

Demographic Characteristics, BAV Sievers Types, and Interactions Between BAV-Associated Valvulopathy and Aortopathy Differently Affect BAV Comorbidities and Outcomes of Aortic Valve Replacement

Yijia Li^{1,2} MD., Qiong Zhao^{3#} MD., Ph.D., Yue Qi⁴, Yichen Qu¹ MD., Ph.D., Akshay Kumar⁵ MD.,
Ph.D., Yan Yang^{1#} MD., Ph.D., Xiongwen Chen^{2#}, Ph.D.

¹ Department of Echocardiography, ⁴ and Department of Epidemiology, Beijing Anzhen Hospital, Capital Medical University, and Beijing Institute of Heart Lung and Blood Vessel Diseases; ² Department of Physiology & Cardiovascular Research Center, Temple University School of Medicine; ³ Inova Heart and Vascular Institute, Inova Fairfax Hospital; ⁵ Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, Medanta Hospital, Gurugram, India

Short Title: Risk Factors of BAV comorbidities and AVR outcomes

Correspondence: #

Xiongwen Chen: Address: Department of Physiology & Cardiovascular Research Center, Temple University School of Medicine, 3500 N. Broad St, Philadelphia, PA 19140; Phone: 215-707-3542; Fax: 215-707-5737; Email: xchen001@temple.edu

Ya Yang: Department of echocardiography, Beijing Anzhen Hospital, Capital Medical University, and Beijing Institute of Heart Lung and Blood Vessel Diseases, Anzhen Lu 2 Hao, Beijing 100029, China; Tel: +86-10-64456450; Fax: +86-10-66591706; E-mail: echoyangya99@163.com.

Qiong Zhao: Institute: Inova Heart and Vascular Institute, Inova Fairfax Hospital, Cardiac Diagnostic, 1st Floor, 3300 Gallow's Road, Falls Church, VA 22042, USA; Tel: 5714722900; Fax: 5714722901; E-mail: Qiong.Zhao@inova.org

Word Count: 12522

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

1 Abstract

2 **Background:** Bicuspid aortic valve (BAV) is a common congenital disorder. The
3 relationship between demographic and clinical characteristics, BAV Sievers types, BAV
4 associated valvulopathy and/or aortopathy and outcomes of aortic valve replacement (AVR)
5 are interwoven and complicate and have not been fully elucidated. We sought to find these
6 interactions in a large cohort of BAV patients. **Methods:** We retrospectively reviewed the
7 data of 992 BAV patients and collected the complete demographic and clinical data (baseline
8 characteristic, BAV Sievers types, BAV valvulopathy and aortopathy, and pre-, intra- and
9 postoperative data) to comprehensively analyze these relationships. **Results:** In 992 BAV
10 patients, sex differences could be found in demography (body surface area [BSA], age and
11 serum triglyceride), comorbidities, cardiac performance (left ventricular dimension and
12 ejection fraction,), valvulopathy and aortopathy. Sievers types had the same distribution
13 among male and female patients, and had an impact on the incidence of valvulopathy and
14 aortopathy. In the entire cohort, the factors associated with valvulopathy included age, sex,
15 BSA, systolic blood pressure (SBP) and aortopathy, while factors associated with aortopathy
16 were age, sex, BSA and valvulopathy. Aortopathy and valvulopathy promoted the occurrence
17 of each other. Similar risk factors for valvulopathy and aortopathy in male patients were
18 found. For 658 BAV patients underwent AVR, the preoperative demographic characteristics
19 were similar to the whole cohort. More males were required to have simultaneous ascending
20 aortic replacement (AAR). For postoperative early adverse events (EAE) and total ICU
21 hours > 24 hours, the only predict factors were age and aortic cross clamp (ACC) time, while
22 LVEF changes (including postoperative LVEF <50%, LVEF increase or decrease more or
23 less than 5% or 10%) were related to sex, SBP, preoperative LVEF, valvulopathy and
24 aortopathy, AAR, ACC time. Postoperative length of stay > 7 days could be affected by SBP,
25 AAR, aortic stenosis and ACC time. **Conclusion:** Our study revealed comprehensive

1 relationships between demographic characteristics, BAV Sievers types, valvulopathy and
2 aortopathy, and the possible risk factors for adverse outcomes after AVR in BAV patients.
3 Sex, SBP, age, Sievers types, subtypes and interactions between aortopathy and valvulopathy
4 differently impact on aortopathy, valvulopathy and the short outcomes of AVR.

5

6 **Keywords**

7

8 Bicuspid aortic valve, Sievers type, aortopathy, valvulopathy, aortic valve replacement

1 **Introduction**

2 Bicuspid aortic valve (BAV) is a common congenital disorder with a prevalence rate of 2% in
3 the general population, with male predominance. These patients have two aortic valves
4 instead of three as in normal people. While BAV has little impact on the lives of young
5 patients, over time it may cause severe cardiovascular complications such as aortic valve
6 stenosis (AS), aortic valve regurgitation (AR) and aorta dilation. Those BAV comorbidities
7 may require surgical interventions of the valves, such as aortic valve replacement (AVR),
8 and/or the aorta, ^{1, 2}.

9
10 It has been reported BAV Sievers types are associated with some demographic characteristics
11 such as the sex. Krepp et al. reported that type 1 BAV with fusion between the left and right
12 coronary cusp (type 1 L - R) was found more frequently in male than in female patients,
13 whereas type 1 BAV with fusion between the left and noncoronary (type L - N) cusp was
14 more common in female patients³. However, studies by others did not showed this
15 difference^{4, 5}. Demographic characteristics and Sievers types also have effects on BAV
16 valvulopathy and aortopathy, which are the common complications in BAV patients. For the
17 valvulopathy, male and female BAV patients have higher incidence AR and AS,
18 respectively^{4, 6}. Age was another independent determinant for BAV valvulopathy. Male BAV
19 patients more often had moderate/severe AR at a young age, and the occurrence of AR
20 decreased with age, while female BAV patients with had higher incidence of AS regardless
21 of age⁷. Valve function was also affected by blood pressure and BAV Sievers type⁵. It
22 becomes more complicated when considering BAV aortopathy and valvulopathy affects each
23 other.

24

1 As for BAV aortopathy, age, male and BSA could be independent predictors of ascending
2 aorta diameter in BAV patients⁸. Male patients have been reported to more frequently have
3 isolated dilation of the aortic root and diffuse dilation of the aorta when compared with
4 female patients^{4, 6}. Higher BSA, female, age and AS are related to ascending aortic dilation⁹.
5 Male patients with type 1 L - R are associated with larger sinus of Valsalva (SOV) diameter
6 and AR, while female patients have a higher prevalence of AS³.

7

8 Furthermore, studies showed inconsistent risk factors for outcomes in BAV patients
9 underwent AVR. One study implied that both short- and long-term outcomes were not
10 significantly different between males and females⁶, while other suggested that females exhibit
11 a higher relative risk of death, higher operative risk and longer lengths of hospital stay¹⁰.
12 Valvulopathy also affects the postoperative left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) as the
13 BAV-AS patients had a significant increase in LVEF when compared with BAV-AR patients
14 after AVR¹¹. However, it is unclear what are the other factors affecting the improvement or
15 deterioration of LVEF after AVR.

16

17 To date, comprehensive analyses of the relationships between demographic (e.g., age, sex,
18 body surface area (BSA)) and clinical (e.g., hypertension, diabetic mellites) characteristics,
19 BAV Sievers types, incidences of different subtypes valvulopathy and/or aortopathy and their
20 interactions, and the outcomes of aortic valve replacement (AVR) have not been done. In this
21 study, we retrospectively reviewed a large number of BAV patients from January 2008 to
22 December 2017 from our institution to elucidate these relationships.

23

1 **Methods**

2 The Ethics Committees of Beijing Anzhen Hospital, Capital Medical University approved
3 this retrospective study (2017028X) and waived the requirement for written patient informed
4 consent form.


5

6 ***Study Population and protocol***

7 From January 2008 to December 2017, 1166 hospitalized patients from all departments of
8 Beijing Anzhen Hospital with an echocardiographic diagnosis of BAV were screened and
9 complete clinical record data were retrospectively reviewed and collected. Nine hundred and
10 ninety-two BAV patients were enrolled in our study after excluding patients (n = 174) with
11 preoperative aortic dissection, combined congenital heart disease and/or connective tissue
12 disorders, including Marfan syndrome and Ehlers-Danlos syndrome. Among these patients,
13 658 BAV patients underwent AVR. We first analyzed the relationships between demographic
14 characteristics, BAV Sievers types, overall and different subtypes aortopathy, overall and
15 different subtypes valvulopathy, and short-term post-operative outcomes (Figure 1).

16

17 Figure 1. Study Design.



1

2 Abbreviations: BAV: bicuspid aortic valve; Type 0: BAV with no raphe; Type 1 L-R: type 1 BAV with fusion

3 between the left and right coronary cusp; Type 1 R-N: type 1 BAV with fusion between the right and

4 noncoronary cusp; Type 1 L-N: type 1 BAV with fusion between the left and noncoronary cusp; m-s AS:

5 moderate to severe aortic stenosis; $AR \geq 2+$: aortic regurgitation $\geq 2+$; AAo: ascending aorta; LVEF: left

6 ventricular ejection fraction; EAE: early adverse event; ICU: intensive care unit.

7

8 **Data Collection**

9 Complete clinical record data including demographics, clinical history, medical history,

10 physical examination, imaging examination, laboratory data, and clinical treatments were

11 queried retrospectively. Hypertension was considered as a diagnosis when it was newly

12 diagnosed or treated with medicine within 6 months before echocardiography examination.

1 For patients underwent AVR, additional information including preoperative drug use, intra-
2 and postoperative parameters, like postoperative early adverse event (EAE), postoperative
3 LVEF, total intensive care unit (ICU) hours and postoperative length of stay were recorded.
4 EAE encompasses in-hospital and 30-day mortality, major cardiac events (myocardial
5 infarction, ventricular fibrillation, acute heart failure, use of circulatory support like intra-
6 aortic balloon pump [IABP] or extracorporeal membrane oxygenation [ECMO]), acute renal
7 failure, stroke and reoperation for bleeding).

8

9 ***Echocardiography Data***

10 Echocardiography measurements were performed according to the guidelines of American
11 Society of Echocardiography (ASE), European Society of cardiology (ESC) and American
12 College of Cardiology/American Heart Association (ACC/AHA)¹²⁻¹⁴. All patients went
13 through comprehensive transthoracic echocardiography evaluation, and those with the
14 diagnosis of BAV by echocardiography were included for this study. BAV was diagnosed by
15 parasternal long- and short-axis view, showing the existence of only 2 commissures in
16 systole, and was classified based on the Sievers classification system (Sievers types)¹⁵ as type
17 0 (BAV with no raphe), type 1 L-R (BAV with fusion between the left and right coronary
18 cusp), type 1 R-N (BAV with fusion between the right and noncoronary cusp), type 1 L-N
19 (BAV with fusion between the left and noncoronary cusp). There was no type 2 BAV patient
20 in our cohort.

21

22 Valvular dysfunction (valvulopathy, including AS and/or AR) was determined with
23 hemodynamic measurements and the degrees of AS and AR were scored based on the ESC
24 and ACC/AHA guidelines for the management of valvular heart disease^{13, 14, 16}. Valvular
25 function was categorized into four conditions: (1) moderate to severe aortic valve stenosis

1 (m-s AS) only, (2) aortic valve regurgitation $\geq 2+$ (AR $\geq 2+$) only, (3) m-s AS + AR $\geq 2+$,
2 (4) mild AS and/or mild AR or normal ¹⁷.

3
4 For the evaluation of aortopathy, SOV and ascending aorta (AAo) were measured using the
5 leading edge to leading edge technique in the parasternal long axis view perpendicular to the
6 centerline of the aorta. BSA indexed SOV and AAo dimensions were calculated. The dilation
7 of SOV or AAo was defined as the diameter ≥ 40 mm according to the guidelines^{18, 19} and
8 literature²⁰. The classification of BAV aortopathy as follow: (1) aortic root (comprising of the
9 SOV, aortic valve and coronary ostia) dilation only, (2) AAo dilation only, (3) diffuse aortic
10 dilation (i.e., dilation of both aortic root and AAo) and (4) no dilation (normal)²¹.

11 12 ***Statistical Analysis***

13 Continuous variables, expressed as means \pm standard deviation (SD) in case of normally
14 distributed variables or as medians (interquartile ranges (IQR), i.e., median (Q1, Q3), were
15 compared using unpaired Student's *t* test or *Mann-Whitney U* test or one-way analysis of
16 variance where appropriate. Categorical variables, expressed as numbers and/or percentages,
17 were compared using the *Chi-square* or *Fisher's* exact tests.

