

## Supplementary Material


Supplementary Table 1. Characteristic Table

Study, year	Origin	Age	Comparison	n (Int1/Int2)	Syntax score	Comorbidity	Observation period	Study design
Chen et al. 2013 <sup>1</sup>	China	DK-crush: 64.3 ±10.3 Culotte: 63.3±9.2	DK-crush vs Culotte	419 (210/209)	NR	Hypertension:65.9% Hyperlipidemia: 41.8% Diabetes: 31%	3 years	RCT
Hildick-Smith et al. 2021 <sup>2</sup>	11 European countries	Provisional: 70.8±10.1 Double: 71.4±9.8	provisional vs Double	467 (230/237)	Provisional:22.6±5.9 Double: 23.2±6	Diabetes: 27.4% Hypertension: 79.2% Hypercholesterolaemia: 69.3% Current smoker: 14.1%	1 year	RCT
Chen et al. 2017 <sup>3</sup>	China	Provisional: 64±10 DK-crush: 65±9	Provisional vs DK-crush	482 (242/240)	Provisional: 30.1±8.1 DK-Crush: 31.1±7.9	Hyperlipidemia: 47.5% Hypertension: 68.7% Diabetes: 27.2%	3 years	RCT
Gao et al. 2015 <sup>4</sup>	China	Single: 60±11 Doublet: 60±11	Single vs Double	1033 (661/372)	Single: 25±6 Double: 26±5	Diabetes mellitus: 24% Hypertension: 55.9% Hyperlipidemia: 49.5%	4 years	Retrospective Observational
Kawamoto et al. 2017 <sup>5</sup>	Italy	Provisional: 70.8±9.9 Double: 70.4±10.4	Provisional vs Double	377 (216/161)	Provisional: 29±10 Double: 29.9±10	Hypertension: 81.4% Dyslipidemia:67.3% Current smoker: 13% Diabetes: 41.7% CKD:41%	3 years	Retrospective Observational
Chen et al. 2015 <sup>6</sup>	China	DK-crush: 64.3±10.3 Culotte: 63.3±9.2	DK-crush vs Culotte	419 (210/209)	NR	Hypertension:65.9% Hyperlipidemia: 41.8% Diabetes: 31%	3 years	RCT
Kim et al. 2011 <sup>7</sup>	Korea	Single: 70.53±9.47 Double: 70.67±9.13	Single vs Double	392 (254/158)	Single: 23.5 (17.0–32.5) Double: 27.0 (19.0–33.5)	Diabetes: 33.4% Hypertension: 54.8% Hyperlipidemia: 35.4% Current smoker: 21.7% CKD: 3.6%	3 years	Retrospective Observational
Metawee et al. 2024 <sup>8</sup>	Egypt	Provisional: 55.4±10.05 DK-Crush: 55.68±11.70	Provisional vs DK-Crush	150 (75/75)	Provisional: 29.8±9.2 DK-Crush: 30.10±8.4	Smoking: 60.7% Dyslipidemia: 47.3% Diabetes mellitus: 46% Hypertension: 50.7%	6 month	RCT
Chen et al. 2019 <sup>9</sup>	China	Provisional: 64±10 DK-crush: 65±9	Provisional vs DK-crush	482 (242/240)	Provisional: 30.1±8.1 DK-Crush: 31.1±7.9	Hyperlipidemia: 47.5% Hypertension: 68.7% Diabetes: 27.2%	3 years	RCT
Palmerini et al.	Italy	One-stent: 72	One stent vs two stent	773 (456/317)	NR	Hypertension: 68%	2 years	Retrospective


