	43.8/
		80.6						15.9			56.7±11.4		46.8	15.9	37.3
Wang, <sup>17</sup> 2015	56.4±9.4/ 53.7±11.8	60.5/66.	21.1/11.9	39.5/23.8	26.3/23.8	50.0/59.5	NA	NA	0	100/100	48.3±5.7/49. ±5.9	0	39.5/42.	15.8/7.1	44.7/50.
		7											9		0
ULTIMATE, <sup>18</sup> 2018	65.2±10.9/65.9±9.8	73.9/73.	30.0/31.2	70.7/72.0	53.7/55.2	34.9/31.5	9.3/11.9	17.4/19.	1.4/1.1	11.2/14.0	60.9±7.9/60.3±9.3	9.9/8.6	47.5/46.	17.3/16.	25.4/28.
		2						9					7	8	0
SURF, <sup>19</sup> 2019	63.38±11.1/63.60±11.	70.9/74.	32.8/35.1	64.5/66.7	63.1/60.7	61.2/62.3	14.7/16.	20.5/20.	3.3/4.3	76.5/73.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	5	0					4	0		8					
OCT versus CAG															
DOCTORS, <sup>20</sup> 2016	60.8±11.5/ 60.2±11.3	79.2/	21.7/ 15.8	55.8/ 41.7	49.2/ 46.7	39.2/ 42.5	NA	NA	0	100/100	NA	0	NA	NA	NA
		75.8													
ROBUST, <sup>21</sup> 2018	57/59	83/87	17/26	50/52	NA	64/59	1/6	4/4	0	100/100	NA	0	39/32	16/12	48/52
OPTICO BVS, <sup>22</sup> 2020	63.3±12.7/ 62.9±9.1	79/79	21/21	37/58	68/63	37/32	21/11	32/16	NA	53/26	61.0±7.6/ 64.4±10.5	0	38/40	24/10	38/50

[illegible]

OFDI versus IVUS															
OPINION, <sup>34</sup> 2017	69±9/ 68±9	76.5/	41.0/ 40.7	76.5/73.8	76.7/ 79.3	16.3/ 18.0	17.0/	34.0/	1.7/ 2.2	13.1/11.7	NA	0	54.1/	20.4/	24.8/
		79.5					15.1	34.6					48.6	21.5	28.9
MISTIC-1, <sup>35</sup> 2020	72/71	75.9/80.	50.0/43.6	63.0/70.9	79.6/65.5	40.7/21.8	35.2/29.	44.4/47.	0	0	58/57	0	50.0/39.	21.0/26.	29.0/34.
		0					1	3					1	6	4
OCT versus FFR															
FORZA, <sup>36</sup> 2020	69±9/ 68±10	77.6/71.	36.2/34.7	86.8/84.1	84.7/68.2	37.9/39.8	29.9/18.	43.7/41.	2.9/2.3	17.8/21.	56±9/60±8	0	60.6/66.	12.2/16.	27.1/16.
		6					8	5		0			7	4	9
FFR versus iFR															
DEFINE-FLAIR, <sup>37</sup> 2017	65.5±10.8/ 65.2±10.6	77.5/	30.8/30.1	70.3/70.7	63.9/63.4	56.7/56.4	28.8/30.	39.4/42.	0	15.0/14.	NA	0	53.6/52.	20.5/20.	23.7/24.
		74.3					1	2		7			5	7	4
iFR- SWEDEHEART, <sup>38</sup> 2017	67.6±9.6/67.4±9.2	74.2/75.	22.8/20.9	71.6/69.7	71.9/69.2	64.8/62.2	33.1/32.	42.1/41.	4.8/4.2	17.3/17.	NA	1.5/1.6	47.4/47.	19.2/18.	17.9/20.
		2					9	7		5			9	3	0
OCT versus IVUS versus CAG															
ILUMIEN III, <sup>39, 40</sup> 2021	66/66/67	69/73/73	33/38/29	78/77	75	18/13/24	22/20/22	7/5/10	2/8/5	13/13/16	NA	0	51/47/57	27/29/21	22/25/22

Values refer to corresponding treatment arms from original studies.

