RESULTS

All clinical, laboratory and data obtained from coronary angiography of women (group-I) are shown in table A.

The same groups of data for men (group-II) are shown in table B.

Results of history and clinical examination in group I and group II:

Age (table 1)

In Group I age ranged between 35-70 years, mean 50.8±8.1 years.

In Group II age ranged between 39-65 years, mean 52±6.5 years.

Numerically non significant difference was found between both groups (P-value = >0.05)

Clinical presentation: (Table 2)

Out of 50 patients (Group I):

15 patients had chest pain(30%) , 5 patients had myocardial infarction(10%), 2 patients had angina pectoris(4%), 27 patients had unstable angina pectoris(54%) and only 1 patient had non Q myocardial infarction(2%).

Out of 25 patients (group II) :

9 patients had myocardial infarction(36%), 6 patients had angina pectoris(24%) and 10 patients had unstable angina pectoris(40%).

There is significant difference between both groups

(p-value = <0.05)

Risk factors : (Table 3)

In group I:

15 patients had no risk factors (30%), 6 patients had only diabetes as risk factor(12%), 15 had only hypertension as a risk factor(30%) while 14 patients had both diabetes and hypertension(28%).Non of the patients in this group was smoker.

In group II:

Only 1 patient had no risk factor(4%), 1 patient had only diabetes as a risk factor(4%), 3 patients had only hypertension as a risk factor(12%), 5 patients had only smoking as a risk factor (20%), while 5 patients were diabetics & smokers (20%), 7 patients were hypertensives & smokers (28%), 1 patient was diabetic &hypertensive(4%) and 2 patients were diabetics, hypertensives &smokers(8%).

There is marked significant difference between group I and group II.

(p-value = <0.05)

Menopausal status : (in group I)

18 patients were premenopausal (36%) while 32 patients were postmenopausal(64%).

Body mass index : (Table 4)

In (group I) :

15 patients had BMI < 25 (30%),27 patients had BMI from 25 to 30 (54%) and 8 patients had BMI > 30 (16%).

In (group II) :

4 patients had BMI < 25 (16%), 19 patients had BMI from 25 to 30 (76%) and 2 patients had BMI > 30 (8%) .

Non significant difference was found between both groups as regards mean BMI. (p-value = >0.05)

Results of laboratory investigations: (Table 1)

The mean total cholesterol in (group I) was 249.3±28.6 mg/dl while in (group II) was 223.7± 59.3 mg/dl.

Showed significant increase in women (p-value = <0.05)\

The mean LDL cholesterol in (group I) was 169.6± 23.7 mg/dl while in (group II) was 152±39.1 mg/dl,

Showed significant increase in women(p-value = <0.05)

The mean HDL cholesterol in (group I) was 46.8±9.3 mg/dl while in (group II) was 45.6±6.9 mg/dl.
Showed non-significant difference (p-value = >0.05)

The mean triglycerides in (group I) was 146±54.9 mg/dl while in (group II) was 1414.72±45.07 mg/dl,
Showed non-significant difference (p-value = >0.05)

Results of Electrocardiography:

In (group I) ECG was normal in 13 patients (26%) and abnormal in 37 (74%) while in (group II) ECG was not normal in any of the cases and all cases had abnormal ECG (100%).

Results of history and clinical examination of group A and group B :

Age: (Table 5)

In Group A: the mean age was 48.6±7.9 years.
In Group B: the mean age was 52.5±7.9 years.
Numerically non significant difference was found between both groups. (p-value = >0.05)

Clinical presentation: (Table 6)

Out of 22 patients in Group A : 15 patients had chest pain (68%), one patient had angina pectoris(5%) , 6 patients unstable angina (27%), and no patients had either MI or NQMI(0 %).

Out of 28 patients in Group B : 5 patients had MI (18%), one patient had AP(3.5%), 21 patients had UAP(75%), and one patient had NQMI(3.5%).

There was significant difference (p-value = <0.05)

Risk factors : (Table 7)

In Group A:

11 patients had no risk factors(50%), 7 patients had only hypertension as a risk factor(32%) , one patient had only diabetes as a risk factor(4.5%), 3 patients had diabetes and hypertension(13.5%).