18
19 The hazard ratios (HR) of age, sex, valvulopathy and aortopathy and other parameters for
20 postoperative EAE were calculated using proportional Cox hazard models. The odds ratios
21 (OR) of basic clinical parameters, like age, sex, BSA, and BAV Sievers type, BAV-induced
22 comorbidities (including valvulopathy and aortopathy), were analyzed with multivariable
23 logistic regression models adjusted for significant covariables in univariate analysis with
24 backward stepwise method, to investigate factors affecting valvulopathy, aortopathy and
25 short-term post-operative outcomes. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version

1 25.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, N.Y., USA). All tests were 2-sided and a *P* value of < 0.05 was
2 considered statistically significant.

3 **Results**

4

5 *Sex differences in demography, comorbidities, cardiac performance, Sievers types,* 6 *valvulopathy and aortopathy in BAV patients*

7

8 We enrolled 992 patients according to our inclusion criteria, in which 734 (74.0%) patients
9 were male, and 258 (26.0%) patients were female, agreeing with BAV's predominance in
10 males⁴. Females were about 3.6 years older than males when first diagnosed with BAV in our
11 institution. Weight, height and BSA were greater in males. The prevalence of tobacco use
12 was higher in male patients. Male BAV patients had higher incidence of hypertension. Serum
13 triglyceride was higher in male patients, but female patients had higher levels of total
14 cholesterol, high-density lipoprotein (HDL) and low-density lipoprotein (LDL). LVEDD and
15 LVESD were significantly smaller in female (LVEDD, 57.54 ± 11.90 mm vs. 47.67 ± 6.92
16 mm, $P < 0.001$; LVESD, 39.05 ± 10.62 mm vs. 30.88 ± 6.61 mm, $P < 0.001$) while LVEF
17 was lower in males (59.79 ± 10.05 % vs. 63.74 ± 8.67 %, $P < 0.001$) (Table 1).

18

19 In all 992 patients, the most common BAV Sievers types were type 1 L - R (59.2%), followed
20 by type 0 (24.4%), type 1 R - N (13.9%), and type 1 L - N (2.5%). There was no sex
21 difference in the distribution of Sievers types (Table 1 and Table 2).

22

23 BAV strongly predisposes the patients to aortic and/or valvular diseases. The percentage of
24 patients with at least of one form of valvulopathy and/or aortopathy in our cohort was 92.6%

1 and 53.7% had both one form of aortopathy and one form of valvulopathy. Males had higher
2 percentage of at least one form of valvulopathy or aortopathy, and higher percentage of
3 combined valvulopathy and aortopathy (Table 1).

4

5 The overall prevalence of valvulopathy in all BAV patients was high (73.4%), among which
6 75.4% were males and 24.6% were females. Among all BAV patients, males were more
7 frequently having AR $\geq 2+$ only than females (39.0% vs. 12.8%, $P < 0.001$), whereas females
8 were prone to have m-s AS only (45.7% vs 21.3%, $P < 0.001$) (Table 1).

9

10 As shown in Table 1, aortopathy was common in our cohort of BAV patients (73.0%) and
11 most common aortopathy was AAo dilation only (50.1%), followed by diffuse aortic dilation
12 (19.9%), and root dilation only (3.0%). Compared to females, male patients showed higher
13 incidence of aortic diffuse dilation (25.3% vs. 4.3%, $P < 0.001$) and root dilation (3.8% vs.
14 0.8%, $P = 0.014$); , while female patients had greater incidence of AAo dilation only (61.2%
15 vs. 46.2%, $P < 0.001$) (Table 1). The linear dimension of SOV, AAo, and BSA indexed SOV
16 were significantly larger in males when compared with females (SOV, $36.51 \pm 6.75\text{mm}$ vs.
17 $31.16 \pm 4.90\text{mm}$, $P < 0.001$; SOV/BSA, $20.13 \pm 3.91\text{mm/m}^2$ vs. $19.37 \pm 3.28\text{mm/m}^2$, $P =$
18 0.003 ; AAo, $44.33 \pm 8.67\text{mm}$ vs. $42.81 \pm 8.44\text{mm}$, $P = 0.016$), but BSA indexed AAo was
19 significantly larger in females instead (24.47 ± 5.05 vs. 26.65 ± 5.52 , $P < 0.001$), which
20 indicated that females had larger AAo diameter when shared the same BSA as males.

21

22 ***The association between different Sievers types with clinical characteristics, valvulopathy***
23 ***and aortopathy in BAV patients***

24

25 Patients with different BAV Sievers types were equipped with distinct clinical characteristics

1 including DBP, SBP, LVEDD, LVESD, and BSA normalized LVEDD or LVESD. Patients
2 with type 0 Sievers type had the highest diastolic blood pressure (DBP), while type 1 L-N
3 had lowest SBP and DBP. Type 1 L-R and type 1 R-N had larger LV diameter than type 0
4 and type L-N. Type 1 L-N also had the smallest LVEDD/BSA (Table 2).

5
6 In our cohorts, Sievers types had an impact on the incidence of valvulopathy and aortopathy.
7 For valvulopathy, the incidence of $AR \geq 2+$ was greater in type 1 L-R (37.3%) and type 1 R-
8 N (34.8%) than in type 0 (19.4%) and type 1 R-N (20.0%). Interestingly, type 0 and type 1 R-
9 N had most normal or mild AS or AR (Table 2). For BAV aortopathy, type 1 L-R and type 1
10 L-N had larger SOV diameter and BSA indexed SOV than type 0 and type 1 R-N. Type 0 and
11 Type 1 R-N had higher frequency of AAo dilation only than type 1 L-R and type 1 L-N,
12 which on the contrary had lower incidence of diffuse aortic dilation than type 0 and type 1 R-
13 N (table 2). Type 1 L-R and type 1 R-N had higher percentage of at least one form of
14 valvulopathy or aortopathy, and higher percentage of combined valvulopathy and aortopathy
15 (Table 2).

16

17 **Risk factors for valvulopathy in all, male and female BAV patients**

18

19 We further identified independent risk factors for all these three types of valvulopathy, m-s
20 AS only, $AR \geq 2+$ only and both in all, male and female BAV patients, by adjusting for
21 confounders. In the whole cohort, for m-s AS only, age predicted a risk while higher BSA
22 and diffuse aortic dilation strongly decreased the risk of AS. For $AR \geq 2+$ only, higher SBP
23 (instead of hypertension history) and male increase its incidence, while type 1 L-R might be
24 another potential risk factor (OR = 2.943, $P = 0.066$). As for m-s AS+ $AR \geq 2+$, greater BSA
25 greatly decreased the risk, while AAo dilation only, diffuse aortic dilation and male were the

1 risk factors (Table 3 and supplementary Table 1).

2

3 We further looked into the risk and protective factors for BAV associated valvulopathy in
4 male and female BAV patients. For male BAV patients, age was a predict factor (OR =
5 1.046, $P < 0.001$) for m-s AS only, while higher BSA (OR = 0.085, $P = 0.001$) decreased the
6 risk of it. Higher SBP (OR = 1.018, $P = 0.004$) increased the incidence of AR $\geq 2+$ only
7 (Table 3 and supplementary Table 2). For m-s AS+AR $\geq 2+$, higher BSA decreased the risk
8 (OR = 0.049, $P < 0.001$).

9

10 There were interactions between valvulopathy and aortopathy in males: Males were prone to
11 have diffuse aortic dilation (OR = 3.868, $P = 0.001$) (Table 4). Diffuse aortic dilation (OR =
12 0.350, $P < 0.011$) decreased the risk of m-s AS only; AAo dilation only (OR = 2.164, $P =$
13 0.034) and diffuse aortic dilation (OR = 2.837, $P = 0.010$) were the risk factors for m-s
14 AS+AR $\geq 2+$. In females, age is a predictor for m-s AS only (OR = 1.033, $P = 0.011$) and m-
15 s AS + AR $\geq 2+$ (OR = 1.045, $P = 0.033$), while higher BSA decrease the risk for m-s AS +
16 AR $\geq 2+$ (OR = 0.036, $P = 0.045$) (Table 3). For other factors, the numbers of affected female
17 patients were too few and thus we could not assess the risk of them.

18

19 ***Risk factors for BAV aortopathy in all, male and female BAV patients***

20

21 In the entire cohort, BSA was the only risk factor for all forms of aortopathy (aortic root
22 dilation only, OR = 21.551, $P = 0.020$; AAo dilation only, OR = 5.751, $P = 0.001$; diffuse
23 aortic dilation, OR = 37.554, $P < 0.001$). Age was a risk factor for AAo dilation only and
24 diffuse aortic dilation in the whole cohort (AAo dilation only, OR = 1.037, $P < 0.001$; diffuse

1 aortic dilation, OR = 1.050, $P < 0.001$) and male patients (AAo dilation only, OR = 1.033, P
2 < 0.001 ; diffuse aortic dilation, OR = 1.049, $P < 0.001$). BSA was also the only risk factor for
3 all three forms of aortopathy in males (aortic root dilation only, OR = 18.416, $P = 0.036$;
4 AAo dilation only, OR = 7.243, $P = 0.001$; diffuse aortic dilation, OR = 45.402, $P < 0.001$),
5 but not in females. In the whole cohort and males, valvulopathy affected the aortopathy: m-s
6 AS only decreased the risk for diffuse aortic dilation in the whole study cohort (OR = 0.242,
7 $P < 0.001$) and males (OR = 0.338, $P < 0.001$), while m-s AS + AR $\geq 2+$ increase the risk for
8 the whole cohort (OR = 2.402, $P = 0.015$) and males (OR = 2.694, $P = 0.013$). (Table 4). For
9 females, age was a risk factor for AAo dilation only (OR = 1.047, $P < 0.001$). Because the
10 numbers of female patients associated with some factors were limited, we could not perform
11 additional analysis.

12

13 ***Pre-, intra- and post- operative characteristics of all, male and female BAV patients***
14 ***underwent AVR***

15 The preoperative demographic characteristics for BAV patients underwent AVR were similar
16 as the whole cohort. In 658 BAV patients underwent AVR, 75.1% were males, while 24.9%
17 were females. While most pre-operative demographic and clinical characteristics were similar
18 between male and female patients, males were younger (48.74 ± 12.73 years vs. $55.34 \pm$
19 11.20 years, $P < 0.001$) and had lower LVEF (60.67 ± 8.57 % vs. 63.67 ± 8.18 %, $P <$
20 0.001), suggesting more need of AVR in male patients. Males also had lower DBP ($70.94 \pm$
21 13.35 mmHg vs. 73.30 ± 11.07 mmHg, $P = 0.026$), greater BSA (1.82 ± 0.16 m² vs. $1.62 \pm$
22 0.15 m², $P < 0.001$), higher frequency of AR $\geq 2+$ only (223 [45.1%] vs. 25 [15.2%], $P <$
23 0.001) and aortic root dilation only (19 [3.8%] vs. 1 [0.6%], $P = 0.036$) and diffuse aortic
24 dilation (147 [29.8%] vs. 7 [4.3%], $P < 0.001$). Females were more likely to have m-s AS
25 only (119 [24.1%] vs. 101 [61.6%], $P < 0.001$) and AAo dilation only (226 [45.7%] vs. 106

1 [64.6%], $P < 0.001$).

2

3 More male patients were required to have simultaneous ascending aortic replacement when
4 they underwent AVR (248 [50.2%] vs. 62 [37.8%], $P = 0.006$), again suggesting more severe
5 conditions in male BAV patients.

6

7 ***Factors related to postoperative EAE, LVEF and LVEF changes after AVR***

8 Age (HR = 1.030; $P = 0.002$) and longer aortic cross clamp (ACC) time (HR = 1.012, $P <$
9 0.001) were predict factors for EAE. Additionally, we used LVEF, total ICU hours, and
10 postoperative hospital stay as indices of postoperative outcomes. It has been reported that
11 post-operative LVEF<50% is associated adverse long-term prognosis²². Sex was a major
12 factor affecting outcomes. Postoperatively, on average LVEF decreased in all, male and
13 female patients compared to preoperative values and was lower in males than females (57.03
14 $\pm 10.11\%$ vs. $60.83 \pm 10.66\%$, $P < 0.001$). Female patients had longer total ICU hours (21
15 [19, 29.74] vs. 21 [18, 26], $P = 0.042$), and higher percentage of patients needing total ICU
16 hours > 24 hours (38.4% vs. 29.8%, $P = 0.039$). Males had higher percentage of
17 postoperative LVEF < 50% and lower percentage of postoperative LVEF increase > 10%.
18 Multivariable logistic regression confirmed that male was the risk factor for postoperative
19 LVEF < 50% (OR = 3.072, $P = 0.033$). Females stayed in hospital after surgery longer than
20 males and had higher frequency of postoperative length of stay > 7 days. There were 13.7%
21 patients showing EAE but the incidence of EAE was not differing significantly between sex
22 (HR = 1.213, $P = 0.441$) (Table 5).