ACS: acute coronary syndrome; CABG: coronary artery bypass graft; CAG: coronary angiography; FFR: fractional flow reserve; iFR: instantaneous wave-free ratio; IVUS: intravenous ultrasound; LAD: left anterior descending artery; LCX: left circumflex artery; LM: left main coronary artery; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fractions; NA: not available; MI: myocardial infarction; OCT: optical coherence tomography; OFDI: optical frequency domain imaging; PCI: percutaneous coronary intervention; RCA: right coronary artery

## References

1. Frey AW, Hodgson JM, Müller C, Bestehorn HP, Roskamm H. Ultrasound-guided strategy for provisional stenting with focal balloon combination catheter: results from the randomized Strategy for Intracoronary Ultrasound-guided PTCA and Stenting (SIPS) trial. *Circulation* 2000;102(20):2497-502.
2. Fitzgerald PJ, Oshima A, Hayase M, Metz JA, Bailey SR, Baim DS, et al. Final results of the Can Routine Ultrasound Influence Stent Expansion (CRUISE) study. *Circulation* 2000;102(5):523-30.
3. Mudra H, di Mario C, de Jaegere P, Figulla HR, Macaya C, Zahn R, et al. Randomized comparison of coronary stent implantation under ultrasound or angiographic guidance to reduce stent restenosis (OPTICUS Study). *Circulation* 2001;104(12):1343-9.
4. Gaster AL, Slothuus U, Larsen J, Thayssen P, Haghfelt T. Cost-effectiveness analysis of intravascular ultrasound guided percutaneous coronary intervention versus conventional percutaneous coronary intervention. *Scand Cardiovasc J* 2001;35(2):80-5.
5. Gaster AL, Slothuus Skjoldborg U, Larsen J, Korsholm L, von Birgelen C, Jensen S, et al. Continued improvement of clinical outcome and cost effectiveness following intravascular ultrasound guided PCI: insights from a prospective, randomised study. *Heart* 2003;89(9):1043-9.
6. Oemrawsingh PV, Mintz GS, Schali J, Zwinderman AH, Jukema JW, van der Wall EE. Intravascular ultrasound guidance improves angiographic and clinical outcome of stent implantation for long coronary artery stenoses: final results of a randomized comparison with angiographic guidance (TULIP

Study). *Circulation* 2003;107(1):62-7.

7. Gil RJ, Pawłowski T, Dudek D, Horszczaruk G, Zmudka K, Lesiak M, et al. Comparison of angiographically guided direct stenting technique with direct stenting and optimal balloon angioplasty guided with intravascular ultrasound. The multicenter, randomized trial results. *Am Heart J* 2007;154(4):669-75.
8. Russo RJ, Silva PD, Teirstein PS, Attubato MJ, Davidson CJ, DeFranco AC, et al. A randomized controlled trial of angiography versus intravascular ultrasound-directed bare-metal coronary stent placement (the AVID Trial). *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 2009;2(2):113-23.
9. Jakabcin J, Spacek R, Bystron M, Kvasnák M, Jager J, Veselka J, et al. Long-term health outcome and mortality evaluation after invasive coronary treatment using drug eluting stents with or without the IVUS guidance. Randomized control trial. HOME DES IVUS. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv* 2010;75(4):578-83.
10. Chieffo A, Latib A, Caussin C, Presbitero P, Galli S, Menozzi A, et al. A prospective, randomized trial of intravascular-ultrasound guided compared to angiography guided stent implantation in complex coronary lesions: the AVIO trial. *Am Heart J* 2013;165(1):65-72.
11. Kim JS, Kang TS, Mintz GS, Park BE, Shin DH, Kim BK, et al. Randomized comparison of clinical outcomes between intravascular ultrasound and angiography-guided drug-eluting stent implantation for long coronary artery stenoses. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2013;6(4):369-76.

