

Diagnostic and Prognostic Significance of Exercise-Induced Left Bundle Branch Block in Stress Testing

Ömer Burak Çelik ¹, Macit Kalçık ^{2*}, Mucahit Yetim ², Muhammet Cihat Çelik ¹, Lütfü Bekar ², Yusuf Karavelioğlu ²

¹Department of Cardiology, Hitit University Erol Olçok Education and Research Hospital, Corum, Turkey.

²Department of Cardiology, Faculty of Medicine, Hitit University, Corum, Turkey.

*Corresponding Author: Macit Kalcik, Department of Cardiology, Hitit University Faculty of Medicine, Çorum, Turkey.

Received date: September 30, 2024; Accepted date: October 30, 2024; Published date: November 10, 2024

Citation: Ömer B. Çelik, Macit Kalçık, Mucahit Yetim, Muhammet C. Çelik, Lütfü Bekar, et al, (2025), Diagnostic and Prognostic Significance of Exercise-Induced Left Bundle Branch Block in Stress Testing, *J Clinical Cardiology and Cardiovascular Interventions*, 7(12); DOI: 10.31579/2641-0419/523

Copyright: © 2025, Macit Kalcik. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract

Exercise-induced left bundle branch block (EI-LBBB) is a rare but clinically relevant phenomenon observed during exercise stress testing. Unlike pre-existing LBBB, which complicates electrocardiographic interpretation from the outset, EI-LBBB appears transiently during exercise and raises unique diagnostic and prognostic challenges. Its reported prevalence is low, yet it has been associated with both significant coronary artery disease and intrinsic conduction system abnormalities. The onset of EI-LBBB at lower heart rates is often linked to obstructive coronary lesions, whereas high-rate onset may indicate rate-dependent conduction delay in structurally normal hearts. The prognostic implications of EI-LBBB remain controversial. Some studies demonstrate a strong association with adverse cardiovascular outcomes, including myocardial infarction and death, while others report relatively benign courses in patients without coronary artery disease. Diagnostic evaluation is challenging because LBBB masks ischemic ST-segment changes, reducing the utility of standard exercise electrocardiography. For this reason, adjunctive imaging modalities such as stress echocardiography, myocardial perfusion imaging, and cardiac magnetic resonance imaging are recommended to clarify underlying pathology and risk. Management of EI-LBBB requires an individualized approach, incorporating symptom assessment, risk stratification, and additional diagnostic testing. Long-term follow-up is essential, as EI-LBBB may progress to permanent conduction system disease or contribute to ventricular dysfunction over time. Despite decades of recognition, major gaps remain regarding its natural history, optimal diagnostic strategies, and treatment implications. Future prospective studies are needed to define evidence-based recommendations for this rare but important clinical entity.

Keywords: exercise-induced left bundle branch block; coronary artery disease; stress testing; cardiac conduction abnormalities; prognosis

Introduction

Left bundle branch block (LBBB) represents a significant disturbance of the normal conduction pathway of the heart, characterized by delayed activation of the left ventricle and distinctive electrocardiographic features. It is traditionally associated with structural heart disease, ischemia, and degenerative changes of the conduction system [1]. Exercise stress testing remains a cornerstone in the diagnostic evaluation of suspected coronary artery disease (CAD), providing valuable information regarding ischemia, exercise tolerance, and prognosis [2].

However, the occurrence of new-onset LBBB during exercise testing, often referred to as exercise-induced left bundle branch block (EI-LBBB), poses a unique diagnostic and clinical challenge. Unlike pre-existing LBBB, which complicates interpretation of the exercise electrocardiogram, EI-LBBB is relatively rare, with a reported prevalence ranging from 0.2% to 1.1% of patients undergoing exercise stress testing [3,4]. Its precise mechanisms remain incompletely understood, but

proposed etiologies include rate-related conduction delay, myocardial ischemia, and underlying conduction system disease [5].

The prognostic implications of EI-LBBB are controversial. Some studies suggest that EI-LBBB is frequently associated with significant CAD and adverse cardiovascular outcomes [6]. While others report its occurrence in patients without obstructive coronary disease, potentially reflecting intrinsic conduction system abnormalities [7]. This heterogeneity highlights the need for a systematic assessment of the available evidence.

