

Comparison of various transcatheter aortic valves for aortic stenosis – a network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials.

Emily Hiltner, MD<sup>1</sup>, Monarch Shah, MD<sup>2</sup>, Derek Schwabe-Warf, MD<sup>1</sup>, Bruce Haik, MD<sup>1</sup>, Abdul Hakeem, MD<sup>1</sup>, Mark Russo, MD<sup>1</sup>, Ankur Sethi, MD<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Robert Wood Johnson University Hospital, New Brunswick, NJ

<sup>2</sup>St. Peter's University Hospital, New Brunswick, NJ

Address for Correspondence:

Ankur Sethi

901 West Main Street

Building B, Suite 205

Freehold, NJ 07728

Email: [drankursethi@gmail.com](mailto:drankursethi@gmail.com)

Fax: 732-866-0018

## Abstract

### Objectives

Our aim was to compare available transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) valves using direct and indirect evidence from randomized controlled trials (RCT).

### Background

TAVR is now an established treatment for majority of patients with severe aortic stenosis.

However, there is limited data comparing various valves.

### Methods

We performed a systematic search of electronic databases for RCT comparing a TAVR valve to a valve or surgery. A Bayesian network meta-analysis was performed to compile evidence from both direct and indirect comparisons at 30 days and at one year.

### Results

Twelve studies with 10,307 patients eligible for TAVR met the criteria and were included. Self-expanding valve CoreValve type (SEV\_C) is associated with higher risk of pacemaker implantation and use of >1 valve, SEV Accurate type (SEV\_A) is associated with higher risk of  $\geq$  moderate aortic regurgitation (AR) and death, and mechanically expandable valve (MEV) is associated with lower risk of  $\geq$  moderate AR but higher risk of pacemaker at 30 days, SEV\_C and MEV were associated with higher pacemaker rates compared balloon expandable valve (BEV) at 1 year. There is no difference among the valves in stroke at 30 days and 1 year.

### Conclusions

At 30 days, BEV was superior on one or more outcomes of mortality, pacemaker implantation, >1 valve implantation, and  $\geq$  moderate AR compared to other valves except the higher rate  $\geq$

moderate AR compared to MEV. At one year, BEV was associated with lower odds of pacemaker implantation compared to SEV\_C and MEV but not different on other end points.

Keywords: Transcatheter aortic valve replacement, aortic valve replacement, aortic valve disease, meta-analysis

## Introduction

The last decade has seen unprecedented research and development in the transcatheter valve therapies for the treatment of severe aortic stenosis (AS). Multiple large, randomized trials have clearly established transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) as either preferred treatment or suitable alternative across the whole spectrum of patients with AS [1-3]. The most recent 2020 American Heart Association (AHA)/American College of Cardiology (ACC) guidelines have given TAVR a Class I recommendation for the treatment for symptomatic AS in patients older than 65 years, and suitable valve and vascular anatomy regardless of the surgical risk [4]. Even though there is widespread acceptance of TAVR, the choice of most suitable transcatheter valve for AS is far from clear. There are several different types of transcatheter valves in use or under investigation for severe AS in different parts of the world. At least three TAVR valves are approved for commercial use in the United States. There are several differences amongst the available TAVR valves including mode of deployment, intra-annular versus supra-annular placement, length of the valve frame, leaflet type and thickness which may impact both peri-procedural and long-term outcomes. There are few randomized trials providing head-to-head comparisons amongst the various TAVR valves [5-9]. Therefore, we performed a network meta-analysis to compile both direct and indirect evidence comparing outcomes amongst TAVR valves for severe symptomatic native aortic valve stenosis.

## Materials and Methods

### Search strategy and inclusion criteria

We performed a systematic search of electronic databases, PubMed/Medline, Embase and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), for randomized controlled trials comparing TAVR to control in patients with AS. The following key words in various

combinations were used – “transcatheter aortic valve replacement”, “TAVR”, “transcatheter aortic valve implantation”, “TAVI”, “aortic stenosis”, “clinical trial”. In addition, we searched clinical trials.gov and acc.org for studies and follow up not yet published. The bibliographies of review articles and systematic reviews were hand searched for any relevant studies. Last search was performed on October 30, 2021. No language restriction was enforced. All human studies using a transcatheter aortic valve in a randomized fashion for treatment of AS were eligible. Non-randomized and observational studies were excluded. Studies using more than one type of transcatheter valve in a treatment arm were also excluded.

### Data extraction

Two investigators independently evaluated studies for inclusion in the meta-analysis. Studies meeting the inclusion criteria were independently reviewed and relevant study characteristics and end points were extracted and entered in preset form. Any discrepancies were resolved with consensus or help of a third author. We used the revised Cochrane risk of bias tool for randomized trial to assess the quality of included studies [10]. This meta-analysis was conducted in accordance with the Preferred reporting items for systemic reviews and meta-analysis (PRISMA) statement [11]. We used the tool developed by GRADE working group to rate the confidence in the estimates of network meta-analysis for all outcomes [12].

### End points

Death and stroke at 30 days and 1 year were primary clinical end points. Other valve related end points assessed were  $\geq$  moderate aortic regurgitation (AR), pacemaker implantation, valve reintervention, and use of  $>1$  transcatheter valve during the primary procedure.

