

STS 2026



January 29 – February 1, 2026 | New Orleans, LA

Teaching for Tomorrow Together





Off-pump versus on-pump CABG: Preliminary unadjusted individual patient data meta-analysis findings

A. Laurie Shroyer, PhD*, Mario Gaudino, MD*, Daniel Wolbrom, MD, Samuel Greenberg, MD, Lichun He, MS, G. Hossein Almassi, MD, Wilko Reents, MD, and Andre Lamy, MD on behalf of the CABG-IPD-MA study team



Disclosures

Dr. Andre Lamy (primary presenter):

Alexion Pharmaceutical, Renibus Pharmaceutical, and Chugai Pharmaceutical as consultant in cardiac surgery associated AKI (CSA-AKI) for a phase 2 and 3 trials.

All other co-authors:

No disclosures



Background

Three large multi-center, randomized trials off-pump vs. on-pump have published 5-year results:

- GOPCABE
- CORONARY
- ROOBY

- Individual patient data meta-analysis (IPDMA) of 9325 pts



Demographics

| | Off-pump (N=4658) | On-pump (N=4667) |
|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Age (Mean ± SD) | 69.3 ±8.7 | 69.1 ±8.8 |
| Male sex | 81.9% | 82.3% |
| Urgent status | 24.4% | 23.4% |
| CCS Class 3 and 4 | 46.7% | 46.2% |
| History CHF | 26.0% | 24.7% |
| History MI | 35.6% | 37.0% |
| History PCI | 13.4% | 13.1% |
| Cerebrovascular disease | 12.8% | 13.1% |
| EuroScore | 4.6±4.6 | 4.6±4.4 |



Outcomes at 30 days

| | Off-pump | On-pump | Relative Risk (95% CI) | P-Value |
|---------------------------------------|----------|---------|------------------------|---------|
| Composite (death, MI, revasc, stroke) | 8.4 % | 8.0 % | 1.03 (0.96, 1.11) | 0.41 |
| Death | 2.4 % | 2.3 % | 1.02 (0.89, 1.17) | 0.78 |
| Myocardial Infarction | 5.2 % | 4.8 % | 1.04 (0.94, 1.14) | 0.45 |
| Stroke | 1.2 % | 1.4 % | 0.94 (0.79, 1.11) | 0.52 |
| Revascularization | 0.9 % | 0.3 % | 1.82 (1.20, 2.76) | <0.001 |



Outcomes at 1 year

| | Off-pump | On-pump | Relative Risk (95% CI) | P-Value |
|--------------------------------|----------|---------|------------------------|---------|
| Composite (death, MI, revasc,) | 12.0 % | 11.0 % | 1.05 (0.98, 1.12) | 0.16 |
| Death | 5.4 % | 5.3 % | 1.01 (0.93, 1.11) | 0.78 |
| Myocardial Infarction | 5.7 % | 5.5 % | 1.02 (0.93, 1.12) | 0.69 |
| Stroke | NA | NA | | |
| Revascularization | 2.6 % | 1.7 % | 1.27 (1.07, 1.51) | 0.003 |



Outcomes at 5 years

| | Off-pump | On-pump | Relative Risk (95% CI) | P-Value |
|--------------------------------|----------|---------|------------------------|---------|
| Composite (death, MI, revasc,) | 27.4 % | 26.0 % | 1.04 (0.99, 1.09) | 0.13 |
| Death | 18.8 % | 17.3 % | 1.05 (1.00, 1.11) | 0.06 |
| Myocardial Infarction | 7.6 % | 7.3 % | 1.02 (0.95, 1.11) | 0.58 |
| Stroke | NA | NA | | |
| Revascularization | 6.1 % | 5.2 % | 1.10 (1.00, 1.21) | 0.05 |



Outcomes at 30 days non-converted patients

| | Off-pump (N=4224) | On-pump (N=4412) | Relative Risk (95% CI) | P-Value |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------|
| Composite (death, MI, revasc, stroke) | 7.7 % | 7.9% | 0.99 (0.91, 1.06) | 0.72 |
| Death | 2.0 % | 2.2% | 0.96 (0.84, 1.10) | 0.60 |
| Myocardial Infarction | 4.7 % | 4.8 % | 0.99 (0.90, 1.09) | 0.88 |
| Stroke | 1.1 % | 1.5 % | 0.87 (0.74, 1.02) | 0.12 |
| Revascularization | 1.0 % | 0.3 % | 2.01 (1.28, 3.17) | <0.001 |



Outcomes at 30 days converted patients

| | Off-pump to ON (N=434) | On-pump to OFF (N=255) | Relative Risk (95% CI) | P-Value |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---------|
| Composite (death, MI, revasc, stroke) | 15.7 % | 8.6% | 1.59 [1.09, 2.32] | 0.01 |
| Death | 5.5 % | 3.1% | 1.50 [0.82, 2.76] | 0.19 |
| Myocardial Infarction | 9.4 % | 5.1 % | 1.58 [0.98, 2.57] | 0.04 |
| Stroke | 2.8 % | 0.4 % | 4.88 [0.74, 32.19] | 0.04 |
| Revascularization | 0.2 % | 0.8 % | 0.55 [0.25, 1.24] | 0.56 |



Findings

- Repeat revascularization was worse with off-pump
- Converted patients bring new insights about choice of techniques



January 29 - February 1, 2026 | New Orleans, LA

Teaching for Tomorrow Together

Conclusions

Both techniques are effective and safe

Selection of technique is key to optimize benefits for our patients

