

Clinical Value Of CT-Derived Simulations Of Transcatheter-Aortic-Valve-Replacement In Challenging Anatomies The PRECISE-TAVR Trial

Author names and affiliations:

Thijmen W Hokken, MD^a; Hendrik Wienemann, MD^b; James Dargan, BMBS^c; Dirk-Jan van Ginkel, MD^d; Cameron Dowling, MBBS, PhD^{e, f}; Axel Unbehaun, MD^g; Johan Bosmans, MD, PhD^h; Andreas Bader-Wolfe, MD, PhD^g; Robert Gooley, MBBS (Hons), PhD, MBA^c; Martin Swaans, MD^d; Stephen J. Brecker, MD, FACC^c; Matti Adam, MD^b; Nicolas M. Van Mieghem, MD, PhD^a

a. Department of Cardiology, Thoraxcenter. Erasmus University Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

b. Clinic III for Internal Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and University Hospital Cologne, Cologne, Germany

c. Cardiology Clinical Academic Group, St. George's University of London, London, United Kingdom

d. Department of Cardiology, St. Antonius Hospital, Nieuwegein, the Netherlands

e. MonashHeart, Monash Health and Vascular Surgery, Monash Cardiovascular Research Centre, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

f. Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA

g. Department of Cardiology, German Heart Center Berlin, Berlin, Germany

h. Department of Cardiology, Antwerp University Hospital, Antwerp, Belgium

Short Title: Computer simulations in challenging anatomies undergoing TAVR

Word count: 4697

Address of correspondence

Nicolas M. Van Mieghem, MD, PhD

Department of Interventional Cardiology

Thoraxcenter, ErasmusMC, Office Nt 645

Dr Molewaterplein 40 3015 GD Rotterdam

The Netherlands

Phone: +31(0)107035260

Email: n.vanmieghem@erasmusmc.nl

Abstract

Background

Pre-procedural computed tomography planning improves procedural safety and efficacy of transcatheter aortic valve replacement(TAVR). However, contemporary imaging modalities do not account for device-host interactions. This study evaluates the value of pre-procedural computer simulation with FEops HEARTguide™ on overall device success in patients with challenging anatomies undergoing TAVR with a contemporary self-expanding supra-annular transcatheter heart valve.

Methods

This prospective multicenter observational study included patients with a challenging anatomy defined as bicuspid aortic valve, small annulus or severely calcified aortic valve. We compared the heart team's transcatheter heart valve(THV) planning decision based on 1) conventional multislice computed tomography(MSCT) and 2) MSCT imaging with FEops HEARTguide™ simulations. Clinical outcomes and THV performance were followed up to 30 days.

Results

A total of 77 patients were included(Median age 79.9 years (IQR 74.2-83.8), 42% male). In 35% of the patients, pre-procedural planning changed after FEops HEARTguide™ simulations(change in valve size selection(12%) or target implantation height(23%)). A new permanent pacemaker implantation(PPI) was implanted in 13% and >trace paravalvular leakage (PVL) occurred in 28.5%. The contact pressure index(i.e. simulation output indicating the risk of conduction abnormalities) was significantly higher in patients with a new PPI, compared to those without(16.0%(25th-75th percentile 12.0-21.0) vs. 3.5%(25th-75th percentile 0-11.3), $p<0.01$) The predicted PVL was 5.7mL/s(25th-75th percentile 1.3-11.1) in patients with none-trace PVL, 12.7(25th-75th percentile 5.5-19.1) in mild PVL and 17.7(25th-75th percentile 3.6-19.4) in moderate PVL($p=0.04$).

Conclusion

FEops HEARTguide™ simulations may provide enhanced insights in the risk for PVL or PPI after TAVR with a self-expanding supra-annular THV in complex anatomies.