## Statistical analysis

We used intention to treat analysis for all outcomes included in the meta-analysis. A random effect Bayesian network meta-analysis was performed with uninformative prior using 20,000 adaptive iteration and 100,000 simulations. Model convergence was evaluated using Brooks-Gelman-Rubin plot and potential scale reduction factor (shrink factor). A model with decreasing variation over increasing number of simulations and shrink factor  $< 1.05$  was considered to have achieved convergence. We used nodesplit models to assess inconsistency between the direct and indirect evidence for each outcome. A p value  $< 0.05$  was considered an evidence of inconsistency. To preserve transitivity assumption to the extent possible, we excluded patients undergoing transapical TAVR. Furthermore, to account for difference in baseline risk among the studies, we performed a network meta-regression of mean STS score over the odds of mortality after different TAVR valves at 30 days and 1 year. We assessed the heterogeneity among the included studies using global  $I^2$  statistic for each outcome. However, to be conservative and allow for differences between the studies, we used random effect model for our estimates. Odds ratio with 95% credible interval (95% CrI) was used as summary estimate. A 95% CrI which did not contain unity was considered statistically significant. The statistical analysis was conducted using the GeMTC package in R 3.1.2 statistical software using JAGS (Just another Gibbs Sampler) as the sampler [13].

## Results

Twelve studies [1-3,5-9,14-17] with a total of 10,307 patients met the inclusion criteria. The search strategy and selection process are shown in Figure 1. The following valves were compared: balloon expandable valve – SAPIEN /SAPIEN XT/SAPIEN 3 (Edwards Lifesciences,

Irvine, CA, USA) (BEV); self-expanding valve – CoreValve/Evolut R/Evolut Pro (Medtronic Inc, Minneapolis, MN, USA) (SEV\_C); self-expanding valve – Accurate Neo (Boston Scientific, Marlborough, MA, USA) (SEV\_A), and mechanically expanding valve – LOTUS (Boston Scientific, Marlborough, MA, USA) (MEV). TAVR was performed via transfemoral access in all except a minority of patients (Table 1). The mean age of patients ranged from 73 to 84 years. The Society of thoracic Surgeons (STS) scores range from 1.9% to 11.8%. Other relevant study characteristics are shown in Table 1. The network plot of trials contributing direct and indirect evidence comparing different TAVR valves is shown in Figure 1S.

At 30 days, SEV\_A was associated with higher 30-day mortality compared to BEV (OR = 3.0 95% CrI 1.1-8.7) as shown in Figure 2A, however there was no difference in mortality at 1 year in other valves compared to BEV (Figure 2B). Furthermore, the network meta-regression did not show any effect of baseline STS score on odds ratio after SEV\_C, SEV\_A and MEV compared to BEV at 30 days and 1 year follow up (Figure 2S and 3S). There was no difference in stroke at 30 days and 1 year after SEV\_C, SEV\_A and MEV compared to BEV as shown in Figure 3A and 3B. The models for mortality and stroke showed appropriate convergence and no evidence of inconsistency was found on node splitting models except for stroke at 1 year where there is inconsistency for the comparison SEV\_C and BEV (Figure 4S-11S).

At 30 days follow up, moderate or severe AR was significantly more common after SEV\_A and less common after MEV compared to BEV (Figure 4A). There was no difference in 30 days  $\geq$  moderate AR between SEV\_C and BEV. There was no difference in  $\geq$  moderate AR between the other valves and BEV at one year (Figure 4B). The models showed appropriate convergence and no evidence of inconsistency was noted in node splitting models (Figure 12S-15S). Also, there was no difference in  $\geq$  moderate paravalvular regurgitation after SEV\_C (OR =

2.3 95% CrI 0.98-6.5), SEV\_A (OR = 2.8 95% CrI 0.80-11) and MEV (OR = 0.26 95% CrI 0.03-2.3) compared BEV at one year (Figure 16S). All studies except PARTNER 1B trial [1] used Valve Academic Research Consortium (VARC) consensus statement version 1 [14-15] or version 2 definitions for aortic regurgitation [18-19]. However, exclusion of PARTNER 1B trial did not significant effect on network estimate for any valve compared to BEV at 30 days (SEV\_C OR = 1.8 95% CrI 0.87- 4.3; SEV\_A OR = 4.9 95% CrI 2-13; MEV OR = 0.12 95% CrI 0.018-0.67) and 1 year (SEV\_C OR = 2.1 95% CrI 0.85- 5.9; SEV\_A OR = 2.6 95% CrI 0.76-10; MEV OR = 0.23 95% CrI 0.028-2) for  $\geq$  moderate regurgitation.

Pacemaker implantation was significantly higher after SEV\_C and MEV at 30 days (OR = 2.5 95% CrI 1.3-5.3; OR = 5.7 95% CrI 1.3-29) and one year (OR = 2.3 95% CrI 1.1-4.9; OR = 5.4 95% CrI 1.1-28) compared to BEV (Figure 5A and 5B). There was no difference in pacemaker implantation after SEV\_A and BEV. The models showed appropriate convergence and no evidence of inconsistency based on node splitting model (Figure 17S – 20S).