23

24 Diffuse aortic dilation (OR = 2.899, $P = 0.013$), ascending aortic replacement (OR = 2.154, P
25 = 0.016) and longer aortic cross clamp time (OR = 1.012, $P < 0.001$) were the risk factors for

1 postoperative LVEF < 50%, while higher preoperative LVEF is the protective factor (OR =
2 0.873, $P < 0.001$) (table 6). Age (OR = 1.018, $P = 0.015$) and longer aortic cross clamp
3 (ACC) time (OR = 1.015, $P < 0.001$) were the risk factors for total ICU hours > 24 hours.
4 Higher SBP (OR = 0.990, $P = 0.047$) and accompanied ascending aortic replacement (OR =
5 0.552, $P = 0.001$) decrease the possibility of postoperative length of stay > 7 days, while m-s
6 AS only (OR = 1.846, $P = 0.027$) and longer ACC time (OR = 1.005, $P = 0.021$) increased
7 the risk of staying more days in the hospital.

8
9 Furthermore, we analyzed the factors for postoperative LVEF improvements or deterioration
10 by LVEF changes of 5% or 10% (table 7). Higher SBP (OR = 0.984, $P = 0.017$) and
11 preoperative LVEF (OR = 0.880, $P < 0.001$), and accompanied ascending aortic replacement
12 (OR = 0.604, $P = 0.037$) might hinder the patients from LVEF improvement by > 5%, while
13 patients with m-s AS only (OR = 2.559, $P = 0.018$) were prone to have postoperative LVEF
14 increase > 5%. Higher preoperative LVEF (OR = 0.855, $P < 0.001$) also decrease the chance
15 of LVEF improvement by > 10%. Higher preoperative LVEF and AR $\geq 2+$ only were risk
16 factors for postoperative LVEF decrease > 5% (preoperative LVEF, OR = 1.120, $P < 0.001$;
17 AR $\geq 2+$ only, OR = 2.486, $P = 0.001$) or decrease > 10% (preoperative LVEF, OR = 1.110,
18 $P < 0.001$; AR $\geq 2+$ only, OR = 3.172, $P = 0.001$), while m-s AS only (OR = 0.437, $P =$
19 0.030) was the protective factor for postoperative LVEF decrease > 10%. (table 7).

20

21 **Discussion**

22

23 In this study, we performed a comprehensive evaluation of the relationships among
24 demographic and clinical characteristics, BAV Sievers types, valvulopathy and aortopathy,

1 and the risk/protective factors for outcomes after aortic valve replacement (AVR) in BAV
2 patients, with our large retrospective cohort of BAV patients. Our study unveiled multiple
3 previously unrecognized interwoven interactions between some demographic characteristics,
4 BAV Sievers types, and operational outcomes.

5

6 *Demographic characteristics' effects on BAV associated valvulopathy and aortopathy:*

7 Though it is well known that BAV is a male predominant entity^{4,23}, as also shown by our
8 study, whether there are sex differences in BAV Sievers types, valvulopathy, aortopathy and
9 operational outcomes has been controversial. Our study demonstrated that type 1 L-R was
10 the most prevalent configuration without sex difference in Sievers types, agreeing with the
11 reports by Kong et al.⁴ and by Lee et al⁵. On the contrary, Roman et al. reported that among
12 424 unoperated BAV patients, males had more frequently type 1 L - R than females (81.5%
13 vs. 69.0%, $P = 0.03$), whereas type 1 L - N was more common in females (18.5% vs. 31.0%,
14 $P = 0.03$)³. In addition, our cohort showed that male BAV patients were younger, with larger
15 BSA, LVEDD and LVESD, and lower LVEF than females and had more need for AVR or
16 AVR+AAR, suggesting faster development and worse outcomes of aortopathy and
17 valvulopathy in males.

18

19 *Influences of Demographic and clinical characteristics, and BAV Sievers types on aortopathy*
20 *and valvulopathy in BAV patients:*

21 As BAV is associated with adverse aortopathy and valvulopathy which have significant
22 impact on the health of these patients, it is necessary to test if the demographic and clinical
23 characteristics, like age, sex, BSA and blood pressure, and Sievers types were independent
24 predictors for BAV valvulopathy, aortopathy. One advantage of our study is that the large
25 number of patients and comprehensive dataset enabled us to analyze risk/protective factors of

1 aortopathy and valvulopathy in subpopulations such as male patients or patients with specific
2 comorbidities.

3 Sievers types and sex may affect aortopathy. Sievers et al²⁴ showed that AAO dilation was
4 observed more often in BAV type 1 L-R and type 0 than in other Sievers types. Aortic root
5 dilation was more often in type 0 and type 1 R-N, while diffuse aortic dilation was more
6 frequent in type 1 L-R. Our results also showed patients with type 1 L-R had the highest
7 proportion of diffuse aortic dilation, but we found that type 1 R-N but not type 0 was more
8 likely to have AAO dilation only, which was different from Sievers' result. Our discovery that
9 the frequency of m-s AS only was similar in different Sievers types was also different from
10 the results reported by Sievers et al²⁴. These differences could be due to the fact that different
11 BAV fusion pattern may lead to the hemodynamic changes in aorta in distinct ways, resulting
12 in different types of aortopathy^{25, 26}. In terms of the effects of sex, Kong et al. pointed out
13 that males showed more frequent aortic SOV dilation compared with females⁴. Andrei et al.
14 reported males with BAV had larger aortic dimension but did not mention which segment of
15 the aorta was dilated⁶. In our study, we examined aortic dilation both at the root and
16 ascending segments. The diameter of SOV, AAO, BSA indexed SOV were larger in males,
17 but normalized AAO by BSA was larger in females. Aortic root dilation only or diffuse aortic
18 dilation was more frequently found in males while females tended to have more AAO
19 dilation. In addition, in our whole cohort, higher BSA, age, m-s AS+AR $\geq 2+$ were the risk
20 factors for all or some types of aortopathy but m-s AS only was a protective factor for diffuse
21 aortic dilation. Male shared similar prediction factors of aortopathy with the whole cohort.
22 But in females, only age could be determined as an independent predictor for AAO dilation
23 only.

24

1 Valvulopathy was in 73.4% of BAV patients in our study cohort (m-s AS and/or AR $\geq 2+$).
2 We found that male BAV patients were present more often with m-s AR only at a young age,
3 while female BAV patients had more frequent AS, consistent with the result of a Krepps's
4 study³ and Kong's study⁴. Kong's study only examined BAV Sievers types and sex on types
5 of valvulopathy and concluded that only sex was related. Our data presented a much more
6 complex situation: for the whole cohort, age is the risk factor for m-s AS only but higher
7 BSA and diffuse aortic dilation were the protective factors. Higher SBP and male would
8 increase the risk of AR $\geq 2+$ only. For m-s AS +AR $\geq 2+$, AAO dilation, diffuse aortic
9 dilation and male were the risk factor while higher BSA would protect the patients from m-s
10 AS +AR $\geq 2+$. The risk or protect factors of valvulopathy in male were similar as for whole
11 cohort. But in females, the only identified risk factor for m-s AS only was age, while age and
12 BSA were independent determinants for m-s AS +AR $\geq 2+$.

13

14 Biological mechanisms for aortopathy and valvulopathy associated with BAV

15 There were two main hypotheses to explain aortic dilation: hemodynamic theory and gene
16 theory²⁷⁻²⁹. In AS patient, the aortic dilation could be induced by valve related flow
17 turbulence (hemodynamic theory), while AR could be the results of aortic root dilation
18 caused by related gene mutations (gene theory), as suggested by Sievers et al²⁴. In our study,
19 we showed sex difference in aortopathy though not the same as previously reported,
20 consistent with the "X chromosome protection theory"³⁰⁻³² Further investigation is needed to
21 explain these sex differences in BAV aortopathy.

22

23 The mechanisms for BAV valvulopathy are not clear. Gene mutations or expression changes
24 causes BAV Sievers types, which may be directly associated with different subtypes of
25 valvulopathy³³. In our study, male sex is also related to AR $\geq 2+$ or m-s AS+ AR $\geq 2+$,

1 suggesting some genetic influence on the development of specific types of valvulopathy.

2

3 *Who can obtain more benefits or are exposed to more risks to surgical interventions in BAV*
4 *patients?*

5 Our study has suggested that male BAV patients advance to more severe (e.g., lower LVEF)
6 conditions that even requires surgical interventions at younger ages. So, it seems that male
7 BAV patients should benefit more from surgical interventions. However, we found no
8 significant difference in ACC time and EAE between sex though females needed longer total
9 ICU hours and postoperative length of stay. In contrast, Andrei and colleagues implied that
10 females had higher risk for in-hospital mortality and longer ICU median hours of stay, longer
11 ACC times and higher preoperative LVEF⁶. Another study analyzed 3 cohort (community
12 cohort, tertiary clinical referral cohort, and surgical referral cohort), and found that in surgical
13 referral cohort, females exhibited a higher relative risk of death¹⁰. We found that age and
14 longer ACC time were risk factors for EAE and total ICU hours > 24 hours.

15 We further evaluated the benefits and risks of surgical interventions by examining the more
16 subtle but critical parameters, postoperative LVEF < 50% and LVEF change by operation
17 and total post-operation stay. Postoperative LVEF < 50% could be a predictor for 5-year
18 survival for AVR in BAV patients²². Male, lower preoperative LVEF, accompanied
19 ascending aortic replacement and longer ACC time were risk factor of postoperative LVEF <
20 50%. However, the lower preoperative LVEF was also the predictor for postoperative LVEF
21 increase. AS only patients were prone to have LVEF increase after surgery which agrees the
22 AVR in BAV/TAV patients^{11, 34} probably due to the decrease of afterload after the removal of
23 stenosed AV. AR patients were prone to have postoperative LVEF decrease as reported by
24 Disha et al.¹¹, which could reflect no need of high LVEF after regurgitation correction. For

1 longer postoperative stay (>7 days), AS, age and longer ACC time were risk factors, but
2 accompanied ascending aortic replacement was shown to be a protective factor.

3

4 **Study limitations**

5 The principal limitation of this study was its single center based retrospective study, and the
6 short follow-up time after surgeries.

7 This study is based on a single center though our patient number is large. Also, we only
8 analyzed hospitalized patients, and among them, surgical inpatients occupy a large
9 proportion. This might lead to a selection bias. Besides, the patients enrolled in this study
10 were all Chinese (Asians), and it was known that there were some anatomical and genetic
11 differences between American, European and Asian patients.³⁵ By far, only few studies were
12 available for the characterization of BAV patients of Chinese or Asians³⁵⁻³⁷. We have already
13 registered a multicenter study on BAV (registration number: ChiCTR-RRC-17013678) which
14 will enable us to further test our findings and to carry out the long-term follow-up in the
15 future.

16 There were several data analyses that cannot be done because of the limited number of
17 patients in subgroups such as some Sievers types or a subtype of aortopathy in females, AAo
18 dilation only in females, m-s AS +AR \geq 2+ and root dilation only in whole cohort and males.