Keywords

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement, conduction abnormalities, paravalvular leakage, computer simulations

Abbreviations

BAV	=	Bicuspid Aortic Valve
ECG	=	Electrocardiogram
LVOT	=	Left Ventricular Outflow Tract
MSCT	=	Multislice Computed Tomography
PPI	=	Permanent pacemaker Implantation
PVL	=	Paravalvular Leakage
TAVR	=	Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement
TTE	=	Transthoracic Echocardiography

Introduction

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement (TAVR) is recommended for elderly patients with symptomatic severe aortic stenosis (AS) across the operative risk spectrum.(1,2)

Electrocardiogram(ECG)-gated, contrast-enhanced multi-slice computed tomography (MSCT) is the preferred imaging modality for obtaining detailed information on aortic valve morphology, dimensions, calcium burden, membranous septum length, left ventricular outflow tract (LVOT) and transcatheter heart valve sizing.(3,4) The CoreValve/Evolut platform is a widely used self-expanding supra-annular transcatheter valve that compared favorably to SAVR in a series of randomized controlled trials with superior hemodynamic valve performance but with more paravalvular leakage and a higher need for new pacemaker implantation.(5-7)

Heavily calcified tricuspid, bicuspid and small aortic valves may pose specific challenges from a TAVR perspective and are associated with paravalvular leakage (PVL), conduction abnormalities and aortic root injury. (8-10).

Insights in device-host interactions may help to understand and predict such TAVR related complications. FEops HEARTguide™ is a CE marked software package, also regulatory approved in Canada and Australia, for patient-specific simulations for structural heart interventions, which can support to determine the risk for conduction abnormalities and PVL post-TAVR by virtually implanting a transcatheter heart valve in a 3D anatomical computer model. The computer simulations has been validated in tricuspid and bicuspid anatomies.(11-14)

The goal of this prospective multi-center observational study (PRECISE-TAVR) is to evaluate the effect of FEops HEARTguide™ on THV sizing and implantation strategy in severe AS patients with challenging aortic anatomy in order to predict risk of PVL and conduction abnormalities following TAVR with the Evolut Pro(+).

Methods

Study Population

The PRECISE-TAVR trial is a prospective multicenter observational study, including patients with a challenging anatomy, eligible for an Evolut Pro valve (Medtronic, Minneapolis, MN). A challenging anatomy was defined as 1) a bicuspid aortic valve, 2) a heavily calcified tricuspid valve (with Agatston score >3000 for men and >1600 for women) or 3) a small aortic valve (mean annular diameter <20mm). Formal exclusion criteria were presence of a permanent pacemaker prior to TAVR, a failing surgical bio-prosthesis or suboptimal MSCT imaging quality precluding accurate computational modelling. The study was conducted in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki and did not fall under the scope of the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act per Institutional Review Boards' review (MEC-2020-0486).

Study Procedure

First, multi-disciplinary heart teams identified patients with challenging aortic anatomies who were selected for TAVR with the Evolut Pro (+) THV based on MSCT analyses per local standard. THV sizing and implantation strategy were documented. Second, patient-specific computer simulations of device implantation were performed and the derived contact pressure and PVL were obtained. Simulations were then shared with the local heart teams. THV sizing and implantation strategies could be changed accordingly per local heart team's discretion.

A dedicated prospective database captured relevant patient demographics, medical history and comorbidities, ECG, Transthoracic Echocardiography(TTE) and MSCT findings including THV sizing and implantation strategies before and after FEops HEARTguide™ simulations, procedural and clinical follow up data.

Computer simulations

MSCT imaging studies were transmitted to FEops (Gent, Belgium) for HEARTguide computer simulations of device implantation. A detailed description of the computer simulations has been described earlier.(14) In brief, a 3-dimensional, patient-specific aortic root was reconstructed from the pre-procedural ECG-gated contrast-enhanced CT-scan with finite element models. For each patient, Evolut TAVR simulations were performed for the 2 most appropriate available device sizes and at an implantation depth < 3mm (high implantation) and 5mm (medium

implantation). The THV properties of the models were assessed from micro-CT images and optical microscopy measurements, as well as in-vitro radial compression tests at body temperature.