The use of >1 transcatheter valve during the index procedure was significantly more common after SEV\_C (OR = 16 95% CrI 1.4-3e<sup>2</sup>) but no different after SEV\_A and MEV compared to BEV (Figure 21S). However, the potential scale reduction factor for this model did not reach the prespecified value of < 1.05 for the comparison between SEV\_C and MEV (Figure 22S). After excluding the study using MEV, the model achieved convergence (Figure 23S) and continued to show that SEV\_C was associated with > 1 valve use compared to BEV (Figure 6). There was no evidence of inconsistency as shown by node splitting model (Figure 24S).

The risk of bias evaluation for included studies is shown in Table 1S (supplement). The overall risk of bias was considered low for all included studies. Also, there was no significant heterogeneity based on global  $I^2$  statistic as shown in Table 2S (supplement). Based on the



GRADE group recommendations there was high confidence in the estimates for mortality and pacemaker implantation at 30 days and 1 year for the comparison SEV\_C versus BEV. All other estimates have moderate or low confidence mostly secondary to imprecision as shown in Table 3S (supplement).

## Discussion

We conducted a comprehensive network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials comparing different TAVR valves used in the treatment of severe symptomatic AS. We found SEV\_A had higher mortality and  $\geq$  moderate AR compared to BEV at 30 days, but not at one year follow up. SEV\_C and MEV were associated with significantly increased risk of pacemaker implantation at 30 days and one year compared to BEV. SEV\_C was associated with higher risk of use  $>1$  valve compared to BEV. Our study represents one of the largest meta-analyses comparing contemporary TAVR prostheses and reports both short and mid-term outcomes.

We found a significantly increased risk of mortality at 30-days with SEV\_A compared to BEV; however, this increased risk was no longer present at 1 year follow up. This lack of significant difference at 1 year could be secondary to imprecision in our estimate rather than absence of effect. This finding is very intriguing and needs to be addressed by an adequately powered clinical trial. Furthermore, there was no significant difference in mortality between BEV and SEV\_C, the two of the most used TAVR valves. Our results are consistent with prior meta-analyses and a large propensity matched analysis showing no difference in 30 days and 1 year mortality between BEV and SEV [21-23]. To account for baseline difference in surgical risk, we performed a network meta-regression which did not show any effect of baseline STS score on odds of mortality for all prosthesis types compared to BEV.

Moderate or greater paravalvular leak/regurgitation (PVL) after TAVR has been previously shown to be associated with higher risk of heart failure hospitalization and long-term mortality [2,25-27]. PVL is likely the most common mechanism of regurgitation within the 30 days of the procedure as demonstrated by very low incidence of  $\geq$  moderate AR in the surgical arms of the included trials. However, it may not always be feasible to differentiate between the intra-valvular and paravalvular regurgitation based on transthoracic studies performed at follow up in the included studies. We found at 30 days, there was increased risk of  $\geq$  moderate AR in patients who received SEV\_A and reduced risk in patients who received MEV compared to BEV. However, at 1 year follow up, there was no significant difference in the occurrence of  $\geq$  moderate AR in all valves compared to BEV. Additionally, there was no difference in PVL between other valve types and BEV at 1 year follow up. A previous network meta-analysis of ten studies reported higher incidence of  $\geq$  moderate PVL after SEV compared to BEV at 30 days [22]. However, this meta-analysis incorporated SEV\_C and SEV\_A in one group and did not include SCOPE (Safety and Efficacy Comparison of Two TAVI Systems in a Prospective Randomized Evaluation) II trial which showed significantly higher  $\geq$  moderate AR in SEV\_A compared to SEV\_C. We did not find a significant difference in  $\geq$  moderate AR between SEV\_C and BEV, however, there was a strong trend of towards higher AR after SEV\_C (Figure 3A and B). The CHOICE [6] and SOLVE TAVI [7] trials directly compared SEV\_C to BEV, and the former found higher incidence of  $\geq$  moderate AR whereas the later reported numerically higher  $\geq$  moderate AR after SEV\_C compared to BEV. Furthermore, FRANCE 2, a large national TAVR registry, reported SEV to be associated with higher risk  $\geq$  moderate AR compared to BEV [26]. Therefore, additional studies with adequate power are required to resolve this issue particularly

for the comparison of BEV to SEV\_C and SEV\_A. Also, despite lower risk of PVL compared to BEV and SEV, MEV is no longer available for use in the United States [27].

Our study found no significant difference in the risk of stroke with all valves studied compared to BEV. However, there was inconsistency between direct and indirect evidence particularly at one year. This inconsistency is likely due to the SOLVE TAVI trial, which directly compared SEV with BEV, and met the trial criteria for equivalence for the stroke reporting an incidence of 1% versus 6.9% respectively [7]. Whereas the incidence of stroke at one year after TAVR in the PARTNER 2 [2] and PARTNER 3 [3] trials, which compared BEV with SAVR, and SURTAVI trial [16] and the EVOLUT low risk trial [14], which compared SEV with SAVR, were 8%, 1.2%, 5.5% and 4.1% respectively. Furthermore, in a propensity matched analysis of >12,000 patients from 10 different studies (The CENTER-collaboration), BEV was associated with lower risk of stroke compared to SEV\_C [23]. Therefore, we believe the equipoise between the valves in terms of stroke continues.