Given the increasing use of exercise stress testing in both outpatient and inpatient settings, recognition of EI-LBBB and understanding its implications is of growing clinical importance. This review aims to summarize current knowledge regarding the pathophysiology, diagnostic considerations, prognostic significance, and management strategies of exercise-induced LBBB, with a focus on identifying gaps in the literature and directions for future research.

Pathophysiology of Exercise-Induced LBBB

The mechanisms underlying exercise-induced left bundle branch block (EI-LBBB) are complex and multifactorial. One proposed explanation is rate-related conduction delay, in which the left bundle branch fails to conduct when the heart rate exceeds a critical threshold. This phenomenon is often reversible, as conduction may normalize once the heart rate decreases, suggesting a functional rather than structural abnormality in some patients [8].

Another important mechanism is myocardial ischemia. During exercise, increased myocardial oxygen demand can unmask conduction abnormalities within the left bundle branch, particularly in the presence of underlying coronary artery disease [9]. Ischemia may impair conduction through the His-Purkinje system, resulting in transient bundle branch block. Some studies have reported a strong association between EI-LBBB and significant obstructive lesions of the left anterior

descending or left main coronary arteries, highlighting ischemia as a key contributor in certain cases [10].

Degenerative disease of the conduction system also plays a role. Patients with structurally normal coronary arteries may still develop EI-LBBB due to intrinsic disease of the bundle branches, often age-related fibrosis or idiopathic degeneration. In these cases, EI-LBBB may represent an early manifestation of conduction system disease, potentially progressing to permanent bundle branch block or advanced atrioventricular block over time [11].

Autonomic influences and electrolyte shifts during exercise have also been considered as contributing factors, although evidence supporting these mechanisms is limited. Ultimately, EI-LBBB is likely a heterogeneous condition, with ischemia, rate-related conduction delay, and intrinsic conduction disease variably contributing depending on the patient population (**Table 1**).

Mechanism	Description	Clinical Clues
Rate-related conduction delay	Left bundle fails to conduct once heart rate exceeds a threshold	Appears at higher heart rates, often not associated with CAD
Myocardial ischemia	Increased oxygen demand unmasks conduction abnormality	More frequent at lower heart rates, linked to LAD/LMCA lesions
Degenerative conduction disease	Age-related fibrosis or idiopathic bundle branch disease	Occurs even without CAD, may progress to permanent LBBB
Autonomic/electrolyte effects	Exercise-induced changes may contribute	Evidence limited

Table 1: Proposed Mechanisms of Exercise-Induced Left Bundle Branch Block (EI-LBBB)

Abbreviations: EI-LBBB: Exercise-Induced Left Bundle Branch Block, CAD: Coronary Artery Disease, LAD: Left Anterior Descending Artery, LMCA: Left Main Coronary Artery

Diagnostic Challenges

The occurrence of exercise-induced left bundle branch block presents several diagnostic challenges in clinical practice. A major difficulty arises from the fact that the presence of LBBB itself alters ventricular depolarization and repolarization, leading to secondary ST-segment and T-wave changes on the electrocardiogram. These alterations often mimic or obscure ischemic patterns, making conventional interpretation of exercise stress testing unreliable in such patients [12].

Because of these limitations, the diagnostic accuracy of exercise electrocardiography in patients with LBBB is significantly reduced. Standard ischemic criteria based on ST-segment depression are not valid in this setting, and the risk of both false-positive and false-negative results is high [13]. Consequently, alternative diagnostic modalities are recommended when evaluating patients with suspected coronary artery disease who develop EI-LBBB during stress testing.

Stress imaging techniques, such as stress echocardiography and myocardial perfusion scintigraphy, provide valuable adjunctive

information by assessing wall motion abnormalities and perfusion defects, respectively. However, even these modalities may have technical limitations in patients with baseline conduction abnormalities. Cardiac magnetic resonance imaging has also been proposed as a promising option, particularly for tissue characterization and precise evaluation of regional contractility [14].