Computer simulations have been already used to predict the risk of conduction abnormalities and PVL post-TAVR. For the prediction of conduction abnormalities, the contact pressure exerted on the region nearby the membranous septum is extracted from the simulation. More in detail, the region of interest is defined as extending from the inferior border of the membranous septum to 15mm below the annulus. This is the area where the HIS-bundle surfaces in the LVOT and might be subjected to pressure trauma by the valve frame. The relative area of the region of interest that experiences contact pressure is defined as contact pressure index and a contact pressure index of >14% was defined as the cut-off point for conduction abnormalities. (11)

A subsequent computational fluid dynamic simulation of the blood flow in diastole is computed to predict the risk of PVL. A blood flow of >16mL/s was defined as a cut-off point for moderate PVL. (12)

Outcomes and definitions

The primary objective of the study was to evaluate to what extent computer simulations in challenging aortic anatomies may affect TAVR sizing and implantation strategies and identify patients at risk for high degree AV blocks or more than trace PVL. The follow-up period was 30 days. PVL-assessment was performed by TTE.

Statistical analysis

Distribution of continuous variables were tested for normality with the Shapiro-Wilk test. Continuous variables were reported as mean \pm standard deviation or median (25TH -75TH percentile) and analyzed with a student's T-test, ANOVA, Mann Whitney U- or Kruskal-Wallis-test as appropriate. Categorical variables were reported as percentage and compared with Chi-Square or Fishers Exact test. The best-fitted simulation, based on the implantation depth, for each patient was used to evaluate correlation with PVL and new pacemakers. Receiver-operating characteristic (ROC)-curves were generated to find the optimal cut-off values for >trace PVL based on the computer model PVL-measurements and for new PPI post-TAVR based on the computer model contact pressure index. (Youden index criteria). A 2-sided P-value <0.05 was

considered statistically significant. All statistics were performed with SPSS software version 28.0 (SPSS, Chicago IL, United States).

Results

Study population

MSCT studies of 83 patients were transmitted for FEops HEARTguide™ computer simulations. Quality was insufficient for computer simulations in 6 cases. Therefore, the study cohort consisted of 77 patients undergoing a TAVR-procedure between October 2020 and April 2022. Baseline characteristics are depicted in Table 1. Median age was 79.9 years (25th-75th percentile 74.2-83.8), 42% was male, median BMI was 27.0 kg/m² (25th-75th percentile 22.8-34.0) and median Surgeon's Predicted Risk of Mortality (STS-PROM) was 2.8% (25th-75th percentile 1.8 - 4.1) with clinical frailty in 35%. MSCT-analysis revealed a mean annulus area of 443mm³ (±91.3) and a severely calcified aortic valve in 74% of the patients. The mean Agatston score was 4405 ± 978 in male patients and 2824 ± 1368 in female patients. The challenging anatomy was a bicuspid valve in 17 patients (22%), a small annulus in 13 (17%) patients, and a severely calcified tricuspid valve in 47 patients (61%).

Procedure and 30-day outcomes

Pre-procedural planning changed after computer simulations in 35% of cases (change in valve size selection (12%) or target implantation height (23%)). Procedural characteristics are shown in Table 2. Predilatation was performed in 62% and postdilatation in 27%. Evolut size was 23mm in 5%, 26mm in 31%, 29mm in 46% and 34mm in 18%. Valve migration occurred in 2 (3%) patients, a second valve was necessary in 3 (4%) patients and conversion to surgery in 1 (1%) patient.

The 30-day outcomes are displayed in Table 3. New LBBB occurred in 14% and a permanent pacemaker was implanted in 10 patients (13%) (total AV block in 9 patients and a brady-tachy syndrome in 1). The implantation depth relative to NCC, as measured by angiography, was 5.6±3.8 for the patients without a new PPI versus vs. 5.7±4.0 for the patients who received a new PPI (p=0.71). Echocardiography post-TAVR showed none-trace PVL in 71.1% of the patients, mild PVL in 22% and moderate PVL in 5 patients (6.5%).

Computer simulations

The computer simulations that more closely matched the procedure in terms of valve size and implantation depth were compared with the relevant clinical events. The contact pressure index was significantly higher in patients with a new PPI, compared to those without (16.0% (25th-75th

percentile 12.0-21.0) vs. 3.5% (25th-75th percentile 0-11.3), $p < 0.01$) (Figure 1). A cut-off value of 11.5% correlated well with PPI (AUC 0.83 (95% confidence interval (CI) 0.72-0.94), sensitivity 86%, specificity 76%). Two patients (4.3%) with a contact pressure index $\leq 14\%$ and 5 patients (31.3%) with a contact pressure $> 14\%$ received a new PPI ($p < 0.01$).