19

20 **Conclusion**

21 Our study provided the evidence for comprehensive relationships between demographic and
22 clinical characteristics, BAV Sievers types, valvulopathy and aortopathy, and the possible
23 risk factors for adverse outcomes after AVR in BAV patients. Sex, SBP, age, Sievers types,

- 1 interactions between aortopathy and valvulopathy differently impact on aortopathy,
- 2 valvulopathy and the short outcomes of AVR.
- 3

1 Author list:

2

3 Yijia Li

4 Department of Echocardiography, Beijing Anzhen Hospital, Capital Medical University, and

5 Beijing Institute of Heart Lung and Blood Vessel Diseases

6 Department of Physiology & Cardiovascular Research Center, Temple University School of

7 Medicine

8 E-mail: tuk54304@temple.edu

9 phone: +1 2677522688

10

11 Qiong Zhao:

12 Qiong Zhao: Institute: Inova Heart and Vascular Institute, Inova Fairfax Hospital, Cardiac Diagnostic,

13 1st Floor, 3300 Gallow's Road, Falls Church, VA 22042, USA;

14 E-mail: Qiong.Zhao@inova.org

15 Phone: 5714722900

16

17 Yue Qi:

18 Department of Epidemiology, Beijing Anzhen Hospital, Capital Medical University, and

19 Beijing Institute of Heart Lung and Blood Vessel Diseases

20 E-mail: qiyue_bjcn@163.com

1 phone: +86 13811106169

2

3 Yichen Qu

4 Department of Echocardiography, Beijing Anzhen Hospital, Capital Medical University, and

5 Beijing Institute of Heart Lung and Blood Vessel Diseases

6 E-mail: quyichen439@163.com

7 phone: +86 15959146872

8

9

10 Akshay Kumar

11 Address: Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, Medanta Hospital, Gurugram, India, Medanta

12 Hospital, Islampur Colony, Sector 38, Gurugram, India 122001

13 E-mail: drakshay82@gmail.com

14 phone: 843-870-3792

15

16 Ya Yang:

17 Department of Echocardiography, Beijing Anzhen Hospital, Capital Medical University, and

18 Beijing Institute of Heart Lung and Blood Vessel Diseases

19 E-mail: echoyangya6666@163.com

20 phone: +86 18911662958

1

2 Xiongwen Chen:

3 Department of Physiology & Cardiovascular Research Center, Temple University School of

4 Medicine

5 E-mail: xchen001@temple.edu

6 Phone: +1 215-707-3542

7

1 Acknowledgment:

2 Dr. Li had full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of
3 the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. Dr. Qi and Qu carried out the statistical
4 analysis; Dr. Zhao helped with study concept and design. Dr. Chen and Yang proposed the
5 study directions, suggested critical analyses, and performed critical revision.

6 Funding: None

7 Disclosure: There are no relationships with industry.

8

1 Reference

- 2 1. Borger MA, Fedak PWM, Stephens EH, Gleason TG, Girdauskas E, Ikonomidis JS,
3 Khoynzhad A, Siu SC, Verma S, Hope MD, Cameron DE, Hammer DF, Coselli JS, Moon MR,
4 Sundt TM, Barker AJ, Markl M, Della Corte A, Michelena HI and Elefteriades JA. The
5 American Association for Thoracic Surgery consensus guidelines on bicuspid aortic valve-
6 related aortopathy: Executive summary. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2018;156:473-480.
- 7 2. Nishimura RA, Otto CM, Bonow RO, Carabello BA, Erwin JP, 3rd, Guyton RA, O'Gara
8 PT, Ruiz CE, Skubas NJ, Sorajja P, Sundt TM, 3rd and Thomas JD. 2014 AHA/ACC Guideline
9 for the Management of Patients With Valvular Heart Disease: a report of the American
10 College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines.
11 *Circulation.* 2014;129:e521-643.
- 12 3. Krepp JM, Roman MJ, Devereux RB, Bruce A, Prakash SK, Morris SA, Milewicz DM,
13 Holmes KW, Ravekes W, Shohet RV, Pyeritz RE, Maslen CL, Kroner BL, Eagle KA, Preiss L,
14 Gen TACI and Asch FM. Bicuspid and unicuspid aortic valves: Different phenotypes of the
15 same disease? Insight from the GenTAC Registry. *Congenit Heart Dis.* 2017.
- 16 4. Kong WK, Regeer MV, Ng AC, McCormack L, Poh KK, Yeo TC, Shanks M, Parent S,
17 Enache R, Popescu BA, Yip JW, Ma L, Kamperidis V, van der Velde ET, Mertens B, Ajmone
18 Marsan N, Delgado V and Bax JJ. Sex Differences in Phenotypes of Bicuspid Aortic Valve and
19 Aortopathy: Insights From a Large Multicenter, International Registry. *Circ Cardiovasc*
20 *Imaging.* 2017;10.
- 21 5. Lee SY, Shim CY, Kim D, Cho I, Hong GR, Ha JW and Chung N. Factors Determining
22 Aortic Valve Dysfunction in Korean Subjects With a Bicuspid Aortic Valve. *Am J Cardiol.*
23 2017;119:2049-2055.
- 24 6. Andrei AC, Yadlapati A, Malaisrie SC, Puthumana JJ, Li Z, Rigolin VH, Mendelson M,
25 Clennon C, Kruse J, Fedak PW, Thomas JD, Higgins JA, Rinewalt D, Bonow RO and McCarthy
26 PM. Comparison of outcomes and presentation in men-versus-women with bicuspid aortic
27 valves undergoing aortic valve replacement. *Am J Cardiol.* 2015;116:250-5.
- 28 7. Ren X, Li F, Wang C, Hou Z, Gao Y, Yin W and Lu B. Age- and Sex-Related Aortic
29 Valve Dysfunction and Aortopathy Difference in Patients with Bicuspid Aortic Valve. *Int Heart*
30 *J.* 2019;60:637-642.
- 31 8. Kerneis C, Pasi N, Arangalage D, Nguyen V, Mathieu T, Verdonk C, Codogno I, Ou P,
32 Duval X, Tubiana S, Cimadevilla C, Vahanian A and Messika-Zeitoun D. Ascending aorta
33 dilatation rates in patients with tricuspid and bicuspid aortic stenosis: the
34 COFRASA/GENERAC study. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2018;19:792-799.
- 35 9. Nishi H, Sakaguchi T, Miyagawa S, Yoshikawa Y, Fukushima S, Yoshioka D, Ueno T,
36 Kuratani T and Sawa Y. Factors affecting a dilated ascending aorta in patients with bicuspid
37 aortic valve: the relevance of valve anatomy, body size and age. *Surg Today.* 2014;44:1483-
38 9.
- 39 10. Michelena HI, Suri RM, Katan O, Eleid MF, Clavel MA, Maurer MJ, Pellikka PA,
40 Mahoney D and Enriquez-Sarano M. Sex Differences and Survival in Adults With Bicuspid
41 Aortic Valves: Verification in 3 Contemporary Echocardiographic Cohorts. *J Am Heart Assoc.*
42 2016;5.
- 43 11. Disha K, Espinoza A, Rouman M, Secknus MA, Kuntze T and Girdauskas E. Long-
44 Term Recovery of Reduced Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction after Aortic Valve Replacement
45 in Patients with Bicuspid Aortic Valve Disease. *Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2016;64:418-26.
- 46 12. Recommendations for Cardiac Chamber Quantification by Echocardiography in
47 Adults: An Update from the American Society of Echocardiography and the European
48 Association of, Cardiovascular Imaging. *European heart journal cardiovascular Imaging.*
49 2016;17:412.

- 1 13. Cheitlin MD, Alpert JS, Armstrong WF, Aurigemma GP, Beller GA, Bierman FZ,
2 Davidson TW, Davis JL, Douglas PS and Gillam LD. ACC/AHA Guidelines for the Clinical
3 Application of Echocardiography. A report of the American College of Cardiology/American
4 Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Committee on Clinical Application of
5 Echocardiography). Developed in collaboration with the American Society of
6 Echocardiography. *Circulation*. 1997;95:1686-744.
- 7 14. Cheitlin MD, Armstrong WF, Aurigemma GP, Beller GA, Bierman FZ, Davis JL,
8 Douglas PS, Faxon DP, Gillam LD, Kimball TR, Kussmaul WG, Pearlman AS, Philbrick JT,
9 Rakowski H, Thys DM, Antman EM, Smith SC, Jr., Alpert JS, Gregoratos G, Anderson JL,
10 Hiratzka LF, Faxon DP, Hunt SA, Fuster V, Jacobs AK, Gibbons RJ and Russell RO.
11 ACC/AHA/ASE 2003 Guideline Update for the Clinical Application of Echocardiography:
12 summary article. A report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association
13 Task Force on Practice Guidelines (ACC/AHA/ASE Committee to Update the 1997 Guidelines
14 for the Clinical Application of Echocardiography). *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2003;16:1091-110.
- 15 15. Sievers HH and Schmidtke C. A classification system for the bicuspid aortic valve
16 from 304 surgical specimens. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2007;133:1226-33.
- 17 16. Bonow RO, Carabello BA, Chatterjee K, de Leon AC, Jr., Faxon DP, Freed MD, Gaasch
18 WH, Lytle BW, Nishimura RA, O'Gara PT, O'Rourke RA, Otto CM, Shah PM, Shanewise JS,
19 Smith SC, Jr., Jacobs AK, Adams CD, Anderson JL, Antman EM, Fuster V, Halperin JL,
20 Hiratzka LF, Hunt SA, Lytle BW, Nishimura R, Page RL and Riegel B. ACC/AHA 2006
21 guidelines for the management of patients with valvular heart disease: a report of the
22 American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice
23 Guidelines (writing Committee to Revise the 1998 guidelines for the management of patients
24 with valvular heart disease) developed in collaboration with the Society of Cardiovascular
25 Anesthesiologists endorsed by the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions
26 and the Society of Thoracic Surgeons. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2006;48:e1-148.
- 27 17. Kang JW, Song HG, Yang DH, Baek S, Kim DH, Song JM, Kang DH, Lim TH and Song
28 JK. Association between bicuspid aortic valve phenotype and patterns of valvular dysfunction
29 and bicuspid aortopathy: comprehensive evaluation using MDCT and echocardiography.
30 *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2013;6:150-61.
- 31 18. Erbel R, Aboyans V, Boileau C, Bossone E, Di Bartolomeo R, Eggebrecht H,
32 Evangelista A, Falk V, Frank H, Gaemperli O, Grabenwöger M, Haverich A, Iung B, Manolis
33 AJ, Meijboom F, Nienaber CA, Roffi M, Rousseau H, Sechtem U, Sirnes PA, von Allmen RS
34 and Vrints CJ. [2014 ESC Guidelines on the diagnosis and treatment of aortic diseases].
35 *Kardiol Pol*. 2014;72:1169-252.
- 36 19. Hiratzka LF, Creager MA, Isselbacher EM, Svensson LG, Nishimura RA, Bonow RO,
37 Guyton RA and Sundt TM, 3rd. Surgery for aortic dilatation in patients with bicuspid aortic
38 valves: A statement of clarification from the American College of Cardiology/American Heart
39 Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*.
40 2016;151:959-66.
- 41 20. Nataf P and Lansac E. Dilation of the thoracic aorta: medical and surgical
42 management. *Heart*. 2006;92:1345-52.
- 43 21. Fazel SS, Mallidi HR, Lee RS, Sheehan MP, Liang D, Fleischman D, Herfkens R,
44 Mitchell RS and Miller DC. The aortopathy of bicuspid aortic valve disease has distinctive
45 patterns and usually involves the transverse aortic arch. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*.
46 2008;135:901-7, 907 e1-2.
- 47 22. Huntley GD, Thaden JJ, Alsidawi S, Michelena HI, Maleszewski JJ, Edwards WD, Scott
48 CG, Pislaru SV, Pellikka PA, Greason KL, Ammash NM, Malouf JF, Enriquez-Sarano M and
49 Nkomo VT. Comparative study of bicuspid vs. tricuspid aortic valve stenosis. *Eur Heart J*
50 *Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2018;19:3-8.