In Group B:

4 patients had no risk factors(14.2%), 8 patients had hypertension only as a risk factor(28.5%),5 patients had only diabetes as a risk factor(18%), 11 patients had hypertension and diabetes(39%).

There is marked significant difference between group A and group B. (p-value = <0.05)

Menopausal status : (Table 8)

In group A: 10 patients were premenopausal(45.5%) and 12 patients were postmenopausal(54.5%).

In group B: 8 patients were premenopausal(28.5%), and 20 patients were postmenopausal(71.5%).

There is significant difference between group A and group B (p-value = <0.05)

Body mass index : (Table 9)

In group A: 8 patients had BMI <25(36%), 11 patients had BMI from 25 to 30(50%), and 3 patients had BMI > 30 (14%).

In group B: 7 patients had BMI <25 (25%), 15 patients had BMI from 25 to 30 (53%) and 6 patients had BMI from > 30(22%).

Non significant difference was found between both groups as regards mean BMI. (p-value = >0.05)

Results of laboratory investigations: (Table 5)

The mean total cholesterol

in group A was 244.3± 17.9 mg/dl,

in group B was 253± 34.7 mg/dl.

Non significant difference was found between both groups.

(p-value = >0.05)

The mean LDL cholesterol
in group A was 157.3± 16.7 mg/dl,
in group B was 179.3± 24 mg/dl.
Showed significant increase in group B (p-value = <0.05)

The mean HDL cholesterol
in group A was 49.9± 11 mg/dl,
in group B was 44.3± 6.8 mg/dl.
Showed significant increase in group A (p-value = <0.05)

The mean triglycerides
in group A was 109.2± 29.9 mg/dl,
in group B was 175± 52.8 mg/dl.
showed significant increase in group B (p-value = <0.05)

Results of Electrocardiography:

In group (A) ECG was normal in 9 patients (41%) and abnormal in 13(59%),

% In group (B) ECG was normal in 4 patients(14%) and abnormal in 24(86%).

Results of history and clinical examination in group B1 and group B2:

Age : (Table 10)

In Group B1: the mean age was 50.6±5.2 years.
In Group B2: the mean age was 53.9±9.4 years.
Numerically non significant difference was found between both groups. (p-value = >0.05)

Clinical presentation: (Table 11)

Out of 12 patients in Group B1: 2 patients had MI(17%), 9 patients had UAP(75%) , and one patient had NQMI(8%).

Out of 16 patients in Group B2: 3 patients had MI(19%), 12 patients had UAP(75%), and one patient had AP(6%).
Non significant difference was found between both groups .
(p-value = >0.05)

Risk factors : (Table 12)

In Group B1:
2 patients had no risk factors(17%), 6 patients had hypertension only(50%), 2 patients had diabetes only(17%), 2 patients had hypertension and diabetes(17%).

In Group B2:

2 patients had no risk factors(12.5%), 2 patients had only hypertension(12.5%), 3 patients had only diabetes(19%), 9 patients had hypertension and diabetes(56%).

Non significant difference was found between both groups .

(p-value = >0.05)

Menopausal status : (Table 13)

In group B1: 2 patients were premenopausal(17%), and 10 patients were postmenopausal(83%).

In group B2: 6 patients were premenopausal(37.5%), and 10 patients were postmenopausal(62.5%).

Non significant difference was found between both groups .

(p-value = >0.05)

Body mass index : (Table 14)

In (groupB1) :

3 patients had BMI < 25 (25%),7 patients had BMI from 25 to 30 (58%) and 2 patients had BMI > 30 (17%).

In (group B2) :

4 patients had BMI < 25 (25%), 8 patients had BMI from 25 to 30 (50%) and 4 patients had BMI > 30 (25%) .

Non significant difference was found between both groups .

(P= >0.05)

Results of laboratory investigations: (Table 10)

The mean total cholesterol

in group B1 was 254.7± 28 mg/dl,

in group B2 was 252± 39.9 mg/dl.