Figure 2 illustrates the PVL-analysis. The predicted PVL was 5.7 mL/s (25th-75th percentile 1.3-11.1) in patients with none-trace PVL, 12.7 (25th-75th percentile 5.5-19.1) in mild PVL and 17.7 (25th-75th percentile 3.6-19.4) in moderate PVL. A PVL cutoff of 12.2 mL/s helped discriminating patients with $>$ trace PVL (AUC 0.69 (95% CI 0.55-0.82), sensitivity 59%, specificity 79%). Eleven patients (19.3%) with a PVL simulation ≤ 16 mL/s and 11 patients with a PVL > 16 mL/s (61.1%) had a PVL $>$ trace ($p < 0.01$) (supplemental table 1).

Discussion

PRECISE-TAVR is the first multicenter, prospective study to evaluate the added value of computer simulations to pre-procedural planning in patients with a challenging anatomy receiving an Evolut Pro-valve. The main findings are that computer simulations with FEops HEARTguide™ 1) changed the pre-procedural planning in 35% of the patients, 2) well predicted the risk for PVL and 3) identified the risk for new PPI post-TAVR.

Pre-procedural planning is increasingly important for optimal sizing and to identify anatomical risk factors for adverse events.(3) Optimal valve size selection leads to a proper THV fit in the native anatomy ensuring adequate hemodynamic valve performance, proper sealing with no PVL and avoiding excessive contact pressure in the LVOT that may result in conduction disorders. Conventional MSCT imaging tools do not consider device-host interactions. Indeed, aortic root shape (elliptical vs circular, vertical vs. horizontal, long vs. short LVOT) and calcifications (location, amount/volume) may affect how a THV is deployed and seated in situ. Arguably, device-host interactions may be reinforced in more complex anatomical phenotypes such as bicuspid aortic valves, heavily calcified tricuspid valves, and small anatomies. Severe calcifications of the aortic valve lead to frame eccentricity post-TAVR which enhances the severity of PVL. (8) Also, high calcium burden, especially in the left coronary cusp (LCC) is a risk factor for PPI.(9) TAVR in patients with BAV is associated with multiple procedural adverse events, including a higher moderate-severe PVL-rate and new PPI, especially in patients with a calcified raphe.(10,15) In small anatomies, self-expandable valves are hemodynamically superior to balloon-expandable valves, however the >trace PVL rate remains high between 49% and 75%.(16,17)

Our study demonstrates that computer simulations of these device-host interactions may complement procedural planning. Local heart teams changed their strategy in a third of the patients to help mitigate PVL and conduction disorders in complex anatomies. Computer simulations prompted operators to change size and to aim for a higher THV implantation in 12% and 23% of the cases respectively. The 13% PPI rate should be seen in the context of complex anatomies where reported PPI rates vary between 14 and 26%.(9,15,18)

In our study, FEops HEARTguide™ simulations predicted > trace PVL fairly well. The new defined PVL cutoff of 12.2 mL/s is lower than the 16mL PVL cutoff reported in the FEops HEARTguide™ validation study. However, this 12.2mL cutoff in PRECISE-TAVR discriminated < trace from > trace PVL whereas the 16mL threshold in the validation study was used to predict > mild PVL (sensitivity 0.72 and specificity 0.78). Interestingly, in our study a PVL > 16 mL/s was associated with > trace PVL in 61% of cases vs. only 19% when PVL flow < 16mL/s. A specific threshold for > trace PVL seems relevant as mild PVL may also be associated with longer hospitalizations and mortality.(19) Furthermore, we identified a step-wise increased in computer-derived PVL flow as post-procedural PVL severity increased, consistent with recent findings.(20) The incidence of > trace PVL in our study is similar to what has been reported in the post-market FORWARD Pro study with 41% > trace PVL and 2% moderate-severe PVL in a population that was not selected for its complex anatomy but rather aimed to reflect every day practice.