- 1 23. McKellar SH, Michelena HI, Li Z, Schaff HV and Sundt TM, 3rd. Long-term risk of
2 aortic events following aortic valve replacement in patients with bicuspid aortic valves. *Am J*
3 *Cardiol.* 2010;106:1626-33.
- 4 24. Sievers HH, Stierle U, Hachmann RM and Charitos EI. New insights in the association
5 between bicuspid aortic valve phenotype, aortic configuration and valve haemodynamics.
6 *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2016;49:439-46.
- 7 25. Barker AJ, Markl M, Bürk J, Lorenz R, Bock J, Bauer S, Schulz-Menger J and von
8 Knobelsdorff-Brenkenhoff F. Bicuspid aortic valve is associated with altered wall shear stress
9 in the ascending aorta. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2012;5:457-66.
- 10 26. Verma S and Siu SC. Aortic dilatation in patients with bicuspid aortic valve. *N Engl J*
11 *Med.* 2014;370:1920-9.
- 12 27. Michelena HI, Della Corte A, Prakash SK, Milewicz DM, Evangelista A and Enriquez-
13 Sarano M. Bicuspid aortic valve aortopathy in adults: Incidence, etiology, and clinical
14 significance. *Int J Cardiol.* 2015;201:400-7.
- 15 28. Hope MD, Sigovan M, Wrenn SJ, Saloner D and Dyverfeldt P. MRI hemodynamic
16 markers of progressive bicuspid aortic valve-related aortic disease. *J Magn Reson Imaging.*
17 2014;40:140-5.
- 18 29. Pepe G, Nistri S, Giusti B, Sticchi E, Attanasio M, Porciani C, Abbate R, Bonow RO,
19 Yacoub M and Gensini GF. Identification of fibrillin 1 gene mutations in patients with
20 bicuspid aortic valve (BAV) without Marfan syndrome. *BMC Med Genet.* 2014;15:23.
- 21 30. Yetman AT, Starr L, Sanmann J, Wilde M, Murray M and Cramer JW. Clinical and
22 Echocardiographic Prevalence and Detection of Congenital and Acquired Cardiac
23 Abnormalities in Girls and Women with the Turner Syndrome. *Am J Cardiol.* 2018.
- 24 31. Bondy CA. Care of girls and women with Turner syndrome: a guideline of the Turner
25 Syndrome Study Group. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2007;92:10-25.
- 26 32. Carlson M and Silberbach M. Dissection of the aorta in Turner syndrome: two cases
27 and review of 85 cases in the literature. *BMJ Case Rep.* 2009;2009:bcr0620091998.
- 28 33. Soto-Navarrete MT, López-Unzu M, Durán AC and Fernández B. Embryonic
29 development of bicuspid aortic valves. *Prog Cardiovasc Dis.* 2020.
- 30 34. Carasso S, Cohen O, Mutlak D, Adler Z, Lessick J, Aronson D, Reisner SA, Rakowski
31 H, Bolotin G and Agmon Y. Relation of myocardial mechanics in severe aortic stenosis to left
32 ventricular ejection fraction and response to aortic valve replacement. *Am J Cardiol.*
33 2011;107:1052-7.
- 34 35. Kong WKF, Regeer MV, Poh KK, Yip JW, van Rosendaal PJ, Yeo TC, Tay E,
35 Kamperidis V, van der Velde ET, Mertens B, Ajmone Marsan N, Delgado V and Bax JJ. Inter-
36 ethnic differences in valve morphology, valvular dysfunction, and aortopathy between Asian
37 and European patients with bicuspid aortic valve. *Eur Heart J.* 2018;39:1308-1313.
- 38 36. Liu F, Yang YN, Xie X, Li XM, Ma X, Fu ZY, Chen BD, Huang Y, Shan CF, Ma YT and
39 Gao XM. Prevalence of Congenital Heart Disease in Xinjiang Multi-Ethnic Region of China.
40 *PLoS One.* 2015;10:e0133961.
- 41 37. Li Y, Wei X, Zhao Z, Liao Y, He J, Xiong T, Xu Y, Lv W, Ou Y, Tang H, Feng Y and
42 Chen M. Prevalence and Complications of Bicuspid Aortic Valve in Chinese According to
43 Echocardiographic Database. *Am J Cardiol.* 2017;120:287-291.

44

45

1 Figure legends:

2 Figure 1. Study Design.

3 Abbreviations: BAV: bicuspid aortic valve; Type 0: BAV with no raphe; Type 1 L-R: type 1

4 BAV with fusion between the left and right coronary cusp; Type 1 R-N: type 1 BAV with

5 fusion between the right and noncoronary cusp; Type 1 L-N: type 1 BAV with fusion

6 between the left and noncoronary cusp; m-s AS: moderate to severe aortic stenosis; AR \geq 2+:

7 aortic regurgitation \geq 2+; AAo: ascending aorta; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction;

8 EAE: early adverse event; ICU: intensive care unit.

9

1 Tables:

2 Table 1. Differences in demography, clinical characteristics, Sievers types, valvulopathy and aortopathy
3 between male and female BAV patients

Variables	Total (n = 992)	Male (n = 734)	Female (n = 258)	<i>P</i>
				<i>(male vs. female)</i>
Age (years)	50.32 ± 13.48	49.38 ± 13.15	52.99 ± 14.05	< 0.001 [#]
Height (cm)	167.95 ± 8.09	170.96 ± 6.54	159.39 ± 5.57	< 0.001 [#]
Weight (kg)	70.02 ± 12.23	72.73 ± 11.68	62.33 ± 10.33	< 0.001 [#]
Body surface area (m ²)	1.77 ± 0.19	1.82 ± 0.17	1.62 ± 0.15	< 0.001 [#]
Tobacco use (n, %)	416 (41.9%)	406 (55.3%)	10 (3.9%)	< 0.001 [#]
Coronary artery disease (n, %)	90 (9.1%)	68 (9.3%)	22 (8.5%)	0.723
Diabetes mellitus (n, %)	82 (8.3%)	61 (8.3%)	21 (8.2%)	0.940
Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)	123.04 ± 17.07	123.66 ± 17.10	121.26 ± 16.89	0.052
Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)	72.24 ± 12.82	71.93 ± 13.24	73.12 ± 11.51	0.171
Hypertension (n, %)	391 (39.4%)	302 (41.1%)	89 (34.5%)	0.060
<i>Serum Lipid Profile</i>				
Triglyceride (mmol/L)	1.27 (0.88, 1.83)	1.30 (0.90, 1.92)	1.18 (0.85, 1.73)	0.011 [#]
Total cholesterol (mmol/L)	4.42 ± 1.09	4.29 ± 1.06	4.78 ± 1.08	< 0.001 [#]
High density lipoprotein (mmol/L)	1.11 ± 0.31	1.05 ± 0.27	1.28 ± 0.33	< 0.001 [#]
Low density lipoprotein (mmol/L)	2.69 ± 0.83	2.61 ± 0.81	2.90 ± 0.85	< 0.001 [#]
<i>Cardiac morphology and performance</i>				
LVEDD (mm)	54.95 ± 11.05	57.54 ± 11.90	47.67 ± 6.92	< 0.001 [#]
LVESD (mm)	36.91 ± 10.37	39.05 ± 10.62	30.88 ± 6.61	< 0.001 [#]
BSA - indexed LVEDD (mm/m ²)	31.17 ± 8.29	31.16 ± 8.29	29.45 ± 5.35	< 0.001 [#]

BSA-indexed LVESD (mm/m ²)	21.15 ± 7.05	21.15 ± 7.05	19.07 ± 4.70	< 0.001 [#]
LVEF (%)	60.83 ± 9.86	59.79 ± 10.05	63.74 ± 8.67	< 0.001 [#]
<i>Sievers types (n, %)</i>				0.276
Type 0	242 (24.4%)	170 (23.2%)	72 (27.9%)	NC
Type 1	750 (75.6%)	564 (76.8%)	186 (72.1%)	NC
Type 1 L - R	587 (59.2%)	447 (60.9%)	140 (54.3%)	NC
Type 1 R-N	138 (13.9%)	98 (13.4%)	40 (15.5%)	NC
Type 1 L-N	25 (2.5%)	19 (2.6%)	6 (2.3%)	NC
<i>Valvulopathy (n, %)</i>	728 (73.4%)	549 (74.8%)	179 (69.4%)	< 0.001 [#]
Moderate to severe stenosis (m-s AS) only	274 (27.6%)	156 (21.3%)	118 (45.7%)	< 0.001 [#]
Regurgitation (AR) ≥ 2+ only	319 (32.2%)	286 (39.0%)	33 (12.8%)	< 0.001
m-s AS+AR ≥ 2+	135 (13.6%)	107 (14.6%)	28 (10.9%)	0.133
Normal or mild AS or AR	264 (26.6%)	185 (25.2%)	79 (30.6%)	0.090
<i>Aortic Dimensions</i>				
SOV (mm)	35.11 ± 6.74	36.51 ± 6.75	31.16 ± 4.90	< 0.001 [#]
AAo (mm)	43.93 ± 8.63	44.33 ± 8.67	42.81 ± 8.44	0.016 [#]
BSA - indexed SOV (mm/m ²)	19.93 ± 3.77	20.13 ± 3.91	19.37 ± 3.28	0.003 [#]
BSA - indexed AAo (mm/m ²)	25.04 ± 5.27	24.47 ± 5.05	26.65 ± 5.52	< 0.001 [#]
<i>Aortopathy (n, %)</i>	724 (73.0%)	553 (75.3%)	174 (67.4%)	< 0.001 [#]
Root dilation only (n, %)	30 (3%)	28 (3.8%)	2 (0.8%)	0.014 [#]
AAo dilation only (n, %)	497 (50.1%)	339 (46.2%)	158 (61.2%)	< 0.001 [#]
Diffuse aortic dilation (n, %)	197 (19.9%)	186 (25.3%)	11 (4.3%)	< 0.001 [#]
Normal	268 (27.0%)	181 (24.7%)	87 (33.7%)	0.005 [#]
Valvulopathy or aortopathy	919 (92.6%)	688 (93.7%)	231 (89.5%)	0.004 [#]

Valvulopathy and aortopathy 533 (53.7%) 414 (56.4%) 119 (46.1%) 0.026[#]

1 Data present as means ± standard deviation or median (interquartile range) or number (percentage).
 2 Abbreviations: BAV: bicuspid aortic valve; Type 0: BAV with no raphe; Type 1 L-R: type 1 BAV with fusion between the left and right
 3 coronary cusp; Type 1 R-N: type 1 BAV with fusion between the right and noncoronary cusp; Type 1 L-N: type 1 BAV with fusion between
 4 the left and noncoronary cusp; AS: aortic stenosis; AR: aortic regurgitation; BSA: body surface area; LVEDD: left ventricular end-diastolic
 5 dimension; LVESD: left ventricular end-systolic dimension; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction; SOV: sinus of Valsalva; AAo:
 6 ascending aorta; BSA - indexed SOV: SOV/BSA, BSA - indexed AAo: AAo/BSA. NC: not compared between sexes because there is no sex
 7 difference when doing Chi-square analysis to analyze the overall effect of sex on Sievers types. [#] *P* < 0.05.

Table 2. Demography and Clinical Characteristics in BAV patients with different Sievers types

Variables	Type 0 (n = 242)		Type 1 (n = 750)			<i>P</i> (different Sievers types)
			Type 1 L-R (n = 587)	Type 1 R-N (n = 138)	Type 1 L-N (n = 25)	
Age (years)	49.85 ± 13.60	50.60 ± 13.52	49.75 ± 13.33	51.44 ± 12.53	0.759	
Male (n, %)	170 (70.2%)	447 (76.1%)	98 (71.0%)	19 (76.0%)	0.276	
Height (cm)	167.29 ± 8.46	168.38 ± 7.62	167.04 ± 9.38	168.92 ± 7.15	0.503	
Weight (kg)	69.75 ± 12.86	70.25 ± 11.79	69.71 ± 12.60	68.92 ± 14.59	0.912	
Body surface area (m ²)	1.76 ± 0.20	1.77 ± 0.18	1.76 ± 0.20	1.76 ± 0.22	0.862	
Tobacco use (n, %)	103 (42.6%)	248 (42.2%)	52 (37.7%)	13 (52.0%)	0.546	
Coronary artery disease (n, %)	28 (11.6%)	47 (8.0%)	13 (9.4%)	2 (8.0%)	0.551	
Diabetes mellitus (n, %)	23 (9.5%)	45 (7.7%)	13 (9.4%)	1 (4.0%)	0.654	
Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)	122.50 ± 17.62	123.94 ± 16.70	122.41 ± 17.78	110.60 ± 10.87	< 0.001 [#]	
Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)	75.15 ± 12.78	71.33 ± 12.84	71.54 ± 12.45	69.40 ± 10.65	0.001 [#]	
Hypertension (n, %)	95 (39.3%)	241 (41.1%)	47 (34.1%)	8 (32.0%)	0.408	
Serum Lipid Profile						
Triglyceride (mmol/L)	1.22 (0.86, 1.77)	1.27 (0.88, 1.88)	1.30 (1.00, 1.76)	1.32 (0.80, 2.30)	0.682	