Permanent pacemaker (PPM) placement after TAVR has been associated with increased heart failure admissions, left ventricle systolic dysfunction and, in some studies, higher mortality [23-25]. As indications for TAVR extend to lower risk patient populations, it has become increasingly important to avoid this post-procedural complication. We found significantly increased risk of PPM placement in patients who received SEV\_C and MEV compared to BEV. The previous network meta-analysis similarly reported increased risk of PPM placement with SEV compared to BEV [22]. Furthermore, the CENTER-collaboration found that SEV\_C is associated with three-fold higher risk of PPM compared to BEV [23]. The continuous radial force of the nitinol frame in the SEV\_C and the potential for deeper implantation leading to

persistent AV node and bundle mechanical compression and injury have been postulated to explain these between-valve differences in PPM rates [31-32].

As per VARC consensus statement, successful delivery of a single functioning TAVR valve in a correct anatomical position without any major complication is required for technical success [32]. We found that use >1 valve is more common after SEV\_C compared to BEV. Similarly in the FRANCE 2 registry, the use of > 1 valve occurred in 3.5% patients undergoing SEV\_C compared 1.4% patients undergoing BEV [33]. The differences in deployment process, metallic frame, anchoring mechanism and delivery system may possibly explain the lower technical success of SEV\_C compared to BEV [33].

Several limitations of our study need to be mentioned. The compilation of direct and indirect evidence in network meta-analysis is based on transitivity assumption. We systematically tested and reported inconsistency, if any, for each reported outcome using node-splitting model. We purposefully excluded the trans-apical cohort of prior BEV studies to preserve transitivity. Furthermore, to assess the effect of differences in baseline risk we performed a network meta-regression of mean STS score on odds ratio for mortality. In addition to allow for heterogeneity among the studies we performed a random effect meta-analysis which usually leads to wider confidence intervals, therefore, may not detect small differences in the effect. Because of the limited number of studies and use of more than one iteration of valves we were not able to compare just the latest iteration of BEV to SEV\_C.

## Conclusion

At 30 days, BEV was superior on one or more outcomes of mortality, pacemaker implantation, >1 valve implantation, and  $\geq$  moderate AR compared to other valves except the

higher rate  $\geq$  moderate AR compared to MEV. There is no significant difference between the available valves in terms of mortality, stroke,  $\geq$ moderate regurgitation at 1 year, however, BEV is associated with lower risk of PPM compared to SEV\_C and MEV.

### Conflict of Interest

The authors have no relevant relationships to disclose.

## References:

1. Smith CR, Leon MB, Mack MJ, Miller DC, Moses JW, Svensson LG, Tuzcu EM, Webb JG, Fontana GP, Makkar RR, Williams M, Dewey T, Kapadia S, Babaliaros V, Thourani VH, Corso P, Pichard AD, Bavaria JE, Herrmann HC, Akin JJ, Anderson WN, Wang D, Pocock SJ; PARTNER Trial Investigators (2011) Transcatheter versus surgical aortic-valve replacement in high-risk patients. *N Engl J Med* 364(23):2187-2198.
2. Leon MB, Smith CR, Mack MJ, Makkar RR, Svensson LG, Kodali SK, Thourani VH, Tuzcu EM, Miller DC, Herrmann HC, Doshi D, Cohen DJ, Pichard AD, Kapadia S, Dewey T, Babaliaros V, Szeto WY, Williams MR, Kereiakes D, Zajarias A, Greason KL, Whisenant BK, Hodson RW, Moses JW, Trento A, Brown DL, Fearon WF, Pibarot P, Hahn RT, Jaber WA, Anderson WN, Alu MC, Webb JG; PARTNER 2 Investigators (2016) Transcatheter or Surgical Aortic-Valve Replacement in Intermediate-Risk Patients. *N Engl J Med* 374(17):1609-1620.
3. Mack MJ, Leon MB, Thourani VH, Makkar R, Kodali SK, Russo M, Kapadia SR, Malaisrie SC, Cohen DJ, Pibarot P, Leipsic J, Hahn RT, Blanke P, Williams MR, McCabe JM, Brown DL, Babaliaros V, Goldman S, Szeto WY, Genereux P, Pershad A, Pocock SJ, Alu MC, Webb JG, Smith CR; PARTNER 3 Investigators (2019) Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement with a Balloon-Expandable Valve in Low-Risk Patients. *N Engl J Med* 380(18):1695-1705.
4. Otto CM, Nishimura RA, Bonow RO, Carabello BA, Erwin JP 3rd, Gentile F, Jneid H, Krieger EV, Mack M, McLeod C, O'Gara PT, Rigolin VH, Sundt TM 3rd, Thompson A, Toly C (2021) 2020 ACC/AHA Guideline for the Management of Patients With Valvular Heart Disease: Executive Summary: A Report of the American College of

Cardiology/American Heart Association Joint Committee on Clinical Practice

Guidelines. *Circulation* 143(5):e35-e71.

