

Commentary on Stent-Induced Coronary Stenosis in a Previously Noncritical Segment Following PCI: A Case Report

Description

Habibi and Mostafavi highlight an instructive case and an unusual but important phenomenon after Percutaneous Coronary Intervention (PCI): The development of severe coronary stenosis in a previously noncritical segment shortly after stent implantation [1]. As PCI remains the cornerstone of coronary artery revascularization, rare postoperative vascular responses such as those described in this report deserve close attention from the interventional community. In the case presented, a middle-aged woman developed an acute coronary syndrome two months after PCI, and angiographic findings showed critical stenosis of the left main coronary artery in a previously noncritical segment, with significant restenosis in previously placed stents in the left anterior descending and left circumflex arteries. This set of findings is particularly noteworthy because it represents a vascular response that extends beyond the conventional boundaries of stenosis confined to the stented segment.

Although Instant Restenosis (ISR) is a well-known complication after PCI, the emergence of a new critical lesion in a previously unremarkable adjacent coronary segment raises important questions about the underlying pathophysiology. Beyond neointimal hyperplasia and mechanical vessel injury, immunologic and inflammatory mechanisms are increasingly implicated in vascular remodeling after stenting [3,4].

Hypersensitivity reactions to stent components including metal alloys, polymer coatings, or eluting drug agents may contribute to local inflammation, endothelial dysfunction, and acceleration of atherosclerosis [3]. While such reactions are uncommon with today's drug-eluting stents, sporadic cases continue to be reported and remain clinically significant. Another consideration is that PCI may, in susceptible individuals, cause more widespread endothelial activation or inflammatory responses elsewhere in the coronary circulation.

Such mechanisms could theoretically cause plaque instability or rapid lesion progression in previously angiographically insignificant and noncritical areas. Although a definitive cause cannot be established from a single case, reports such as this provide valuable clinical observations that may stimulate further investigation of the biological and immunological interactions between coronary stents and the vessel wall. From a clinical perspective, this case reinforces the importance of maintaining a high level of suspicion for new lesions in patients presenting with recurrent ischemic symptoms shortly after PCI. While stent restenosis is often the primary concern, clinicians should also consider the possibility of new lesions developing in previously noncritical segments. Early diagnostic reevaluation,

Soroush Mostafavi, Hamzeh Habibi*

Department of Cardiology, University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

Hamzeh Habibi, Department of Cardiology, University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran, E-mail: hamzehhabibi8@gmail.com

Received date: 27-May-2026, Manuscript No. FMIC-26-189723;
Editor assigned: 30-May-2026, Pre QC No. FMIC-26-189723 (PQ);
Reviewed date: 13-Jun-2026, QC No. FMIC-26-189723;
Revised date: 20-Jun-2026, Manuscript No. FMIC-26-189723 (R);
Published date: 27-Jun-2026, DOI: 10.37532/1755-5310.2026.18(1).1038

including repeat coronary angiography as clinically indicated, remains essential to identify unusual complications and guide appropriate management [5,6].

This phenomenon differs from the findings of studies that have focused primarily on left main artery restenosis within the stent or disease progression in previously damaged segments. For example, a review by Wee, et al. comprehensively discusses ISR in the unprotected left main coronary artery and highlights risk factors and outcomes, but does not explicitly address new critical LM lesions that appear shortly after non-LM stenting [2]. This distinction highlights the unique and concerning nature of the reported case, suggesting a systemic or more diffuse vascular response rather than local stent failure.

Possible hypersensitivity reaction in the reported case is consistent with evidence suggesting immunologic responses to stent components. Although hypersensitivity vasculitis and coronary aneurysm formation after modern Drug-Eluting Stents (DES) are less common, reports have been published. A notable article by Hu, et al. describes a rare case of hypersensitivity reaction to a cobalt-chromium sirolimus stent that presented with Acute Coronary Syndrome (ACS) and eosinophilic reaction, which is remarkably similar to the theoretical basis proposed in this case report. This similarity reinforces the need to consider immunologic causes of unusual complications after PCI [3].

The simultaneous occurrence of ISR in previously stented segments and new stenosis in a distal, unstented segment, as observed in this case, suggests a more general tendency for vascular remodeling or an accelerated atherosclerotic process initiated by primary PCI. This is different from isolated cases of ISR. The research of Nakazawa, et al. while focusing primarily on late stent thrombosis and polymer sensitivity, suggests that systemic inflammatory responses can affect the entire coronary system. The simultaneous presence of both mechanisms in the same patient suggests a common systemic or local inflammatory trigger affecting both stented and non-stented areas, a crucial aspect for further mechanistic investigation [4].