Another challenge is distinguishing between ischemia-induced EI-LBBB and rate-related or idiopathic forms. A careful evaluation of patient characteristics, coronary risk profile, and associated symptoms during the onset of LBBB is crucial. For example, EI-LBBB occurring at low workloads or heart rates is more often associated with significant coronary artery disease, whereas onset at higher heart rates may favor rate-dependent conduction delay without ischemia [15].

These diagnostic uncertainties highlight the importance of individualized assessment and the need for integrating multiple diagnostic tools to accurately interpret EI-LBBB in the context of stress testing (**Table 2**).

Challenge	Effect	Recommended Solution
ST-segment alterations masking ischemia	Reduces diagnostic accuracy of ECG	Stress echocardiography, myocardial perfusion imaging, CMR
Differentiating ischemic vs. rate-related block	Impacts clinical management	Consider onset heart rate, risk profile, and symptoms
High false positive/negative rates	Limits reliability of exercise ECG	Integrate multimodality assessment

Table 2: Diagnostic Challenges and Solutions in EI-LBBB

Abbreviations: EI-LBBB: Exercise-Induced Left Bundle Branch Block, ECG: Electrocardiogram, CMR: Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Imaging, CAD: Coronary Artery Disease

Literature Review and Clinical Evidence

Reports of exercise-induced left bundle branch block (EI-LBBB) first appeared in the early 1970s, with Narula and colleagues describing its occurrence in otherwise healthy individuals as well as in patients with

coronary artery disease [7]. Since then, multiple observational studies have attempted to define its prevalence, mechanisms, and prognostic significance. Although rare, EI-LBBB has consistently been reported with a prevalence of less than 1% in patients undergoing exercise stress testing [3,4].

The association between EI-LBBB and coronary artery disease has been a major focus of investigation. Several studies have shown that EI-LBBB is often linked with significant obstructive coronary lesions, particularly in the left anterior descending and left main arteries (9,10). In these cohorts, the onset of EI-LBBB during exercise has been interpreted as a marker of ischemia and associated with higher rates of adverse cardiovascular events, including myocardial infarction and cardiac death [6,13]. Importantly, the onset of EI-LBBB at lower heart rates, typically below 120 beats per minute, has been correlated with more severe underlying coronary artery disease [15,16].

Conversely, other reports have identified patients who develop EI-LBBB in the absence of obstructive coronary artery disease. In these cases, EI-LBBB has been attributed to rate-dependent conduction delay or idiopathic conduction system disease, suggesting that not all occurrences carry the same prognostic weight (11,17). This heterogeneity has

complicated efforts to establish clear clinical guidelines, as outcomes vary depending on the patient population and underlying pathology.

Long-term follow-up studies have provided additional insights. Grady et al. demonstrated that patients with EI-LBBB had a significantly higher risk of mortality and major adverse cardiac events compared with matched controls [6]. In contrast, Biagini et al. reported that the prognosis was more favorable in patients without significant coronary artery disease, indicating that the prognostic significance of EI-LBBB is strongly influenced by the presence or absence of CAD [13].

Taken together, the evidence suggests that EI-LBBB is a heterogeneous entity. When associated with significant coronary artery disease, it represents an important risk marker for adverse outcomes. In patients without obstructive CAD, however, EI-LBBB may reflect intrinsic conduction system abnormalities with a more variable prognosis (Table 3).

Study	Population	Findings	Prognosis
Vasey et al.	Exercise test patients	Association between EI-LBBB and CAD	Linked to adverse outcomes
Grady et al.	Long-term follow-up	Higher mortality and MACE in EI-LBBB	Poor prognosis
Biagini et al.	Patients without CAD	Some cases benign	Heterogeneous outcomes
Stein et al.	General population	Prevalence 0.2–1.1%	Rare but significant

Table 3: Literature on Prognostic Significance of EI-LBBB

Abbreviations: EI-LBBB: Exercise-Induced Left Bundle Branch Block, CAD: Coronary Artery Disease, MACE: Major Adverse Cardiac Events

Guidelines and Expert Opinions

Current international guidelines provide limited specific recommendations regarding exercise-induced left bundle branch block (EI-LBBB). The European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association (ACC/AHA) guidelines recognize that the presence of baseline LBBB complicates interpretation of exercise stress testing, but they do not address EI-LBBB as a distinct clinical entity [2,18]. Instead, both guidelines suggest that in patients with LBBB—whether pre-existing or exercise-induced—diagnostic reliance should shift from standard electrocardiography to adjunctive imaging techniques, such as stress echocardiography, myocardial perfusion imaging, or cardiac MRI.