Total cholesterol (mmol/L)	4.40 ± 1.02	4.43 ± 1.12	4.44 ± 1.08	4.20 ± 0.85	0.679
High density lipoprotein (mmol/L)	1.11 ± 0.32	1.11 ± 0.30	1.10 ± 0.34	1.03 ± 0.29	0.458
Low density lipoprotein (mmol/L)	2.67 ± 0.79	2.71 ± 0.84	2.67 ± 0.88	2.53 ± 0.72	0.770
<i>Cardiac morphology and performance</i>					
LVEDD (mm)	53.17 ± 10.74	55.79 ± 11.39	55.08 ± 10.06	52.20 ± 9.16	0.004 [#]
LVESD (mm)	35.81 ± 10.38	37.58 ± 10.74	36.45 ± 8.89	34.82 ± 8.17	0.050
BSA - indexed LVEDD (mm/m ²)	30.19 ± 7.22	30.81 ± 8.16	31.37 ± 6.49	29.86 ± 5.27	0.006 [#]
BSA-indexed LVESD (mm/m ²)	20.35 ± 6.61	20.73 ± 6.91	20.66 ± 5.67	19.92 ± 4.84	0.109
LVEF (%)	60.90 ± 10.58	60.55 ± 10.00	61.91 ± 8.29	60.68 ± 6.97	0.621
<i>Valvulopathy (n, %)</i>					< 0.001 [#]
Moderate to severe stenosis (m-s AS) only	70 (28.9%)	166 (28.3%)	32 (23.2%)	6 (24.0%)	0.603
Regurgitation (AR) ≥ 2+ only	47 (19.4%)	219 (37.3%)	48 (34.8%)	5 (20.0%)	< 0.001 [#]
m-s AS+AR ≥ 2+	24 (9.9%)	81 (13.8%)	26 (18.8%)	4 (16.0%)	0.104
Normal or mild AS or AR	101 (41.7%)	121 (20.6%)	32 (23.2%)	10 (40.0%)	< 0.001 [#]
<i>Aortic Dimensions</i>					
SOV (mm)	33.39 ± 6.46	36.11 ± 6.86	33.84 ± 6.06	35.51 ± 6.05	< 0.001 [#]
AAo (mm)	44.30 ± 8.88	43.72 ± 8.77	44.10 ± 7.63	44.39 ± 8.64	0.221
BSA - indexed SOV (mm/m ²)	18.97 ± 3.81	20.46 ± 3.74	19.30 ± 3.29	20.42 ± 4.17	< 0.001 [#]
BSA - indexed AAO (mm/m ²)	25.26 ± 5.53	24.85 ± 5.31	25.35 ± 4.60	25.45 ± 5.24	0.119
<i>Aortopathy (n, %)</i>					0.001 [#]
Root dilation only (n, %)	3 (1.2%)	24 (4.1%)	2 (1.4%)	1 (4.0%)	0.105
AAo dilation only (n, %)	139 (57.4%)	262 (44.6%)	84 (60.9%)	12 (48.0%)	< 0.001 [#]
Diffuse aortic dilation (n, %)	33 (13.6%)	139 (23.7%)	20 (14.5%)	5 (20%)	0.003 [#]

Normal	67 (27.7%)	162 (27.6%)	32 (28.0%)	7 (28.0%)	0.755
Valvulopathy or aortopathy	209 (86.4%)	554 (94.4%)	113 (96.4%)	23 (92.0%)	< 0.001 [#]
Valvulopathy and aortopathy	107 (44.2)	337 (57.4%)	79 (57.2%)	10 (40.0%)	0.002 [#]

Data present as means \pm standard deviation or median (interquartile range) or number (percentage).

Abbreviations: BAV: bicuspid aortic valve; Type 0: BAV with no raphe; Type 1 L-R: type 1 BAV with fusion between the left and right coronary cusp; Type 1 R-N: type 1 BAV with fusion between the right and noncoronary cusp; Type 1 L-N: type 1 BAV with fusion between the left and noncoronary cusp; AS: aortic stenosis; AR: aortic regurgitation; BSA: body surface area; LVEDD: left ventricular end-diastolic dimension; LVESD: left ventricular end-systolic dimension; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction; SOV: sinus of Valsalva; AAo: ascending aorta; BSA - indexed SOV: SOV / BSA, BSA - indexed AAo: AAo / BSA. [#]*P* < 0.05.

Table 3. Risk factors for BAV Valvulopathy

Variable	Total						Male						Female					
	Moderate to severe stenosis (m-s AS) only (OR, CI, P)	Regurgitation (AR) ≥ 2+ only (OR, CI, P)	m-s AS+AR ≥ 2+ (OR, CI, P)		Moderate to severe stenosis (m-s AS) only (OR, CI, P)	Regurgitation (AR) ≥ 2+ only (OR, CI, P)	m-s AS+AR ≥ 2+ (OR, CI, P)		Moderate to severe stenosis (m-s AS) only (OR, CI, P)	Regurgitation (AR) ≥ 2+ only (OR, CI, P)	m-s AS+AR ≥ 2+ (OR, CI, P)							
Age	1.038, 1.022–1.055, 0.000 [#]	0.987, 0.972–1.001, 0.074	1.013, 0.994–1.032, 0.181		1.046, 1.025–1.068, 0.000 [#]	0.991, 0.974–1.008, 0.282	1.005, 0.984–1.027, 0.633		1.033, 1.007–1.059, 0.011 [#]	0.971, 0.940–1.003, 0.073	1.045, 1.004–1.088, 0.033 [#]							
Body surface area	0.148, 0.044–0.493, 0.002 [#]	0.491, 0.157–1.531, 0.220	0.044, 0.011–0.185, 0.000 [#]		0.085, 0.019–0.378, 0.001 [#]	0.549, 0.161–1.874, 0.339	0.049, 0.010–0.239, 0.000 [#]		0.352, 0.042–2.931, 0.334	0.203, 0.010–3.992, 0.294	0.036, 0.001–0.926, 0.045 [#]							
Systolic blood pressure	1.002, 0.991–1.014, 0.690	1.017, 1.006–1.028, 0.003 [#]	1.000, 0.986–1.013, 0.956		1.006, 0.992–1.020, 0.397	1.018, 1.006–1.031, 0.004 [#]	0.996, 0.980–1.012, 0.599		0.996, 0.976–1.016, 0.684	1.008, 0.980–1.037, 0.586	1.006, 0.978–1.035, 0.670							
Triglyceride	0.931, 0.786–1.102, 0.407	0.953, 0.810–1.121, 0.562	0.978, 0.802–1.193, 0.829		0.954, 0.770–1.181, 0.663	0.967, 0.812–1.150, 0.702	0.970, 0.768–1.223, 0.794		0.902, 0.680–1.196, 0.473	0.840, 0.492–1.435, 0.524	0.947, 0.621–1.444, 0.801							
Total cholesterol	1.060, 0.880–1.277, 0.540	0.916, 0.760–1.104, 0.358	1.174, 0.943–1.461, 0.152		1.077, 0.844–1.374, 0.551	0.967, 0.783–1.194, 0.757	1.201, 0.929–1.553, 0.162		1.022, 0.757–1.380, 0.885	0.742, 0.484–1.137, 0.171	1.015, 0.647–1.593, 0.947							
Male	1.130, 0.671–1.903, 0.645	4.358, 2.452–7.745, 0.000 [#]	2.757, 1.430–5.316, 0.002 [#]		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A							

Sievers types							*	*	*
Sievers types 0	1.039, 0.340–	0.714, 0.217–	0.680, 0.186–	1.238, 0.315–	0.846, 0.222–	0.510, 0.125–			
	3.177, 0.947	2.352, 0.580	2.491, 0.561	4.871, 0.760	3.225, 0.807	2.071, 0.346			
Sievers type 1 L - R	2.261, 0.756–	2.943, 0.932–	1.920, 0.550–	2.183, 0.571–	2.878, 0.787–	1.422, 0.375–			
	6.763, 0.144	9.293, 0.066	6.696, 0.306	8.347, 0.254	10.523, 0.110	5.397, 0.605			
Sievers type 1 R-N	1.343, 0.409–	2.633, 0.772–	2.243, 0.593–	0.882, 0.198–	2.334, 0.587–	1.588, 0.377–			
	4.405, 0.627	8.974, 0.122	8.483, 0.234	3.937, 0.869	9.277, 0.228	6.690, 0.528			
Aortopathy							*	*	*
Root dilation only	0.843, 0.212–	2.204, 0.757–	*	0.821, 0.176–	2.088, 0.705–	*			
(n, %)	3.361, 0.809	6.414, 0.147		3.825, 0.802	6.183, 0.184				
AAo dilation only	1.274, 0.822–	0.834, 0.528–	2.126, 1.170–	1.614, 0.906–	0.897, 0.533–	2.164, 1.061–			
(n, %)	1.973, 0.278	1.320, 0.439	3.864, 0.013 [#]	2.875, 0.104	1.508, 0.681	4.414, 0.034 [#]			
Diffuse aortic dilation	0.252, 0.121–	1.415, 0.827–	2.478, 1.214–	0.350, 0.156–	1.480, 0.833–	2.837, 1.288–			
(n, %)	0.525, 0.000 [#]	2.422, 0.205	5.059, 0.013 [#]	0.784, 0.011 [#]	2.631, 0.181	6.251, 0.010 [#]			

Abbreviations: Type 0: BAV with no raphe; Type 1 L-R: type 1 BAV with fusion between the left and right coronary cusp; Type 1 R-N: type 1 BAV with fusion between the right and noncoronary cusp; BAV:

bicuspid aortic valve; AS: aortic stenosis; AR: aortic regurgitation; AAo: ascending aorta. * Limited number of patients for data analysis. [#] $P < 0.05$. In analysis for male and female, sex has not been included as an independent factor.

Table 4. Risk factors for BAV aortopathy

Variable	Total			Male			Female	
	Root dilation only (OR, CI, P)	AAo dilation only (OR, CI, P)	Diffuse aortic dilation (OR, CI, P)	Root dilation only (OR, CI, P)	AAo dilation only (OR, CI, P)	Diffuse aortic dilation (OR, CI, P)	AAo dilation only (OR, CI, P)	Diffuse aortic dilation (OR, CI, P)
Age	0.991, 0.956–1.026, 0.601	1.037, 1.023–1.050, 0.000 [#]	1.050, 1.032–1.069, 0.000 [#]	0.991, 0.955–1.029, 0.651	1.033, 1.017–1.049, 0.000 [#]	1.049, 1.029–1.069, 0.000 [#]	1.047, 1.021–1.073, 0.000 [#]	1.052, 0.991–1.118, 0.098
Body surface area	21.551, 1.608– 288.773, 0.020 [#]	5.751, 2.037– 16.237, 0.001 [#]	37.554, 9.783– 144.163, 0.000 [#]	18.416, 1.214– 279.353, 0.036 [#]	7.243, 2.134– 24.588, 0.001 [#]	45.402, 10.638– 193.951, 0.000 [#]	4.124, 0.523– 32.501, 0.179	33.767, 0.191– 5971.859, 0.183
Systolic blood pressure	0.989, 0.965–1.015, 0.413	0.991, 0.982–1.001, 0.076	0.997, 0.985–1.010, 0.658	0.984, 0.957–1.011, 0.241	0.989, 0.977–1.000, 0.056	0.996, 0.983–1.009, 0.554	0.997, 0.978–1.016, 0.730	1.013, 0.963–1.066, 0.626
No tobacco	0.541, 0.213–1.375, 0.197	0.971, 0.657–1.434, 0.881	1.019, 0.645–1.610, 0.936	0.539, 0.209–1.391, 0.201	0.954, 0.636–1.429, 0.818	1.042, 0.655–1.656, 0.863	1.011, 0.171–5.966, 0.990	0.085, 0.002–3.464, 0.193
Triglyceride	1.177, 0.914–1.516, 0.206	0.910, 0.789–1.049, 0.195	0.881, 0.730–1.064, 0.188	1.198, 0.916–1.568, 0.186	0.914, 0.768–1.098, 0.315	0.909, 0.745–1.108, 0.345	0.895, 0.687–1.166, 0.412	0.157, 0.022–1.105, 0.063
Total cholesterol	0.843, 0.572–1.244, 0.390	1.009, 0.862–1.181, 0.914	1.006, 0.813–1.245, 0.955	0.819, 0.538–1.248, 0.353	1.056, 0.868–1.285, 0.586	1.042, 0.826–1.315, 0.728	0.889, 0.669–1.180, 0.414	1.055, 0.414–2.688, 0.911
<i>Sievers types</i>								