Non significant difference was found between both groups .

(P = >0.05)

The mean LDL cholesterol

in group B1 was 175± 23.4 mg/dl,

in group B2 was 182.5± 24.9 mg/dl.

Non significant difference was found between both groups .

(P = >0.05)

The mean HDL cholesterol

in group B1 was 47.5± 7.5 mg/dl,

in group B2 was 42± 5.4 mg/dl.

showed significant increase in group B1 (p-value = <0.05)

The mean triglycerides

in group B1 was 185± 57.3 mg/dl,

in group B2 was 167.5± 49.7 mg/dl.

non significant difference was found between both groups .

(P = >0.05)

Results of

Electrocardiography:

In group (B1) ECG was normal in 2 patients and abnormal in 10,
In group (B2) ECG was normal in 2 patients and abnormal in 14.

Results of interpretation of coronary angiography:

I) Visual interpretation

Anatomical distribution: **(Table 15)**

In (Group I) 22 out of 50 patients had normal coronaries or insignificant lesions(44%), 12 patients had single vessel disease(24%) and 16 patients had multi-vessel disease(32%).
In (Group II), normal coronaries or insignificant lesions found in 3 out of 25 patients (12%), 12 patients had single vessel disease(48%) and 10 patients had multi-vessel disease(40%).
There is significant difference between both groups .
(p-value = <0.05)

Localization of coronary arteries affected. (Table 16)

In (Group I) the Left Anterior Descending artery was the most frequently involved artery in patients with significant coronary lesions (28 patients), it was encountered in 23 patients(82%). The Right Coronary artery was involved in 13 patients(46%), the left Circumflex artery in 12 patients(43%), the Obtuse marginal artery in 4 patients(14%) and the Diagonal artery in 3 patients(11%) .

In (Group II) Left Anterior Descending artery was involved in 16 patients out of 22 patients with significant coronary lesions(72%), the Right Coronary artery was involved in 9 patients(41%), the left Circumflex artery in 9 patients(41%), the Obtuse marginal artery in 1 patient (5%)and the Diagonal artery in 1 patient(5%) .

Non significant difference was found between both groups .
(p-value = >0.05)

Site of lesion : (Table 17)

In Group I out of 56 vessels:

Proximal lesion was found in 38 vessels (68%)
Middle 1/3 lesion was found in 16 vessels (28%)
Distal lesion was found in 2 vessels (4%)

In Group II out of 35 vessels:

Proximal lesion was found in 22 vessels (63%)
Middle 1/3 lesion was found in 11 vessels (31%)
Distal lesion was found in 2 vessels (6%)

With no statistical difference between the two groups.

(p-value = >0.05)

Type of lesion: (Table 18)

In Group I out of 56 vessels:

Total occlusion was found in 10 vessels (18%)
Concentric lesion was found in 16 vessels (28%)
Eccentric lesion was found in 30 vessels (53%)

In Group II out of 35 vessels:

Total occlusion was found in 8 vessels (23%)
Concentric lesion was found in 12 vessels (35%)
Eccentric lesion was found in 15 vessels (43%)

Non significant difference was found between both groups .

(p-value = >0.05)

Collateral Grading: (Table 19)

Studying the collateral grading in women and men :

In Group I Grade O/I was found in 15 patients (54%)

Grade II/III was found in 13 patients (46%)

In Group II Grade O/I was found in 15 patients (68%)

Grade II/III was found in 7 patients (32%)

Non significant difference was found between both groups .

(p-value = >0.05)

TIMI flow pattern: (Table 20)

Studying the TIMI flow in women and men :

In Group I Grade O/I was found in 19 vessels (34%)

Grade II/III was found in 37 vessels (66%)

In Group II Grade O/I was found in 14vessels (40%)

Grade II/III was found in 21 vessels (60%)

With no statistical difference between the two groups

(p-value = >0.05)

B) Results of computerized auto interpretation:

% Stenosis: (Table 1)

Mean % stenosis in Group I was 87.2 ± 14.9 and in Group II was 88 ± 13.6 there was no statistical difference between the two groups.