12. Mariani J, Jr., Guedes C, Soares P, Zalc S, Campos CM, Lopes AC, et al. Intravascular ultrasound guidance to minimize the use of iodine contrast in percutaneous coronary intervention: the MOZART (Minimizing cOntrast utiliZation With IVUS Guidance in coRonary angioplasTy) randomized controlled trial. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2014;7(11):1287-93.
13. Tan Q, Wang Q, Liu D, Zhang S, Zhang Y, Li Y. Intravascular ultrasound-guided unprotected left main coronary artery stenting in the elderly. *Saudi Med J* 2015;36(5):549-53.
14. Tian NL, Gami SK, Ye F, Zhang JJ, Liu ZZ, Lin S, et al. Angiographic and clinical comparisons of intravascular ultrasound- versus angiography-guided drug-eluting stent implantation for patients with chronic total occlusion lesions: two-year results from a randomised AIR-CTO study. *EuroIntervention* 2015;10(12):1409-17.
15. Hong SJ, Kim BK, Shin DH, Nam CM, Kim JS, Ko YG, et al. Effect of Intravascular Ultrasound-Guided vs Angiography-Guided Everolimus-Eluting Stent Implantation: The IVUS-XPL Randomized Clinical Trial. *Jama* 2015;314(20):2155-63.
16. Kim BK, Shin DH, Hong MK, Park HS, Rha SW, Mintz GS, et al. Clinical Impact of Intravascular Ultrasound-Guided Chronic Total Occlusion Intervention With Zotarolimus-Eluting Versus Biolimus-Eluting Stent Implantation: Randomized Study. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 2015;8(7):e002592.
17. Wang HX, Dong PS, Li ZJ, Wang HL, Wang K, Liu XY. Application of Intravascular Ultrasound in the Emergency Diagnosis and Treatment of Patients

with ST-Segment Elevation Myocardial Infarction. *Echocardiography* 2015;32(6):1003-8.

18. Zhang J, Gao X, Kan J, Ge Z, Han L, Lu S, et al. Intravascular Ultrasound Versus Angiography-Guided Drug-Eluting Stent Implantation: The ULTIMATE Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;72(24):3126-3137.
19. Nguyen P, Makris A, Hennessy A, Jayanti S, Wang A, Park K, et al. Standard versus ultrasound-guided radial and femoral access in coronary angiography and intervention (SURF): a randomised controlled trial. *EuroIntervention* 2019;15(6):e522-e530.
20. Meneveau N, Souteyrand G, Motreff P, Caussin C, Amabile N, Ohlmann P, et al. Optical Coherence Tomography to Optimize Results of Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in Patients with Non-ST-Elevation Acute Coronary Syndrome: Results of the Multicenter, Randomized DOCTORS Study (Does Optical Coherence Tomography Optimize Results of Stenting). *Circulation* 2016;134(13):906-17.
21. Kala P, Cervinka P, Jakl M, Kanovsky J, Kupec A, Spacek R, et al. OCT guidance during stent implantation in primary PCI: A randomized multicenter study with nine months of optical coherence tomography follow-up. *Int J Cardiol* 2018;250:98-103.
22. Ueki Y, Yamaji K, Barbato E, Nef H, Brugaletta S, Alfonso F, et al. Randomized Comparison of Optical Coherence Tomography Versus Angiography to Guide Bioresorbable Vascular Scaffold Implantation: The OPTICO BVS Study. *Cardiovasc Revasc Med* 2020;21(10):1244-1250.
23. Onuma Y, Kogame N, Sotomi Y, Miyazaki Y, Asano T, Takahashi K, et al. A Randomized Trial Evaluating Online 3-Dimensional Optical Frequency



Domain Imaging-Guided Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in Bifurcation Lesions. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 2020;13(12):e009183.

24. Habara M, Nasu K, Terashima M, Kaneda H, Yokota D, Ko E, et al. Impact of frequency-domain optical coherence tomography guidance for optimal coronary stent implantation in comparison with intravascular ultrasound guidance. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 2012;5(2):193-201.
25. Tonino PA, De Bruyne B, Pijls NH, Siebert U, Ikeno F, van' t Veer M, et al. Fractional flow reserve versus angiography for guiding percutaneous coronary intervention. *N Engl J Med* 2009;360(3):213-24.
26. Pijls NH, Fearon WF, Tonino PA, Siebert U, Ikeno F, Bornschein B, et al. Fractional flow reserve versus angiography for guiding percutaneous coronary intervention in patients with multivessel coronary artery disease: 2-year follow-up of the FAME (Fractional Flow Reserve Versus Angiography for Multivessel Evaluation) study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2010;56(3):177-84.
27. van Nunen LX, Zimmermann FM, Tonino PA, Barbato E, Baumbach A, Engstrøm T, et al. Fractional flow reserve versus angiography for guidance of PCI in patients with multivessel coronary artery disease (FAME): 5-year follow-up of a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2015;386(10006):1853-60.
28. Park SH, Jeon KH, Lee JM, Nam CW, Doh JH, Lee BK, et al. Long-Term Clinical Outcomes of Fractional Flow Reserve-Guided Versus Routine Drug-Eluting Stent Implantation in Patients With Intermediate Coronary Stenosis: Five-Year Clinical Outcomes of DEFER-DES Trial. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 2015;8(12):e002442.