Sievers types 0	0.443, 0.037–5.326, 0.521	1.492, 0.537–4.143, 0.442	0.833, 0.220–3.160, 0.788	0.494, 0.039–6.204, 0.585	1.715, 0.513–5.740, 0.381	1.170, 0.263–5.208, 0.837	0.918, 0.114–7.379, 0.936	0.252, 0.007–8.865, 0.448
Sievers type 1 L - R	1.065, 0.112– 10.145, 0.956	1.069, 0.395–2.890, 0.896	1.261, 0.351–4.536, 0.722	1.020, 0.102– 10.181, 0.986	1.096, 0.340–3.528, 0.878	1.616, 0.386–6.776, 0.511	0.798, 0.103–6.188, 0.829	0.633, 0.024– 16.905, 0.785
Sievers type 1 R-N	0.246, 0.013–4.837, 0.356	1.885, 0.650–5.462, 0.243	0.849, 0.211–3.422, 0.819	0.280, 0.014–5.766, 0.409	2.200, 0.620–7.813, 0.223	1.198, 0.252–5.697, 0.821	1.221, 0.142– 10.492, 0.855	0.388, 0.009– 16.273, 0.619
Valvulopathy								
Moderate to severe stenosis (m-s AS) only	0.905, 0.227–3.615, 0.888	1.303, 0.843–2.014, 0.234	0.242, 0.116–0.509, 0.000 [#]	0.818, 0.178–3.757, 0.796	1.574, 0.885–2.796, 0.122	0.338, 0.151–0.759, 0.009 [#]	1.062, 0.521–2.163, 0.868	* *
Regurgitation (AR) ≥ 2+ only	2.431, 0.820–7.210, 0.109	0.852, 0.540–1.342, 0.489	1.437, 0.840–2.457, 0.186	2.275, 0.748–6.917, 0.147	0.886, 0.528–1.486, 0.646	1.505, 0.846–2.679, 0.165	0.878, 0.303–2.543, 0.811	0.924, 0.154–5.553, 0.931
m-s AS+AR ≥ 2+	* 0.198	2.030, 1.122–3.675, 0.019	2.402, 1.182–4.881, 0.015 [#]	* 0.051	2.015, 0.997–4.072, 0.013 [#]	2.694, 1.231–5.895, 0.198	2.142, 0.672–6.828, 0.343, 0.015–7.799, 0.502	
Male	1.815, 0.345–9.553, 0.482	1.067, 0.681–1.672, 0.778	3.868, 1.784–8.385, 0.001 [#]	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Abbreviations: Type 0: BAV with no raphe; Type 1 L-R: type 1 BAV with fusion between the left and right coronary cusp; Type 1 R-N: type 1 BAV with fusion between the right and noncoronary cusp; BAV: bicuspid aortic valve; AS: aortic stenosis; AR: aortic regurgitation. AAO: ascending aorta. * Limited number of patients for data analysis. And there are too fewer female patients with root dilation only to do any analysis. [#] $P < 0.05$. In analysis for male and female, sex has not been included as an independent factor.

Table 5. Summary of pre-, intra- and postoperative characteristics and outcomes of BAV patients underwent AVR

Variables	Total (n = 658)	Male (n = 494)	Female (n = 164)	P
Preoperative				
Age (years)	50.09 ± 12.94	48.74 ± 12.73	55.34 ± 11.20	< 0.001 [#]
Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)	123.92 ± 17.11	124.39 ± 16.53	122.12 ± 17.79	0.134
Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)	71.41 ± 12.81	70.94 ± 13.35	73.30 ± 11.07	0.026 [#]
Body surface area (m ²)	1.77 ± 0.18	1.82 ± 0.16	1.62 ± 0.15	< 0.001 [#]
LVEDD (mm)	55.87 ± 10.79	58.42 ± 10.66	48.32 ± 7.00	< 0.001 [#]
LVESD (mm)	37.23 ± 9.44	39.18 ± 9.55	31.47 ± 6.22	< 0.001 [#]
LVEF (%)	61.41 ± 8.54	60.67 ± 8.57	63.67 ± 8.18	< 0.001 [#]
<i>Valvulopathy (n, %)</i>				< 0.001 [#]
Moderate to severe stenosis (m-s AS) only	220 (33.4%)	119 (24.1%)	101 (61.6%)	< 0.001 [#]
Regurgitation (AR) ≥ 2+ only	248 (37.7%)	223 (45.1%)	25 (15.2%)	< 0.001 [#]
m-s AS+AR ≥ 2+	105 (16.0%)	85 (17.2%)	20 (12.2%)	0.141
<i>Sievers types (n, %)</i>				0.396
Type 0	134 (20.4%)	97 (19.6%)	37 (22.6%)	
Type 1 L-R	408 (62.0%)	315 (63.8%)	93 (56.7%)	
Type 1 R-N	98 (14.9%)	69 (14.0%)	29 (17.7%)	
Type 1 L-N	18 (2.7%)	13 (2.6%)	5 (3.0%)	
<i>BAV Aortopathy (n, %)</i>				< 0.001 [#]
Root dilation only	20 (3.0%)	19 (3.8%)	1 (0.6%)	0.036 [#]
AAo dilation only	332 (50.5%)	226 (45.7%)	106 (64.6%)	< 0.001 [#]
Diffuse aortic dilation	154 (23.4%)	147 (29.8%)	7 (4.3%)	< 0.001 [#]
Normal	152 (23.1%)	102 (20.6%)	50 (30.5%)	

Drug use

ACEI/ARB (n, %)	104 (15.8%)	83 (16.8%)	21 (12.8%)	0.224
Myocardial nourishment (n, %)	166 (25.2%)	127 (25.7%)	39 (23.8%)	0.622
β -blocker (n, %)	107 (16.3%)	77 (15.6%)	30 (18.3%)	0.416

Intraoperative

Operation hours (hour)	4 (4, 5)	4 (4, 5)	4.5 (4, 5)	0.622
Blood loss (ml)	800 (600, 1100)	800 (600, 1200)	800 (600, 1000)	0.674
Intraoperative blood products (ml)	600 (300, 900)	567 (300, 900)	600 (300, 1000)	0.051
Cardiopulmonary bypass time (minutes)	117 (93, 152.25)	117 (93.75, 146.25)	117 (92.25, 158.75)	0.995
Aortic cross clamp time (minutes)	79 (61.75, 103)	79 (61, 103.25)	77 (62, 102)	0.769
Aortic valve implant size (mm)	22.70 \pm 2.06	23.29 \pm 1.73	20.99 \pm 2.05	< 0.001 [#]
Ascending aortic replacement (%)	310 (47.1%)	248 (50.2%)	62 (37.8%)	0.006 [#]
CABG (%)	52 (7.9%)	42 (8.7%)	10 (6.1%)	0.323

Postoperative

Total ICU hours (hours)	21 (18, 26)	21 (18, 26)	21 (19, 29.74)	0.042 [#]
Total ICU hours > 24 hours (n, %)	210 (31.9%)	147 (29.8)	63 (38.4)	0.039 [#]
Postoperative LVEDD (mm)	48.57 \pm 7.63	50.14 \pm 7.79	43.77 \pm 4.60	< 0.001 [#]
Postoperative LVESD (mm)	33.25 \pm 7.89	34.72 \pm 8.14	28.77 \pm 4.96	< 0.001 [#]
Postoperative LVEF (%)	58.04 \pm 10.26	57.03 \pm 10.11	60.83 \pm 10.66	< 0.001 [#]

Postoperative LVEF change

Postoperative LVEF change (%)	-2 (-9, 3)	-2.5 (-9, 2)	-1 (-8, 3)	0.215
Postoperative LVEF < 50% (n, %)	86 (13.1%)	80 (16.2%)	6 (3.7%)	< 0.001 [#]
Postoperative LVEF increase > 5%	114 (17.3%)	79 (16%)	35 (21.3%)	0.117
Postoperative LVEF increase > 10%	41 (6.2%)	25 (5.1%)	16 (9.8%)	0.031 [#]

Postoperative LVEF decrease > 5%	273 (41.5%)	205 (41.5%)	68 (41.5%)	0.994
Postoperative LVEF decrease > 10%	139 (21.1%)	109 (22.1%)	30 (18.3%)	0.305
Total length of stay (days)	15 (12, 20)	15 (12, 19)	15 (12, 21)	0.273
Postoperative length of stay (days)	7 (6, 10)	7 (6, 10)	8 (7, 11)	0.044 [#]
Postoperative length of stay > 7 days (n, %)	324 (49.2)	231 (46.8)	93 (56.7)	0.027 [#]
EAE (n, %)				
Myocardial infarction	5 (0.8%)	5 (1.0%)	0 (0%)	0.339
Ventricular fibrillation	30 (4.6%)	21 (4.3%)	9 (5.5%)	0.519
Acute heart failure	14 (2.1%)	10 (2.0%)	4 (2.4%)	0.757
Postoperative death	12 (1.8%)	9 (1.8%)	3 (1.8%)	1.000
Use of ECMO or IABP	15 (2.3%)	12 (2.4%)	3 (1.8%)	1.000
Renal failure	5 (0.8%)	5 (1.0%)	0 (0%)	0.339
Stroke	12 (1.8%)	9 (1.8%)	3 (1.8%)	1.000
Reoperation for bleeding	39 (5.9%)	26 (5.3%)	13 (7.9%)	0.211

Data present as means ± standard deviation or median (interquartile range) or number (percentage).

Abbreviations: AS: aortic stenosis; AR: aortic regurgitation; AAo: ascending aorta; BAV: bicuspid aortic valve; Type 0: BAV with no raphe; Type 1 L-R: type 1 BAV with fusion between the left and right coronary cusp; Type 1 R-N: type 1 BAV with fusion between the right and noncoronary cusp; Type 1 L-N: type 1 BAV with fusion between the left and noncoronary cusp; CABG: coronary artery bypass grafting; ICU: intensive care unit; LVEDD: left ventricular end-diastolic dimension; LVESD: left ventricular end-systolic dimension; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction; EAE: early adverse event; ECMO: extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; IABP: intra-aortic balloon pump. [#] $P < 0.05$.

Table 6. Factors related to post-OP EAE, postoperative LVEF < 50%, total ICU hours > 24 hours and Postoperative length of stay > 7 days

Variables	Cox regression: EAE		Logistic regression: postoperative LVEF<50%		Total ICU hours > 24 hours		Postoperative length of stay > 7 days	
	Univariable	Multivariable	Univariable	Multivariable	Univariable	Multivariable	Univariable	Multivariable
	analysis (HR, CI, P)	analysis (HR, CI, P)	analysis (OR, CI, P)	analysis (OR, CI, P)	analysis (OR, CI, P)	analysis (OR, CI, P)	analysis (OR, CI, P)	analysis (OR, CI, P)
Male	1.542, 0.875–	1.213, 0.742–1.982,	3.358, 1.135–	3.071, 1.096–8.606,	0.650, 0.406–	0.710, 0.479–1.053,	0.754, 0.485–	0.791, 0.533–
	2.717, 0.134	0.441	9.936, 0.029	0.033 [#]	1.043, 0.074	0.089	1.173, 0.210	1.173, 0.243
Age	1.028, 1.007–	1.030, 1.011–1.050,	1.006, 0.981–		1.019, 1.004–	1.018, 1.003–1.033,	1.003, 0.989–	
	1.049, 0.008	0.002 [#]	1.031, 0.648		1.036, 0.017	0.015 [#]	1.017, 0.645	
Body surface area	0.439, 0.107–		0.740, 0.132–		2.119, 0.681–		1.355, 0.484–	
	1.799, 0.253		4.160, 0.740		6.597, 0.195		3.789, 0.563	
Systolic blood pressure	0.995, 0.983–		0.977, 0.955–	0.976, 0.955–0.999,	1.000, 0.989–		0.990, 0.980–	0.990, 0.981–1.000,
	1.009, 0.500		1.000, 0.046	0.037 [#]	1.010, -0.930		1.000, 0.404	0.047 [#]
Valvulopathy								
Moderate to severe stenosis (m-s AS) only	0.784, 0.405–		0.785, 0.204–	0.805, 0.213–3.052,	0.904, 0.498–		1.837, 1.052–	1.846, 1.074–3.172,
	1.518, 0.471		3.014, 0.724	0.750	1.639, 0.739		3.207, 0.032	0.027 [#]

Regurgitation (AR) ≥ 2+ only	0.843, 0.416– 1.708, 0.635		3.031, 0.919– 9.990, 0.068	2.895, 0.903–9.287, 0.074	0.750, 0.417– 1.348, 0.337		1.060, 0.623– 1.802, 0.830	1.060, 0.628–1.790, 0.827
m-s AS+AR≥ 2+	0.773, 0.359– 1.661, 0.509		1.335, 0.360– 4.950, 0.666	1.340, 0.368–4.877, 0.657	0.953, 0.496– 1.832, 0.885		0.977, 0.535– 1.786, 0.941	0.961, 0.530–1.745, 0.897
<i>BAV Aortopathy</i>								
Root dilation only	0.626, 0.080– 4.887, 0.655		1.526, 0.338– 6.890, 0.583	1.453, 0.326–6.470, 0.624	1.509, 0.527– 4.326, 0.444		1.260, 0.477– 3.329, 0.641	
AAo dilation only	1.480, 0.799– 2.740, 0.213		1.708, 0.769– 3.793, 0.188	1.751, 0.808–3.794, 0.156	0.834, 0.513– 1.356, 0.464		0.990, 0.634– 1.545, 0.963	
Diffuse aortic dilation	0.867, 0.382– 1.968, 0.732		2.843, 1.179– 6.860, 0.020	2.899, 1.257–6.683, 0.013 [#]	0.620, 0.332– 1.159, 0.134		0.978, 0.560– 1.707, 0.938	
Preoperative LVEF	1.003, 0.978– 1.028, 0.828		0.873, 0.844– 0.903, 0.000	0.873, 0.845–0.902, 0.000 [#]	0.986, 0.966– 1.007, 0.199		0.999, 0.979– 1.018, 0.892	
Ascending aortic replacement	0.944, 0.587– 1.518, 0.813		2.176, 1.159– 4.088, 0.016	2.154, 1.153–4.027, 0.016 [#]	0.857, 0.572– 1.282, 0.452		0.552, 0.381– 0.800, 0.002	0.552, 0.395–0.772, 0.001 [#]
Aortic cross clamp time	1.012, 1.008– 1.016, 0.000	1.012, 1.008–1.015, 0.000 [#]	1.012, 1.006– 1.019, 0.000	1.012, 1.006–1.019, 0.000 [#]	1.015, 1.010– 1.021, 0.000	1.015, 1.011–1.020, 0.000 [#]	1.005, 1.001– 1.010, 0.023	1.005, 1.001–1.010, 0.021 [#]

Abbreviations: AS: aortic stenosis; AR: aortic regurgitation; AAo: ascending aorta; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction; EAE: early adverse event. [#] $P < 0.05$.