5. Lanz J, Kim WK, Walther T, Burgdorf C, Möllmann H, Linke A, Redwood S, Thilo C, Hilker M, Joner M, Thiele H, Conzelmann L, Conradi L, Kerber S, Schymik G, Prendergast B, Husser O, Stortecky S, Heg D, Jüni P, Windecker S, Pilgrim T; SCOPE I investigators (2019) Safety and efficacy of a self-expanding versus a balloon-expandable bioprosthesis for transcatheter aortic valve replacement in patients with symptomatic severe aortic stenosis: a randomised non-inferiority trial. *Lancet*. 394(10209):1619-1628.
6. Abdel-Wahab M, Mehilli J, Frerker C, Neumann FJ, Kurz T, Tölg R, Zachow D, Guerra E, Massberg S, Schäfer U, El-Mawardy M, Richardt G; CHOICE investigators (2014) Comparison of balloon-expandable vs self-expandable valves in patients undergoing transcatheter aortic valve replacement: the CHOICE randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 311(15):1503-1514.
7. Thiele H, Kurz T, Feistritzer HJ, Stachel G, Hartung P, Eitel I, Marquetand C, Nef H, Doerr O, Lauten A, Landmesser U, Abdel-Wahab M, Sandri M, Holzhey D, Borger M, Ince H, Öner A, Meyer-Saraei R, Wienbergen H, Fach A, Frey N, König IR, Vonthein R, Rückert Y, Funkat AK, de Waha-Thiele S, Desch S (2020) Comparison of newer generation self-expandable vs. balloon-expandable valves in transcatheter aortic valve implantation: the randomized SOLVE-TAVI trial. *Eur Heart J* 41(20):1890-1899.
8. Tamburino C, Bleiziffer S, Thiele H, Scholtz S, Hildick-Smith D, Cunnington M, Wolf A, Barbanti M, Tchetchè D, Garot P, Pagnotta P, Gilard M, Bedogni F, Van Belle E, Vasa-Nicotera M, Chieffo A, Deutsch O, Kempfert J, Søndergaard L, Butter C, Trillo-Nouche R, Lotfi S, Möllmann H, Joner M, Abdel-Wahab M, Bogaerts K, Hengstenberg

- C, Capodanno D (2020) Comparison of Self-Expanding Bioprostheses for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients With Symptomatic Severe Aortic Stenosis: SCOPE 2 Randomized Clinical Trial. *Circulation* 142(25):2431-2442.
9. Reardon MJ, Feldman TE, Meduri CU, Makkar RR, O'Hair D, Linke A, Kereiakes DJ, Waksman R, Babliaros V, Stoler RC, Mishkel GJ, Rizik DG, Iyer VS, Gleason TG, Tchétché D, Rovin JD, Lhermusier T, Carrié D, Hodson RW, Allocco DJ, Meredith IT; Reprise III Investigators (2019) Two-Year Outcomes After Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement With Mechanical vs Self-expanding Valves: The REPRISE III Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Cardiol* 4(3):223-229.
10. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, Cates CJ, Cheng H-Y, Corbett MS, Eldridge SM, Hernán MA, Hopewell S, Hróbjartsson A, Junqueira DR, Jüni P, Kirkham JJ, Lasserson T, Li T, McAleenan A, Reeves BC, Shepperd S, Shrier I, Stewart LA, Tilling K, White IR, Whiting PF, Higgins JPT (2019) RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 366(14898).
11. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; PRISMA Group (2009) Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ* 339:b2535.
12. Puhan MA, Schünemann HJ, Murad MH, Li T, Brignardello-Petersen R, Singh JA, Kessels AG, Guyatt GH; GRADE Working Group (2014) A GRADE Working Group approach for rating the quality of treatment effect estimates from network meta-analysis. *BMJ* 349:g5630.



13. van Valkenhoef G, Kuiper J (2016) gemtc: Network Meta-Analysis Using Bayesian Methods. R package version 0.8-2. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gemtc>. Date accessed October 30, 2021.
14. Popma JJ, Deeb GM, Yakubov SJ, Mumtaz M, Gada H, O'Hair D, Bajwa T, Heiser JC, Merhi W, Kleiman NS, Askew J, Sorajja P, Rovin J, Chetcuti SJ, Adams DH, Teirstein PS, Zorn GL 3rd, Forrest JK, Tchétché D, Resar J, Walton A, Piazza N, Ramlawi B, Robinson N, Petrossian G, Gleason TG, Oh JK, Boulware MJ, Qiao H, Mugglin AS, Reardon MJ; Evolut Low Risk Trial Investigators (2019) Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement with a Self-Expanding Valve in Low-Risk Patients. *N Engl J Med* 380(18):1706-1715.
15. Thyregod HG, Steinbrüchel DA, Ihlemann N, Nissen H, Kjeldsen BJ, Petursson P, Chang Y, Franzen OW, Engstrøm T, Clemmensen P, Hansen PB, Andersen LW, Olsen PS, Søndergaard L (2015) Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients With Severe Aortic Valve Stenosis: 1-Year Results From the All-Comers NOTION Randomized Clinical Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 65(20):2184-2194.
16. Reardon MJ, Van Mieghem NM, Popma JJ, Kleiman NS, Søndergaard L, Mumtaz M, Adams DH, Deeb GM, Maini B, Gada H, Chetcuti S, Gleason T, Heiser J, Lange R, Merhi W, Oh JK, Olsen PS, Piazza N, Williams M, Windecker S, Yakubov SJ, Grube E, Makkar R, Lee JS, Conte J, Vang E, Nguyen H, Chang Y, Mugglin AS, Serruys PW, Kappetein AP; SURTAVI Investigators (2017) Surgical or Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement in Intermediate-Risk Patients. *N Engl J Med* 376(14):1321-1331.
17. Adams DH, Popma JJ, Reardon MJ, Yakubov SJ, Coselli JS, Deeb GM, Gleason TG, Buchbinder M, Hermiller J Jr, Kleiman NS, Chetcuti S, Heiser J, Merhi W, Zorn G,