29. Layland J, Oldroyd KG, Curzen N, Sood A, Balachandran K, Das R, et al. Fractional flow reserve vs. angiography in guiding management to optimize outcomes in non-ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: the British Heart Foundation FAMOUS-NSTEMI randomized trial. *Eur Heart J* 2015;36(2):100-11.
30. Chen SL, Ye F, Zhang JJ, Xu T, Tian NL, Liu ZZ, et al. Randomized Comparison of FFR-Guided and Angiography-Guided Provisional Stenting of True Coronary Bifurcation Lesions: The DKCRUSH-VI Trial (Double Kissing Crush Versus Provisional Stenting Technique for Treatment of Coronary Bifurcation Lesions VI). *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2015;8(4):536-46.
31. Zhang Z, Li K, Tian J. Efficacy and safety outcomes of fractional flow reserve in guiding clinical therapy of non-ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction compared with angiography alone in elderly Chinese patients. *Clin Interv Aging* 2016;11:1751-1754.
32. Quintella EF, Ferreira E, Azevedo VMP, Araujo DV, Sant'Anna FM, Amorim B, et al. Clinical Outcomes and Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of FFR Compared with Angiography in Multivessel Disease Patient. *Arq Bras Cardiol* 2019;112(1):40-47.
33. Puymirat E, Cayla G, Simon T, Steg PG, Montalescot G, Durand-Zaleski I, et al. Multivessel PCI Guided by FFR or Angiography for Myocardial Infarction. *N Engl J Med* 2021;385(4):297-308.
34. Kubo T, Shinke T, Okamura T, Hibi K, Nakazawa G, Morino Y, et al. Optical frequency domain imaging vs. intravascular ultrasound in percutaneous

coronary intervention (OPINION trial): one-year angiographic and clinical results. *Eur Heart J* 2017;38(42):3139-3147.

35. Muramatsu T, Ozaki Y, Nanasato M, Ishikawa M, Nagasaka R, Ohota M, et al. Comparison Between Optical Frequency Domain Imaging and Intravascular Ultrasound for Percutaneous Coronary Intervention Guidance in Biolimus A9-Eluting Stent Implantation: A Randomized MISTIC-1 Non-Inferiority Trial. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 2020;13(11):e009314.
36. Burzotta F, Leone AM, Aurigemma C, Zambrano A, Zimbardo G, Ariotti M, et al. Fractional Flow Reserve or Optical Coherence Tomography to Guide Management of Angiographically Intermediate Coronary Stenosis: A Single-Center Trial. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2020;13(1):49-58.
37. Davies JE, Sen S, Dehbi HM, Al-Lamee R, Petraco R, Nijjer SS, et al. Use of the Instantaneous Wave-free Ratio or Fractional Flow Reserve in PCI. *N Engl J Med* 2017;376(19):1824-1834.
38. Götzberg M, Christiansen EH, Gudmundsdottir IJ, Sandhall L, Danielewicz M, Jakobsen L, et al. Instantaneous Wave-free Ratio versus Fractional Flow Reserve to Guide PCI. *N Engl J Med* 2017;376(19):1813-1823.
39. Ali ZA, Maehara A, G  n  reux P, Shlofmitz RA, Fabbiochi F, Nazif TM, et al. Optical coherence tomography compared with intravascular ultrasound and with angiography to guide coronary stent implantation (ILUMIEN III: OPTIMIZE PCI): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2016;388(10060):2618-2628.

40. Ali ZA, Karimi Galougahi K, Maehara A, Shlofmitz RA, Fabbicchi F, Guagliumi G, et al. Outcomes of optical coherence tomography compared with intravascular ultrasound and with angiography to guide coronary stent implantation: one-year results from the ILUMIEN III: OPTIMIZE PCI trial. *EuroIntervention* 2021;16(13):1085-1091.