Table 1. 1-year follow up according to the use of embolic protection devices in the DES sub-group.

	EDPs (+)	EDPs (-)	Crude Calculation	
	n **= 112**	***n*** **= 267**	**HR (95% CI)**	***p*****-value**
MACCE	19 (17.0)	62 (23.2)	0.68 (0.38-1.19)	0.177
Death	5 (4.5)	21 (7.9)	0.55 (0.20-1.49)	0.238
MI	5 (4.5)	19 (7.1)	0.61 (0.22-1.68)	0.338
Stroke	0 (0.0)	5 (1.9)	-	0.999
TVR	8 (7.1)	34 (12.7)	0.53 (0.24-1.18)	0.119
TLR	6 (5.4)	21 (7.9)	0.66 (0.26-1.69)	0.389

CI: confidence interval, EPDs- embolic protection devices, HR- hazard ratio, MACCE- major adverse cardiac and cerebrovascular events, MI- myocardial infarction, TLR- target lesion revascularization, TVR- target vessel revascularization.

Table 2. 1-year follow up according to the use of embolic protection devices in the no-thrombectomy sub-group.

	EDPs (+)	EDPs (-)	Crude Calculation	
	n **= 180**	***n*** **= 570**	**HR (95% CI)**	***p*****-value**
MACCE	36 (20.0)	147 (25.8)	0.72 (0.48-1.09)	0.116
Death	7 (3.9)	43 (7.5)	0.50 (0.22-1.12)	0.092
MI	13 (7.2)	55 (9.6)	0.73 (0.39-1.37)	0.325
Stroke	2 (1.1)	10 (1.8)	0.63 (0.14-2.90)	0.552
TVR	16 (8.9)	70 (12.3)	0.70 (0.40-1.23)	0.697
TLR	12 (6.7)	50 (8.8)	0.74 (0.39-1.43)	0.743

CI: confidence interval, EPDs- embolic protection devices, HR- hazard ratio, MACCE- major adverse cardiac and cerebrovascular events, MI- myocardial infarction, TLR- target lesion revascularization, TVR- target vessel revascularization.

Table 3. Impact of the stent diameter on the 1-year follow up outcomes.

	HR	**95%CI**	***p***
MACCE	0.86	0.66-1.13	0.275
Death	0.83	0.52-1.33	0.443
MI	1.16	0.79-1.72	0.450
Stroke	1.06	0.41-2.70	0.908
TVR	0.80	0.55-1.16	0.237
TLR	0.83	0.54-1.27	0.390

Univariate logistic regression method was used. HR- hazard ratio, MACCE- major adverse cardiac and cerebrovascular events, MI- myocardial infarction, TLR- target lesion revascularization, TVR- target vessel revascularization.