Study, year	Origin	Age	Comparison	n (Int1/Int2)	Syntax score	Comorbidity	Observation period	Study design
2008 <sup>10</sup>		(29-97) Two-stent: 70 (37-90)	technique			Diabetes mellitus: 28.6% Hypercholesterolemia: 62.9% Smoking: 35.2%		Observational
Zhang et al. 2015 <sup>11</sup>	China	One-stent: 56.8±13.0 Two-stent: 62.1±12.7	One stent vs two stent technique	88 (50/38)	NR	Hypertension: 70.4% Diabetes mellitus: 14.8% Hyperlipidemia: 23.9% Current smoker: 26.1%	1 year	Retrospective Observational
Sarma et al. 2021 <sup>12</sup>	India	Provisional: 57.77 Double: 60.90	Provisional vs Double	67 (56/11)	Provisional: 22.65 Double: 25.36	Smoking: 10.7% Hypertension: 59.7% Diabetes mellitus: 53.7% Hyperlipidemia: 3%	2 years	Retrospective Observational
Lee et al. 2020 <sup>13</sup>	South Korea	Single: 64.4±10.5 Double: 64.4±9.8	Single vs Double	1.002(440/562)	NR	Hypertension: 64% Diabetes mellitus: 37% Current smoking: 25.8% Hyperlipidemia: 11.7%	3 years	Retrospective Observational
Ferenc et al. 2019 <sup>14</sup>	Germany	Single: 70.6±10.7 Double: 70.2±10.9	Single vs Double	867 (477/390)	NR	Diabetes mellitus: 29% Current smoker: 12% Hypertension: 84.2%	10 years	Retrospective Observational
Kandzari et al. 2018 <sup>15</sup>	17 different countries	Provisional: 66.2±9.3 Double: 66.8±9.3	Provisional vs Double	529 (344/185)	Provisional: 21.2±6.1 Double: 22.2±5.8	Diabetes mellitus: 30.8% Smoking: 64.1% Hypertension: 74.7% Hyperlipidemia: 71.8%	3 years	RCT
Migliorini et al. 2017 <sup>16</sup>	Italy	Provisional: 72±11 Crush stent: 70±10	Provisional vs Crush Stent	405 (278/127)		Hypertension: 68% Diabetes mellitus: 25% Hypercholesterolemia: 56%	1 year	Prospective observational
Kawamoto et al. 2017 <sup>17</sup>	Italy	Mini-crush: 105±78.9 Culotte: 74±82.2	Mini-crush stenting vs Culotte stenting	225 (135/90)	Mini-crush: 30.4±10.5 Culotte: 27.5±9.4	Hypertension: 80.4% Dyslipidemia: 74.2% Smoker: 16% Diabetes mellitus: 34.2% CKD: 48.8%	5 years	Retrospective observational
Rigatelli et al. 2018 <sup>18</sup>	Italy, Vietnam, Bulgaria	Nano-crush: 77.1±5.8 Culotte: 78.1±6.8	Nano-crush vs culotte technique	65 (32/33)	Nano-crush: 26.3±7.2 Culotte: 21.4±4.8	Hypertension: 64.6% Hypercholesterolemia: 69.2% Diabetes: 26.1%	3 years	Retrospective observational

Study, year	Origin	Age	Comparison	n (Int1/Int2)	Syntax score	Comorbidity	Observation period	Study design
Predescu et al. 2023 <sup>19</sup>	Romania	Single: 63 (52;57) Double: 69 (57;72)	Single vs Double	70 (41/29)	Single: 32 Double: 25	Smoker: 32.3% Hypertension: 81.4% Dyslipidemia: 79.7% Diabetes mellitus: 30.4% Smoker: 27.1%	4 years	Retrospective observational
Solangi et al. 2022 <sup>20</sup>	Pakistan	Provisional: 56.8±9.9 Double: 57.4±10.4	Provisional vs Double	291 (166 /125)	Provisional: 23±7.2 Double: 26±5.4	Diabetes: 42.6% Hypertension: 81.4% Smoking: 30.9% CKD: 48.1%	3 years	Retrospective cohort