Expert opinion papers and smaller consensus statements emphasize that EI-LBBB should not be dismissed as a benign phenomenon. When EI-LBBB develops at lower workloads or heart rates, it is more likely associated with significant coronary artery disease and warrants further evaluation, often with coronary angiography [15,16,19]. In contrast, onset at higher heart rates without evidence of ischemia may represent rate-dependent conduction block and could be monitored more conservatively, although long-term follow-up is still advised due to the potential progression to permanent conduction abnormalities [11,17].

Some electrophysiology experts argue that EI-LBBB may represent an early marker of conduction system disease even in the absence of ischemia. This perspective suggests a broader role for long-term rhythm monitoring and periodic reassessment of left ventricular function in these patients [20]. However, these recommendations are based largely on observational data rather than randomized controlled trials.

Overall, while guidelines provide general direction on the limitations of exercise testing in the presence of LBBB, they leave significant gaps regarding the optimal evaluation and management of EI-LBBB. Expert consensus fills some of these gaps but highlights the need for further systematic research.

Clinical Approach and Management

The detection of exercise-induced left bundle branch block (EI-LBBB) during stress testing should prompt a careful and systematic evaluation.

The first step is to determine whether the onset is associated with clinical symptoms such as chest pain, dyspnea, or syncope. Symptomatic patients, especially when EI-LBBB develops at relatively low workloads or heart rates, should be considered at higher risk for underlying coronary artery disease (9,15,19). In such cases, invasive coronary angiography or non-invasive imaging with high diagnostic accuracy, such as coronary computed tomography angiography, should be pursued to rule out significant obstructive lesions.

In asymptomatic individuals or in those where EI-LBBB appears only at higher heart rates, a more conservative approach may be reasonable. Nevertheless, adjunctive imaging is often recommended since the presence of EI-LBBB itself reduces the diagnostic reliability of exercise electrocardiography. Stress echocardiography, myocardial perfusion scintigraphy, and cardiac MRI can provide complementary information to identify ischemia and assess left ventricular function [14,18].

Long-term follow-up is an essential component of management. Several studies suggest that patients with EI-LBBB, even in the absence of obstructive coronary artery disease, are at risk of progression to permanent LBBB, atrioventricular block, or cardiomyopathy related to electrical dyssynchrony [11,17,20]. Therefore, periodic reassessment with electrocardiography and echocardiography is advisable.

For patients who develop symptomatic heart failure or reduced ejection fraction in the context of persistent or progressive LBBB, cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT) should be considered, in accordance with established guidelines for heart failure management (20,21). Additionally, optimization of cardiovascular risk factors, including hypertension, diabetes, and dyslipidemia, remains a cornerstone of therapy for all patients presenting with EI-LBBB, regardless of the underlying mechanism.

Ultimately, the clinical approach to EI-LBBB should be individualized, integrating the onset characteristics (heart rate and workload), symptomatology, coronary risk profile, and the results of further diagnostic testing. This tailored strategy ensures that patients at high risk for ischemic heart disease receive timely intervention, while those with non-ischemic conduction disease are closely monitored for disease progression (Table 4).

Clinical Situation	Suggested Management
Symptomatic, low heart-rate onset	High risk of CAD → Coronary angiography or CTA
Asymptomatic, high heart-rate onset	Likely rate-related block → Conservative follow-up + imaging
Non-ischemic but persistent EI-LBBB	Long-term monitoring with ECG/echo
Progression to permanent LBBB with LV dysfunction	Consider cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT)
All patients	Optimize risk factor control (HT, DM, dyslipidemia)

Table 4: Clinical Approach and Management of EI-LBBB

Abbreviations: EI-LBBB: Exercise-Induced Left Bundle Branch Block, CAD: Coronary Artery Disease, CTA: Computed Tomography Angiography, ECG: Electrocardiogram, LV: Left Ventricle / Left Ventricular, CRT: Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy, HT: Hypertension, DM: Diabetes Mellitus

Despite decades of observation, exercise-induced left bundle branch block (EI-LBBB) remains an under-investigated clinical phenomenon. Much of the existing knowledge is derived from case reports, small observational studies, or retrospective analyses, which limits the generalizability of findings [7,13,16]. Several important gaps persist in our understanding.