- Tadros P, Robinson N, Petrossian G, Hughes GC, Harrison JK, Conte J, Maini B, Mumtaz M, Chenoweth S, Oh JK; U.S. CoreValve Clinical Investigators (2014) Transcatheter aortic-valve replacement with a self-expanding prosthesis. *N Engl J Med* 370(19):1790-1798.
18. Leon MB, Piazza N, Nikolsky E, Blackstone EH, Cutlip DE, Kappetein AP, Krucoff MW, Mack M, Mehran R, Miller C, Morel MA, Petersen J, Popma JJ, Takkenberg JJ, Vahanian A, van Es GA, Vranckx P, Webb JG, Windecker S, Serruys PW (2011) Standardized endpoint definitions for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation clinical trials: a consensus report from the Valve Academic Research Consortium. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 57(3):253-269.
19. Kappetein AP, Head SJ, Génèreux P, Piazza N, van Mieghem NM, Blackstone EH, Brott TG, Cohen DJ, Cutlip DE, van Es GA, Hahn RT, Kirtane AJ, Krucoff MW, Kodali S, Mack MJ, Mehran R, Rodés-Cabau J, Vranckx P, Webb JG, Windecker S, Serruys PW, Leon MB (2012) Updated standardized endpoint definitions for transcatheter aortic valve implantation: the Valve Academic Research Consortium-2 consensus document. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 60(15):1438-1454.
20. Osman M, Ghaffar YA, Saleem M, Kheiri B, Osman K, Munir MB, Alkhouli M (2019) Meta-Analysis Comparing Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation With Balloon Versus Self-Expandable Valves. *Am J Cardiol* 124(8):1252-1256.
21. Elgendy IY, Gad MM, Mahmoud AN, Dvir D, Kapadia SR, Alfonso F, Capodanno D (2020) Meta-analysis Comparing Outcomes of Self-Expanding Versus Balloon-Expandable Valves for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation. *Am J Cardiol* 128:202-209.

22. Vlastra W, Chandrasekhar J, Muñoz-Garcia AJ, Tchétché D, de Brito FS Jr, Barbanti M, Kornowski R, Latib A, D'Onofrio A, Ribichini F, Baan J, Tijssen JGP, Trillo-Nouche R, Dumonteil N, Abizaid A, Sartori S, D'Errigo P, Tarantini G, Lunardi M, Orvin K, Pagnesi M, Del Valle R, Modine T, Dangas G, Mehran R, Piek JJ, Delewi R (2019) Comparison of balloon-expandable vs. self-expandable valves in patients undergoing transfemoral transcatheter aortic valve implantation: from the CENTER-collaboration. *Eur Heart J* 40(5):456-465.
23. Athappan G, Patvardhan E, Tuzcu EM, Svensson LG, Lemos PA, Fraccaro C, Tarantini G, Sinning JM, Nickenig G, Capodanno D, Tamburino C, Latib A, Colombo A, Kapadia SR (2013) Incidence, predictors, and outcomes of aortic regurgitation after transcatheter aortic valve replacement: meta-analysis and systematic review of literature. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 61(15):1585-1595.
24. Kodali S, Pibarot P, Douglas PS, Williams M, Xu K, Thourani V, Rihal CS, Zajarias A, Doshi D, Davidson M, Tuzcu EM, Stewart W, Weissman NJ, Svensson L, Greason K, Maniar H, Mack M, Anwaruddin S, Leon MB, Hahn RT (2015) Paravalvular regurgitation after transcatheter aortic valve replacement with the Edwards sapien valve in the PARTNER trial: characterizing patients and impact on outcomes. *Eur Heart J* 36(7):449-456.
25. Van Belle E, Juthier F, Susen S, Vincentelli A, Iung B, Dallongeville J, Eltchaninoff H, Laskar M, Leprince P, Lievre M, Banfi C, Auffray JL, Delhay C, Donzeau-Gouge P, Chevreul K, Fajadet J, Leguerrier A, Prat A, Gilard M, Teiger E; FRANCE 2 Investigators (2014) Postprocedural aortic regurgitation in balloon-expandable and self-expandable transcatheter aortic valve replacement procedures: analysis of predictors and

impact on long-term mortality: insights from the FRANCE2 Registry. *Circulation* 129(13):1415-1427.