Table 7. Factors related to postoperative LVEF changes

Variables	Logistic regression: postoperative LVEF increase > 5%		Logistic regression: postoperative LVEF increase > 10%		Logistic regression: postoperative LVEF decrease > 5%		Logistic regression: postoperative LVEF decrease > 10%	
	Univariable analysis (OR, CI, P)	Multivariable analysis (OR, CI, P)	Univariable analysis (OR, CI, P)	Multivariable analysis (OR, CI, P)	Univariable analysis (OR, CI, P)	Multivariable analysis (OR, CI, P)	Univariable analysis (OR, CI, P)	Multivariable analysis (OR, CI, P)
	Male	0.757, 0.411–1.395, 0.372	0.696, 0.402–1.205, 0.195	0.491, 0.189–1.280, 0.146	0.446, 0.188–1.060, 0.067	0.865, 0.538–1.392, 0.551	0.884, 0.581–1.346, 0.565	1.054, 0.587–1.891, 0.861
Age	0.998, 0.978–1.019, 0.870		1.010, 0.974–1.047, 0.592		0.994, 0.979–1.009, 0.447		0.996, 0.979–1.014, 0.654	
Body surface area	0.950, 0.227–3.970, 0.944		1.280, 0.133–12.295, 0.831		0.882, 0.288–2.706, 0.827		0.455, 0.119–1.745, 0.251	
Systolic blood pressure	0.984, 0.970–0.997, 0.020	0.984, 0.970–0.997, 0.017 [#]	0.981, 0.959–1.003, 0.093	0.981, 0.959–1.003, 0.084	1.005, 0.994–1.016, 0.355		1.009, 0.996–1.022, 0.194	
Preoperative LVEF	0.877, 0.851–0.904, 0.000	0.880, 0.854–0.906, 0.000 [#]	0.849, 0.811–0.888, 0.000	0.855, 0.819–0.892, 0.000 [#]	1.121, 1.091–1.152, 0.000	1.120, 1.091–1.150, 0.000 [#]	1.110, 1.076–1.145, 0.000	1.110, 1.075–1.145, 0.000 [#]

Valvulopathy

Moderate to severe stenosis (m-s AS) only	2.552, 1.143–5.698, 0.022	2.559, 1.173–5.583, 0.018 [#]	1.533, 0.429–5.476, 0.511	1.621, 0.484–5.429, 0.434	0.051, 0.302–1.003, 0.051	0.576, 0.327–1.013, 0.056	0.402, 0.183–0.882, 0.023	0.437, 0.206–0.925, 0.030 [#]
Regurgitation (AR) ≥ 2+ only	0.665, 0.290–1.523, 0.334	0.670, 0.295–1.520, 0.338	0.299, 0.068–1.319, 0.111	0.277, 0.069–1.105, 0.069	2.229, 1.262–3.937, 0.006	2.486, 1.439–4.298, 0.001 [#]	2.913, 1.463–5.799, 0.002	3.172, 1.635–6.155, 0.001 [#]
m-s AS+AR ≥ 2+	1.048, 0.422–2.607, 0.919	0.996, 0.406–2.444, 0.992	0.699, 0.160–3.050, 0.634	0.655, 0.156–2.747, 0.563	1.294, 0.680–2.462, 0.432	1.389, 0.741–2.606, 0.305	1.768, 0.824–3.792, 0.144	1.915, 0.909–4.037, 0.088
<i>BAV Aortopathy</i>								
Root dilation only	0.715, 0.171–2.988, 0.646		*		1.080, 0.383–3.045, 0.885		0.824, 0.236–2.877, 0.761	
AAo dilation only	0.634, 0.336–1.198, 0.161		0.987, 0.363–2.684, 0.980		1.362, 0.842–2.206, 0.208		1.010, 0.574–1.780, 0.971	
Diffuse aortic dilation	0.469, 0.202–1.087, 0.078		0.419, 0.094–1.867, 0.254		1.665, 0.914–3.033, 0.096		1.058, 0.534–2.098, 0.871	
Ascending aortic replacement	0.472, 0.273–0.817, 0.007	0.604, 0.376–0.971, 0.037 [#]	0.609, 0.255–1.455, 0.264		1.418, 0.949–2.117, 0.088		1.158, 0.720–1.863, 0.546	
Aortic cross clamp time	0.998, 0.992–1.004, 0.583		0.995, 0.986–1.004, 0.286		1.005, 1.000–1.010, 0.060	1.004, 1.000–1.009, 0.078	1.007, 1.002–1.013, 0.009	1.007, 1.001–1.012, 0.017 [#]

Abbreviations: AS: aortic stenosis; AR: aortic regurgitation; AAo: ascending aorta; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction. * There are too few patients to do the analysis. [#]*P* < 0.05.

1 **Supplementary tables:**

2

3

Table 1. Risk factors for BAV Valvulopathy (use hypertension instead of systolic blood pressure)

Variable	Moderate to severe stenosis (m-s AS) only (OR, CI, P)	Regurgitation (AR) \geq 2+ only (OR, CI, P)	m-s AS+AR \geq 2+ (OR, CI, P)
Age	1.039, 1.022–1.055, 0.000 [#]	0.983, 0.969–0.998, 0.026	1.010, 0.991–1.028, 0.316
Body surface area	0.143, 0.042–0.484, 0.002 [#]	0.494, 0.161–1.518, 0.218	0.043, 0.010–0.183, 0.000 [#]
Hypertension	0.995, 0.671–1.478, 0.982	0.975, 0.661–1.438, 0.899	1.205, 0.747–1.946, 0.444
No Tobacco	1.152, 0.729–1.820, 0.544	1.755, 1.170–2.631, 0.007 [#]	1.021, 0.612–1.704, 0.937
Triglyceride	0.931, 0.786–1.103, 0.441	0.935, 0.797–1.097, 0.409	0.968, 0.794–1.180, 0.748
Total cholesterol	1.061, 0.883–1.274, 0.530	0.918, 0.765–1.100, 0.354	1.159, 0.933–1.440, 0.183
<i>Sievers types</i>			
Sievers types 0	1.095, 0.362–3.312, 0.872	0.901, 0.278–2.921, 0.862	0.671, 0.186–2.414, 0.541
Sievers type 1 L - R	2.373, 0.801–7.030, 0.119	3.514, 1.126–10.967, 0.030	1.817, 0.530–6.232, 0.342
Sievers type 1 R–N	1.424, 0.438–4.626, 0.557	3.099, 0.922–10.420, 0.067	2.102, 0.565–7.821, 0.268
<i>Aortopathy</i>			
Root dilation only (n, %)	0.847, 0.213–3.366, 0.814	1.865, 0.651–5.340, 0.246	*

AAo dilation only (n, %)	1.287, 0.832–2.785, 0.257	0.754, 0.481–1.180, 0.216	1.939, 0.027	1.078–3.489,
Diffuse aortic dilation (n, %)	0.253, 0.121–0.527, 0.000 [#]	1.4247, 0.736–2.110, 0.412	2.214, 0.027 [#]	1.097–4.468,
Male	1.139, 0.678–1.914, 0.622	4.669, 0.264–8.239, 0.000 [#]	2.794, 0.002 [#]	1.454–5.371,

- 1 Abbreviations: Type 0: BAV with no raphe; Type 1 L-R: type 1 BAV with fusion between the left and right coronary cusp; Type 1 R-N: type 1
- 2 BAV with fusion between the right and noncoronary cusp; BAV: bicuspid aortic valve; AS: aortic stenosis; AR: aortic regurgitation. AAo:
- 3 ascending aorta. * There are too few patients to do the analysis. [#]*P* < 0.05.
- 4

1 Table 2. Risk factors for BAV Valvulopathy in male (use hypertension instead of systolic blood pressure)

Variable	Moderate to severe stenosis (m-s AS) only (OR, CI, P)	Regurgitation (AR) \geq 2+ only (OR, CI, P)	m-s AS+AR \geq 2+ (OR, CI, P)
Age	1.048, 1.026–1.070, 0.000 [#]	0.985, 0.969–1.002, 0.085	1.002, 0.981–1.024, 0.829
Body surface area	0.086, 0.019–0.389, 0.001 [#]	0.495, 0.146–1.677, 0.259	0.047, 0.009–0.232, 0.000 [#]
Hypertension	0.944, 0.582–1.533, 0.817	0.872, 0.571–1.331, 0.526	1.336, 0.772–2.314, 0.301
No Tobacco	1.295, 0.800–2.096, 0.293	1.936, 1.282–2.922, 0.002 [#]	1.118, 0.659–1.897, 0.678
Triglyceride	0.963, 0.780–1.189, 0.727	0.945, 0.797–1.121, 0.561	0.955, 0.758–1.203, 0.695
Total cholesterol	1.081, 0.852–1.370, 0.522	0.971, 0.790–1.193, 0.780	1.196, 0.926–1.543, 0.170
<i>Sievers types</i>			
Sievers types 0	1.302, 0.336–5.044, 0.702	1.081, 0.288–4.058, 0.908	0.484, 0.121–1.942, 0.306
Sievers type 1 L - R	2.296, 0.609–8.651, 0.220	3.646, 1.010–13.161, 0.048	1.310, 0.350–4.907, 0.689
Sievers type 1 R–N	0.928, 0.211–4.075, 0.921	2.962, 0.756–11.604, 0.119	1.442, 0.347–5.992, 0.614
<i>Aortopathy</i>			
Root dilation only (n, %)	0.819, 0.176–3.812, 0.799	1.770, 0.606–5.166, 0.296	*
AAo dilation only (n, %)	1.596, 0.898–2.836, 0.111	0.828, 0.497–1.380, 0.470	1.998, 0.990–4.033, 0.053

Diffuse aortic dilation	0.351, 0.157–0.784, 0.011	1.345, 0.763–2.371, 0.305	2.568, 1.179–5.593,
(n, %)			0.018 [#]


1 Abbreviations: Type 0: BAV with no raphe; Type 1 L-R: type 1 BAV with fusion between the left and right coronary cusp; Type 1 R-N: type 1
2 BAV with fusion between the right and noncoronary cusp; BAV: bicuspid aortic valve; AS: aortic stenosis; AR: aortic regurgitation. AAo:
3 ascending aorta. * There are too few patients to do the analysis. [#]*P* < 0.05.

4

5

1 Figure

2 Figure 1. Study Design.



3

4 Abbreviations: BAV: bicuspid aortic valve; Type 0: BAV with no raphe; Type 1 L-R: type 1 BAV with fusion

5 between the left and right coronary cusp; Type 1 R-N: type 1 BAV with fusion between the right and noncoronary

6 cusp; Type 1 L-N: type 1 BAV with fusion between the left and noncoronary cusp; m-s AS: moderate to severe

7 aortic stenosis; AR \geq 2+: aortic regurgitation \geq 2+; AAo: ascending aorta; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction;

8 EAE: early adverse event; ICU: intensive care unit.

9