## Supplementary Figure 1. Indirectness



## Supplementary Figure 2. Funnel Plot



Supplementary Figure 3. Risk of Bias



## References

1. Chen SL, Xu B, Han YL, et al. Comparison of double kissing crush versus culotte stenting for unprotected distal left main bifurcation lesions: results from a multicenter, randomized, prospective DKCRUSH-III study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2013;61:1482–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2013.01.023>; PMID: 23490040.
2. Hildick-Smith D, Egred M, Banning A, et al. The European bifurcation club left main coronary stent study: a randomized comparison of stepwise provisional vs. systematic dual stenting strategies (EBC MAIN). *Eur Heart J* 2021;42:3829–39. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehab283>; PMID: 34002215.
3. Chen SL, Zhang JJ, Han Y, et al. Double kissing crush versus provisional stenting for left main distal bifurcation lesions: DKCRUSH-V randomized trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2017;70:2605–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2017.09.1066>; PMID: 29096915.
4. Gao Z, Xu B, Yang Y, et al. Comparison between one-stent versus two-stent technique for treatment of left main bifurcation lesions: a large single-center data. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv* 2015;85:1132–8. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ccd.25849>; PMID: 25614097.
5. Kawamoto H, Chieffo A, D’Ascenzo F, et al. Provisional versus elective two-stent strategy for unprotected true left main bifurcation lesions: insights from a FAILS-2 sub-study. *Int J Cardiol* 2018;250:80–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcard.2017.09.207>; PMID: 28992999.
6. Chen SL, Xu B, Han YL, et al. Clinical outcome after DK crush versus culotte stenting of distal left main bifurcation lesions: the 3-year follow-up results of the DKCRUSH-III study. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2015;8:1335–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcin.2015.05.017>; PMID: 26315736.
7. Kim WJ, Kim YH, Park DW, et al. Comparison of single-versus two-stent techniques in treatment of unprotected left main coronary bifurcation disease. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv* 2011;77:775–82. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ccd.22915>; PMID: 21520380.
8. Metawee AK, Amin MO, Zahran SAN. Comparison between provisional stenting and two stents technique (DK-crush or nano-crush) in bifurcation coronary artery lesions. *Al-Azhar International Medical Journal* 2024;2024:7 <https://doi.org/10.58675/2682-339X.2569>.
9. Chen X, Li X, Zhang JJ, et al. 3-year outcomes of the DKCRUSH-V trial comparing DK crush with provisional stenting for left main bifurcation lesions. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2019;12:1927–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcin.2019.04.056>; PMID: 31521645.
10. Palmerini T, Marzocchi A, Tamburino C, et al. Impact of bifurcation technique on 2-year clinical outcomes in 773 patients with distal unprotected left main coronary artery stenosis treated with drug-eluting stents. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 2008;1:185–92. <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.108.800631>; PMID: 20031677.
11. Zhang J, Liu S, Geng T, Xu Z. One-stent versus two-stent techniques for distal unprotected left main coronary artery bifurcation lesions. *Int J Clin Exp Med* 2015;8:14363–70. PMID: 26550422.
12. Sarma VRSS, Gopalakrishna K, Purnachandra rao K, et al. A study of unprotected left main intervention in the ACS population 2013–2018. *Indian Heart J* 2021;73:492–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ihj.2021.06.010>; PMID: 34474764.
13. Lee CH, Ahn JM, Kang DY, et al. Comparison of simple versus complex stenting in patients with true distal left main bifurcation lesions. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv* 2021;97:776–85. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ccd.29219>; PMID: 32898318.
14. Ferenc M, Banholzer N, Hochholzer W, et al. Long-term results after PCI of unprotected distal left main coronary artery stenosis: the Bifurcations Bad Krozingen (BBK)-Left Main Registry. *Clin Res Cardiol* 2019;108:175–84.

- <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00392-018-1337-9>; PMID: 30051181.
15. Kandzari DE, Gershlick AH, Serruys PW, et al. Outcomes among patients undergoing distal left main percutaneous coronary intervention: technique analysis from the EXCEL trial. *Circ: Cardiovascular Interventions* 2018;11:1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.118.007007>.
  16. Migliorini A, Valenti R, Vergara R, et al. Angiographic and clinical outcome after crush of everolimus-eluting stent for distal unprotected left main disease. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv* 2017;90:72–7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ccd.26901>; PMID: 28707445.
  17. Kawamoto H, Takagi K, Chieffo A, et al. Long-term outcomes following mini-crush versus culotte stenting for the treatment of unprotected left main disease: insights from the Milan and New-Tokyo (MITO) registry. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv* 2017;89:13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ccd.26654>; PMID: 27471180.
  18. Rigatelli G, Zuin M, Vassilev D, et al. Culotte versus the novel nano-crush technique for unprotected complex bifurcation left main stenting: difference in procedural time, contrast volume and X-ray exposure and 3-years outcomes. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging* 2019;35:207–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10554-018-1497-8>; PMID: 30446919.
  19. Predescu L, Postu M, Zarma L, et al. Unprotected left main bifurcation stenting in acute coronary syndromes: two-stent technique versus one-stent technique. *J Pers Med* 2023;13:670. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm13040670>; PMID: 37109056.
  20. Solangi AA, Nasrullah, Jalaludin, et al. Provisional vs dual stenting of left main coronary artery bifurcation lesions. *Pakistan Journal of Medical & Health Sciences* 2022;16:629–31. <https://doi.org/10.53350/pjmhs20221611629>.