26. Soliman OI, El Faquir N, Ren B, Spitzer E, van Gils L, Jonker H, Geleijnse ML, van Es GA, Tijssen JG, van Mieghem NM, de Jaegere PPT (2018) Comparison of valve performance of the mechanically expanding Lotus and the balloon-expanded SAPIEN3 transcatheter heart valves: an observational study with independent core laboratory analysis. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging* 19(2):157–167.
27. Chamandi C, Barbanti M, Munoz-Garcia A, Latib A, Nombela-Franco L, Gutiérrez-Ibanez E, Veiga-Fernandez G, Cheema AN, Cruz-Gonzalez I, Serra V, Tamburino C, Mangieri A, Colombo A, Jiménez-Quevedo P, Elizaga J, Laughlin G, Lee DH, Garcia Del Blanco B, Rodriguez-Gabella T, Marsal JR, Côté M, Philippon F, Rodés-Cabau J (2018) Long-Term Outcomes in Patients With New Permanent Pacemaker Implantation Following Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 11(3):301-310.
28. Aljabbar T, Qiu F, Masih S, Fang J, Elbaz-Greener G, Austin PC, Rodés-Cabau J, Ko DT, Singh S, Wijesundera HC (2018) Association of Clinical and Economic Outcomes With Permanent Pacemaker Implantation After Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *JAMA Netw Open* 1(1):e180088.
29. Regueiro A, Abdul-Jawad Altisent O, Del Trigo M, Campelo-Parada F, Puri R, Urena M, Philippon F, Rodés-Cabau J (2016) Impact of New-Onset Left Bundle Branch Block and Periprocedural Permanent Pacemaker Implantation on Clinical Outcomes in Patients Undergoing Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 9(5):e003635.

30. Urena M, Rodés-Cabau J (2015) Managing heart block after transcatheter aortic valve implantation: from monitoring to device selection and pacemaker indications. *EuroIntervention* 11 Suppl W:W101-105.
31. Muñoz-García AJ, Hernández-García JM, Jiménez-Navarro MF, Alonso-Briales JH, Domínguez-Franco AJ, Fernández-Pastor J, Peña Hernández J, Barrera Cordero A, Alzueta Rodríguez J, de Teresa-Galván E (2012) Factors predicting and having an impact on the need for a permanent pacemaker after CoreValve prosthesis implantation using the new Accutrak delivery catheter system. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 5(5):533-539.
32. VARC-3 WRITING COMMITTEE:, Généreux P, Piazza N, Alu MC, Nazif T, Hahn RT, Pibarot P, Bax JJ, Leipsic JA, Blanke P, Blackstone EH, Finn MT, Kapadia S, Linke A, Mack MJ, Makkar R, Mehran R, Popma JJ, Reardon M, Rodes-Cabau J, Van Mieghem NM, Webb JG, Cohen DJ, Leon MB (2021) Valve Academic Research Consortium 3: Updated Endpoint Definitions for Aortic Valve Clinical Research. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 77(21):2717-2746.
33. Gilard M, Eltchaninoff H, Iung B, Donzeau-Gouge P, Chevreul K, Fajadet J, Leprince P, Leguerrier A, Lievre M, Prat A, Teiger E, Lefevre T, Himbert D, Tchetché D, Carrié D, Albat B, Cribier A, Rioufol G, Sudre A, Blanchard D, Collet F, Dos Santos P, Meneveau N, Tirouvanziam A, Caussin C, Guyon P, Boschhat J, Le Breton H, Collart F, Houel R, Delpine S, Souteyrand G, Favereau X, Ohlmann P, Doisy V, Grollier G, Gommeaux A, Claudel JP, Bourlon F, Bertrand B, Van Belle E, Laskar M; FRANCE 2 Investigators (2012) Registry of transcatheter aortic-valve implantation in high-risk patients. *N Engl J Med* 366(18):1705-1715.

Figure 1 – Flow diagram depicting search strategy for the network meta-analysis.

Figure 2 – Forest plot showing of odds ratio of mortality after different valves compared to balloon expandable valve (BEV) A) at 30 days and B) at 1 year. MEV – Mechanically expanding valve, SEV\_A – Self expanding valve Accurate Neo type, SEV\_C – Self expanding valve CoreValve type.

Figure 3 – Forest plot showing of odds ratio of stroke after different valves compared to balloon expandable valve (BEV) A) at 30 days and B) at 1 year. MEV – Mechanically expanding valve, SEV\_A – Self expanding valve Accurate Neo type, SEV\_C – Self expanding valve CoreValve type.

Figure 4 – Forest plot showing of odds ratio of  $\geq$  moderate aortic regurgitation after different valves compared to balloon expandable valve (BEV) A) at 30 days and B) at 1 year. MEV – Mechanically expanding valve, SEV\_A – Self expanding valve Accurate Neo type, SEV\_C – Self expanding valve CoreValve type.

Figure 5 – Forest plot showing of odds ratio of permanent pacemaker implantation after different valves compared to balloon expandable valve (BEV) A) at 30 days and B) at 1 year. MEV – Mechanically expanding valve, SEV\_A – Self expanding valve Accurate Neo type, SEV\_C – Self expanding valve CoreValve type.

Figure 6 – Forest plot showing of odds ratio use > 1 valve after different valves compared to balloon expandable valve (BEV). SEV\_A – Self expanding valve Accurate Neo type, SEV\_C – Self expanding valve CoreValve type.

#### Supplementary Table Legends

Table 1S – Risk of bias evaluation of the included studies using Cochrane risk of bias tool.

Table 2S - Global  $I^2$  statistics to assess heterogeneity for all outcomes.

Table 3S – Grading the certainty of network estimates using GRADE group recommendations for network meta-analysis.