The rapid onset of ACS two months after PCI in this case highlights the aggressive nature of this complication. This is a shorter time frame than the typical presentation of late stent thrombosis or conventional restenosis progression, which suggests a distinct and rapidly evolving pathologic process. In contrast, Cutlip, et al. defined angiographic and clinical finding of restenosis, classifying manifestations by time intervals, but the specific combination of rapid critical lesion and ISR within this short time interval remains an unusual finding that deviates from the standard classification and challenges the common understanding of restenosis progression [5].

Current guidelines of coronary revascularization, emphasize the importance of symptom assessment after PCI, but cases such as this one suggest that more extensive angiographic reassessment may be necessary in selected high-risk or unusual cases, beyond just the assessment of the stented segment [6].

The authors' suggestion of potential immunological or atherosclerotic mechanisms warrants further investigation. This is consistent with studies of systemic inflammatory markers and their role in accelerating atherosclerosis. For example, Libby extensively reviews the complex interplay between inflammation and the progression of atherosclerosis, emphasizing that inflammatory processes can destabilize plaques elsewhere in the coronary arteries [7].

The exact cause of differentiation between stent-induced hypersensitivity reaction and accelerated atherosclerosis remains challenging to determine from a single case. However, histological studies of coronary arteries occasionally show evidence of hypersensitivity characterized by eosinophilic infiltration or giant cell arteritis, as reported by Fujiyoshi, et al. regarding late stent thrombosis. While this case report does not provide histology, its clinical presentation is consistent with the potential for such immune-mediated vascular injury, identifying less common yet severe mechanisms [8,9].

From a therapeutic point of view, the management of such a sporadic and aggressive disease requires careful consideration. While PCI is often the default, the presence of critical LM stenosis and extensive ISR in other vessels may, in some contexts, lean towards surgical revascularization Coronary Artery Bypass Graft (CABG), depending on the patient's overall clinical condition, comorbidities such as diabetes and the syntax score. A review by Virani, et al. discuss the management of patients with ischemic heart disease, decision-making for revascularization strategies, and emphasize the importance of anatomical complexity. This case report presents a challenging scenario that forces clinicians to reevaluate the optimal revascularization strategy given the aggressive nature of the disease [10].

Conclusion

Despite advances in stent technology and procedural techniques, unexpected and complex biological responses may occur. This sentiment is reflected in many case reports of unusual complications of PCI, which together create a puzzle of our evolving understanding of stent-vessel interactions.

Overall, the report by Habibi and Mostafavi adds meaningful observations to the body of literature on unusual complications associated with PCI. This case highlights the possibility of rapid development of critical stenosis outside previously treated segments, the complexity of vascular responses after coronary

intervention, and the need for continued vigilance in post-PCI follow-up. Further investigation of inflammatory and sensitizing mechanisms could help elucidate the pathogenesis of such cases and potentially guide strategies for risk stratification and prevention in the future.

References

1. Habibi H, Mostafavi S. Stent-induced coronary stenosis in a previously noncritical segment following PCI: A Case Report. *Clin Case Rep*. 14(4):72555 (2026).
2. Wee SB, Ahn JM, Kang DY, et al. Contemporary state-of-the-art PCI of left main coronary artery disease. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv*. 17(11):014026 (2024).
3. Hu W, Jiang J. Hypersensitivity and in-stent restenosis in coronary stent materials. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol*. 10:1003322 (2022).
4. Nakazawa G. Stent thrombosis of drug eluting stent: Pathological perspective. *J Cardiol*. 58(2):84-91 (2011).
5. Cutlip DE, Windecker S, Mehran R, et al. Clinical end points in coronary stent trials: A case for standardized definitions. *Circulation*. 115(17):2344-2351 (2007).
6. Lawton JS, Tamis-Holland JE, Bangalore S, et al. 2021 ACC/AHA/SCAI guideline for coronary artery revascularization: executive summary: A report of the American college of cardiology/american heart association joint committee on clinical practice guidelines. *Circulation*. 145(3):4-17 (2022).
7. Libby P. Inflammation in atherosclerosis. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol*. 32(9):2045-2051 (2012).
8. Fujiyoshi K, Grogan A, Virmani R, et al. Pathophysiology of coronary restenosis. *Interv Cardiol Clin*. 15(2):191-203 (2026).
9. Zununi Vahed S, Ahmadian E, Foroughi P, et al. Vitamin D receptor and vitamin D binding protein gene polymorphisms are associated with renal allograft outcome. *Nutrients*. 13(4):1101 (2021).
10. Virani SS, Newby LK, Arnold SV, et al. 2023 AHA/ACC/ACCP/ASPC/NLA/PCNA guideline for the management of patients with chronic coronary disease: A report of the american heart association/american college of cardiology joint committee on clinical practice guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 82(9):833-955 (2023).