In PRECISE-TAVR, a contact pressure index of 11.5 % was a good predictor for PPI post-TAVR (sensitivity 0.86, specificity 0.76) and compares with the 14% threshold in the original validation study for any conduction abnormalities (PPI or new LBBB) (sensitivity 0.95, specificity 0.54).(11) In our study a contact pressure > 14% resulted in a PPI rate of 31% vs. 4% when contact pressure remained ≤14%. Contact pressure will increase with deeper THV implantation. Mean depth of implantation (DOI) was 5.7±4.0 for patients with PPI vs. 5.6±3.8mm for patients with no PPI, showing that implantation depth alone is not a good predictor for PPI post-TAVR. The PPI rate in PRECISE-TAVR was 13% and compares favorably with PPI rates in post-market registries (FORWARD 18%; FORWARD Pro 19%), a RCT in low-risk patients with PPI (17%) and comparable to a propensity-matched analysis using new implantation techniques(12%).(7,21-23) New implantation techniques such as the double S curve and the cusp overlap technique were not systematically applied in PRECISE-TAVR. Intuitively, a cusp overlap technique should result in higher DOI with corresponding lower contact pressure and potentially lower PPI. The length of the membranous septum also correlates with PPI. In particular a short MS (< 3mm) is associated with a higher PPI because there is a higher likelihood of contact interference between the THV frame and the His Bundle.(24)

FEops HEARTguide™ not only considers MS length but also accounts for the interaction of the THV with the surrounding anatomical structures resulting in contact pressure on the region of the conduction system. This contact pressure may correlate better with PPI than MS length per se.

Limitations

PRECISE-TAVR is a prospective observational study that only considered the Evolut Pro platform in patients with predefined complex anatomies. There was no independent screening committee, and all patients were selected by the respective local heart teams. The decision to perform additional manoeuvres to correct PVL or to proceed with PPI was at the discretion of the treating physician. Of note, total AV block was identified in 90% of patients with PPI. Echocardiograms after TAVR were evaluated by local imagers and not by an independent echocardiography Core Laboratory. Finally, computer simulations predict what ideally would happen for a specific THV size and implantation depth in a specific anatomy. Operators may not always manage to implant the THV in the exact same location as suggested by the simulation. Also, a one-shot implantation may have a different effect than multiple repositioning attempts that may result in more device LVOT interactions and trauma.

Conclusion

Feops HEARTguide™ simulations may provide enhanced insights in the risk for PVL or PPI after TAVR with a self-expanding supra-annular THV in complex anatomies.

Specific requests

What is known:

Conventional pre-procedural planning in patient undergoing TAVR includes a contrast-enhanced multi-slice computed tomography for obtaining detailed information on aortic valve morphology, dimensions, calcium burden, membranous septum length, LVOT and transcatheter heart valve sizing. However, device-host interactions remains difficult to predict, especially in patients with a challenging anatomy, leading to a higher risk of permanent pacemaker implantation and paravalvular leakage.

What the study adds

The PRECISE-TAVR trial showed that the use computer simulations leads to a significant change in pre-procedural planning, including valve size and implantation height. When comparing the implantation depth post-TAVR with the computer simulations, FEops HEARTguide™ simulations accurately predicts which patients are at risk for PPI or >trace PVL.

Sources of Funding: PRECISE-TAVR is part of a project that has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement No. 945698.

Disclosures:

- Thijmen W Hokken: none
- Henrik Wienemann: none
- James Dargan: none
- Dirk-Jan van Ginkel: none
- Cameron Dowling reports grants from Medtronic, outside the submitted work.
- Axel Unbehaun: none
- Johan Bosmans works as clinical proctor Medtronic CoreValve
- Andreas Bader-Wolfe: none
- Robert Gooley reports personal fees from Boston Scientific, outside the submitted work.
- Martin Swaans reports proctoring fees for training/educational services to the Department of Cardiology from Boston Scientific, Abbott Vascular, Edwards Lifesciences, Cardiac dimensions, Philips Healthcare and Bioventrix inc.
- Stephen J. Brecker reports Consultancy fees from : Medtronic & Aortic Innovations
- Matti Adam reports grants and personal fees from Medtronic, and personal fees from JenaValve, Edwards Lifesciences, and Boston Scientific
- Nicolas M. Van Mieghem has received research support from Abbott, Boston Scientific, Edwards Lifesciences, Medtronic, PulseCath, Daiichi Sankyo, Pie Medical, Materialise and consultancy fees from Abbott, Anteris, Boston Scientific, Medtronic, Abiomed, PulseCath, Daiichi Sankyo, Teleflex