First, the true prevalence and natural history of EI-LBBB are uncertain. Most available data come from stress test cohorts, which may not represent the broader population undergoing cardiac evaluation. Prospective, multicenter studies with larger sample sizes are required to clarify incidence, risk factors, and outcomes [3,4,10].

Second, the prognostic significance of EI-LBBB remains controversial. While some studies suggest a strong association with coronary artery disease and adverse outcomes [6,9,19], others demonstrate that EI-LBBB can occur in the absence of obstructive lesions, possibly reflecting intrinsic conduction disease with more benign implications [11,17]. Future research should aim to stratify patients according to onset characteristics, such as heart rate thresholds and accompanying symptoms, to better predict which individuals are at higher risk.

Third, diagnostic strategies in the context of EI-LBBB require further refinement. Although current guidelines recommend adjunctive imaging modalities [18,21], there is little evidence directly comparing the accuracy and prognostic value of different techniques in this specific population. Comparative trials involving stress echocardiography, myocardial perfusion imaging, and cardiac MRI could provide much-needed clarity.

Finally, therapeutic implications remain poorly defined. It is unknown whether early identification and management of EI-LBBB in asymptomatic patients alter long-term outcomes, or whether these individuals should simply be monitored. The potential role of advanced rhythm monitoring, electrophysiological studies, and early intervention strategies such as prophylactic pacing or resynchronization therapy has yet to be systematically evaluated [20,21].

Addressing these gaps will require collaborative research efforts, ideally integrating electrophysiological, imaging, and clinical outcome data. Such studies have the potential not only to clarify the prognostic implications of EI-LBBB but also to inform evidence-based management strategies tailored to individual patient profiles.

Conclusion

Exercise-induced left bundle branch block (EI-LBBB) is an uncommon but clinically significant finding during exercise stress testing. Although its prevalence is low, its occurrence often raises important diagnostic and prognostic questions. Evidence suggests that EI-LBBB is a heterogeneous entity: in some patients, it reflects underlying obstructive coronary artery disease and carries an increased risk of adverse outcomes, while in others it represents rate-dependent or idiopathic conduction system disease with more variable prognosis [6,9,11,17,19].

Diagnostic interpretation is complicated by the fact that LBBB itself masks ischemic electrocardiographic changes, limiting the utility of conventional stress testing. For this reason, adjunctive imaging modalities

such as stress echocardiography, myocardial perfusion imaging, and cardiac magnetic resonance imaging are strongly recommended when EI-LBBB occurs [14,18,21].

From a management perspective, patients who develop EI-LBBB should undergo individualized evaluation based on symptomatology, coronary risk profile, and onset characteristics. Those with evidence of ischemia or low-threshold onset require more aggressive diagnostic and therapeutic strategies, whereas others may be monitored with careful long-term follow-up. Importantly, all patients remain at potential risk of progression to permanent LBBB, conduction system disease, or heart failure, underscoring the need for periodic reassessment. Future studies must focus on clarifying the prognostic value of EI-LBBB, refining diagnostic pathways, and defining optimal management strategies. Until more robust evidence is available, a cautious and tailored approach remains essential in clinical practice.

Contributorship: All of the authors contributed planning, conduct, and reporting of the work. All authors had full access to all data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Funding: No financial funding was received for this study.

Competing interests: All of the authors have no conflict of interest.