		INCLUSION CRITERIA	PERIOD	RAL ACCESS (%)	(IN YEARS)				(%)		(%)		(%)		FIBRILLATION (%)		(%)	
					Comparator 1	Comparator 2	Comparator 1	Comparator 2	Comparator 1	Comparator 2	Comparator 1	Comparator 2	Comparator 1	Comparator 2	Comparator 1	Comparator 2	Comparator 1	Comparator 2
SCOPE I (5)	SAPIEN 3 vs ACURATE NEO	>75 Y patients with increased risk (STS score > 10 or other criteria) and suitable for TF access	2017-19	100	83	82.6	3.4	3.7	60	59	8	8	32	2	37	36	11	12
CHOICE (6)	SAPEIN XT vs COREVALVE	High risk patients (STS score ≥ 10 or other criteria) and suitable for TF access	2012-13	100	81.9	79.6	5.6	6.2	60.3	65.8	15.7	12.5	31.4		33.3	24.8	16.5	18.3
SOLVE TAVI (7)	SAPIEN 3 vs CoreValve (EVOLUT R)	>75 Y patients' high risk for SAVR suitable for TF access	2016-18	100	81.5	81.7	4.7	4.9	52.7	58	8.2	11.9	31.1		42.5	47	11.8	13.3
SCOPE II (8)	CoreValve (Evolut R/Pro) vs ACURATE neo	>75 Y TF TAVR patient at increased risk for SAVR	2017-19	100	82.9	83.4	4.5	4.6	38	43	4	7	29		32	35	10	8
REPRISE III (9)	CoreValve (Classic/Evolut R) vs LOTUS	STS score ≥ 8 or other criteria for Increased or extreme risk for SAVR	2014-15	100	82.9	82.8	6.9	6.7	73.4	71.5	20	16	32.6		31.6	35.1	25.7	31.1
Evolut low risk trial (14)	CoreValve (Classic/Evolut R/Pro) vs SAVR	Predicted risk of death after SAVR < 3%	2016-18	99	74	73.8	1.9	1.9	NR	NR	2.5	2.3	31.1		15.5	14.9	7.6	8.5
NOTION (15)	CoreValve vs SAVR	≥ 70 Y regardless of risk	2009-13	96.5	79.2	79	2.9	3.1	NR	NR	NR	NR	17.9		27.8	25.6	4.1	6.7
SURTAVI (16)	CoreValve vs SAVR	Intermediate surgical risk based on STS	2012-16	93.6	79.9	79.7	4.4	4.5	62.6	64.2	16	17.2	34.1		28.1	26.5	30.8	29.9

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.10.16.22281149>; this version posted October 17, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](#).



Study	Comparison	Inclusion criteria	Year	n	STS score	STS score	STS score	STS score	STS score	STS score	STS score	STS score	STS score	STS score	STS score	STS score	STS score	STS score
PARTNER 3 (3)	Sapien 3 vs SAVR	Low risk for SAVR (STS < 4) suitable for TF access	2016-17	100	73.3	73.6	1.9	1.9	27.7	28	nr	nr	31.2	30.2	15.7	18.8	6.9	7.3
PARTNER 2 (TF cohort) (2)	SAPIEN XT vs SAVR	Intermediate surgical risk based on STS score ≥ 4 but <8, or other factors	2011-13	100	81.5	81.7	5.8	5.8	69.2	66.5	nr	nr	37.7	41.2	31	35.2	27.9	32.9
PARTNER 1A (TF cohort) (1)	SAPIEN vs SAVR	High surgical risk (STS score > 10) and at least 15% risk of death by 30 days	2007-09	100	83.6	84.5	11.8	11.7	74.9	76.9	42.6	44.2	nr	nr	40.8	42.7	43	41.6
US CoreValve high risk trial (17)	CoreValve vs SAVR	Predicted risk of operative mortality after SAVR ≥15% but < 50%	2011-12	84	83.2	83.5	7.3	7.5	75.4	76.3	29.7	30.2	34.5	31.9	41	47.5	41.7	42.5

Table 1 – Characteristics of included studies. Accurate Neo (Boston Scientific, Marlborough, MA, USA) Self-expanding valve Accurate neo type, CABG – Coronary artery bypass graft, CAD – Coronary artery disease, CoreValve/Evolut R/Evolut Pro (Medtronic Inc, Minneapolis, MN, USA) Self-expanding valve CoreValve type, LOTUS (Boston Scientific, Marlborough, MA, USA) Mechanically expanding valve, PAD – Peripheral artery disease, NR – Not reported, SAPIEN /SAPIEN XT (Edwards Lifesciences, Irvine, CA, USA) Balloon expandable valve, SAVR – Surgical aortic valve replacement, STS – Society of thoracic surgeons, TAVR – Transcatheter aortic valve replacement, TF – Transfemoral, Y – Years.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.10.16.22281149>; this version posted October 17, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license.

712 citations identified

678 citations excluded due to non-relevant, non-randomized or duplicates


34 full text reviewed for eligibility

24 studies excluded after full review.

- 12 longer term follow up or sub-analysis of included studies
- 6 Non valve trials
- 1 study included > 1 valve in the control arm
- 1 study compared TAVR to medical management
- 3 observational studies


12 studies met the inclusion criteria and included in the meta-analysis

# Mortality at 30 days




A

# Mortality at 1 year




B

# Stroke at 30 days




A

# Stroke at 1 year




B

## Moderate or more aortic regurgitation at 30 days




A

## Moderate or more aortic regurgitation at 1 year




B

# Pacemaker implantation at 30 days



A

# Pacemaker implantation at 1 year



B

# Implantation of multiple valves