References

1. Tan NY, Witt CM, Oh JK, Cha YM.(2020). Left Bundle Branch Block: Current and Future Perspectives. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol.*;13(4):e008239.
2. Fihn SD, Gardin JM, Abrams J, et al. (2012) ACCF/AHA/ACP/AATS/PCNA/SCAI/STS guideline for the diagnosis and management of patients with stable ischemic heart disease. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2012;60(24):e44-e164.
3. Vasey C, O'Donnell J, Morris SN, McHenry PL.(2011). Exercise-induced left bundle branch block and its relation to coronary artery disease. *Am J Cardiol.* 1985;56(12):892-895.
4. Stein R, Ho M, Oliveira CM, et al. Exercise-induced left bundle branch block: prevalence and prognosis. *Arq Bras Cardiol.*;97(1):26-32.
5. Virtanen KS, Heikkilä J, Kala R, Siltanen P. (1981).Chest pain and rate-dependent left bundle branch block in patients with normal coronary arteriograms. *Chest.* ;81(3):326-331.
6. Grady TA, Chiu AC, Snader CE, et al. (1998).Prognostic significance of exercise-induced left bundle-branch block. *JAMA.*;279(2):153-156.
7. Tassone M, Chow CM. (2009).Exercise-induced left bundle branch block: a case and a review of the literature. *J Insur Med.*;41(4):287-292.
8. Rosenbaum MB, Blanco HH, Elizari MV, Lazzari JO, Davidenko JM. (1982).Electrotonic modulation of the T wave and cardiac memory. *Am J Cardiol.*;50(2):213-222.

9. Said SA, Bultje-Peters M, Nijhuis RL. (2013).Exercise-induced left bundle branch block: an infrequent phenomenon: Report of two cases. *World J Cardiol.*;5(9):359-363.
10. Deora S, Sharma JB, Choudhary R, Kaushik A. (2019).Chest pain and exercise induced left bundle branch block - A clinical dilemma. *J Family Med Prim Care.*;8(10):3434-3436.
11. Kim JH, Baggish AL. (2015).Electrocardiographic right and left bundle branch block patterns in athletes: prevalence, pathology, and clinical significance. *J Electrocardiol.*;48(3):380-384.
12. Sgarbossa EB, Pinski SL, Barbagelata A, et al.(1996). Electrocardiographic diagnosis of evolving acute myocardial infarction in the presence of left bundle-branch block. *N Engl J Med.*;334(8):481-487.
13. Ricchetti G, Agricola E, Slavich M. (2024).Exercise-induced left bundle branch block: unmasking dynamic mitral regurgitation in ischaemic heart disease. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging.*;25(6):e170.
14. Hundley WG, Morgan TM, Neagle CM, et al. (2002).Magnetic resonance imaging determination of cardiac prognosis. *Circulation.*;106(18):2328-2333.
15. Heinsimer JA, Irwin JM, Basnigh LL. Influence of underlying coronary artery disease on the natural history and prognosis of exercise-induced left bundle branch block. *Am J Cardiol.* 1987;60(13):1065-1067.
16. Moran JF, Scurlock B, Henkin R, Scanlon PJ. (1992).The clinical significance of exercise-induced bundle branch block. *J Electrocardiol.*;25(3):229-235.
17. Schneider JF, Thomas HE Jr, Kreger BE, et al. (2019).Newly acquired left bundle-branch block: the Framingham study. *Ann Intern Med.* 1979;90(3):303-310.
18. Knuuti J, Wijns W, Saraste A, et al. (2020).ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of chronic coronary syndromes. *Eur Heart J.*;41(3):407-477.
19. Wang L, Lu YW, Zhao YT. (2023).Chest Pain With Exercise-Induced Left Bundle-Branch Block-Is There a Connection?. *JAMA Intern Med.*;183(10):1160-1161.
20. Marques CA, Cabrita A, Pinho AI, et al. (2025).Left bundle branch block cardiomyopathy (LBBB-CMP): from the not-so-benign finding of idiopathic LBBB to LBBB-CMP diagnosis and treatment. *Heart Vessels.*;40(1):62-71.
21. Brignole M, Auricchio A, Baron-Esquivias G, et al. (2013). ESC Guidelines on cardiac pacing and cardiac resynchronization therapy. *Eur Heart J.* 2013;34(29):2281-2329.



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License

To Submit Your Article Click Here: [Submit Manuscript](#)

DOI:10.31579/2641-0419/523

Ready to submit your research? Choose Auctores and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- rigorous peer review by experienced research in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- authors retain copyrights
- unique DOI for all articles
- immediate, unrestricted online access

At Auctores, research is always in progress.

Learn more <https://auctoresonline.org/journals/clinical-cardiology-and-cardiovascular-interventions>