References

1. Vahanian A, Beyersdorf F, Praz F et al. 2021 ESC/EACTS Guidelines for the management of valvular heart disease. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2021;60:727-800.
2. Writing Committee M, Otto CM, Nishimura RA et al. 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. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2021;77:450-500.
3. Blanke P, Weir-McCall JR, Achenbach S et al. Computed Tomography Imaging in the Context of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation (TAVI)/Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement (TAVR): An Expert Consensus Document of the Society of Cardiovascular Computed Tomography. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging* 2019;12:1-24.
4. Yucel-Finn A, Nicol E, Leipsic JA, Weir-McCall JR. CT in planning transcatheter aortic valve implantation procedures and risk assessment. *Clin Radiol* 2021;76:73 e1-73 e19.
5. Adams DH, Popma JJ, Reardon MJ et al. Transcatheter aortic-valve replacement with a self-expanding prosthesis. *N Engl J Med* 2014;370:1790-8.
6. Reardon MJ, Van Mieghem NM, Popma JJ et al. Surgical or Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement in Intermediate-Risk Patients. *N Engl J Med* 2017;376:1321-1331.
7. Popma JJ, Deeb GM, Yakubov SJ et al. Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement with a Self-Expanding Valve in Low-Risk Patients. *N Engl J Med* 2019;380:1706-1715.
8. Di Martino LFM, Soliman OII, Van Gils L et al. Relation between calcium burden, echocardiographic stent frame eccentricity and paravalvular leakage after corevalve transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Eur Heart J* 2017;648-653.
9. Fujita B, Kutting M, Seiffert M et al. Calcium distribution patterns of the aortic valve as a risk factor for the need of permanent pacemaker implantation after transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging* 2016;17:1385-1393.
10. Yoon SH, Bleiziffer S, De Backer O et al. Outcomes in Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement for Bicuspid Versus Tricuspid Aortic Valve Stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2017;69:2579-2589.
11. Rocatello G, El Faquir N, De Santis G et al. Patient-Specific Computer Simulation to Elucidate the Role of Contact Pressure in the Development of New Conduction Abnormalities After Catheter-Based Implantation of a Self-Expanding Aortic Valve. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 2018;11:e005344.
12. de Jaegere P, De Santis G, Rodriguez-Olivares R et al. Patient-Specific Computer Modeling to Predict Aortic Regurgitation After Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2016;9:508-12.
13. Dowling C, Bavo AM, El Faquir N et al. Patient-Specific Computer Simulation of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement in Bicuspid Aortic Valve Morphology. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging* 2019;12:e009178.
14. Schultz C, Rodriguez-Olivares R, Bosmans J et al. Patient-specific image-based computer simulation for the prediction of valve morphology and calcium displacement after TAVI with the Medtronic CoreValve and the Edwards SAPIEN valve. *EuroIntervention* 2016;11:1044-52.
15. Jilaihawi H, Chen M, Webb J et al. A Bicuspid Aortic Valve Imaging Classification for the TAVR Era. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging* 2016;9:1145-1158.
16. Rogers T, Steinvil A, Gai J et al. Choice of Balloon-Expandable Versus Self-Expanding Transcatheter Aortic Valve Impacts Hemodynamics Differently According to Aortic Annular Size. *Am J Cardiol* 2017;119:900-904.

17. Hase H, Yoshijima N, Yanagisawa R et al. Transcatheter aortic valve replacement with Evolut R versus Sapien 3 in Japanese patients with a small aortic annulus: The OCEAN-TAVI registry. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv* 2021;97:E875-E886.
18. Regazzoli D, Chiarito M, Cannata F et al. Transcatheter Self-Expandable Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis in Small Aortic Annuli: The TAVI-SMALL Registry. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2020;13:196-206.
19. Okuno T, Tomii D, Heg D et al. Five-year outcomes of mild paravalvular regurgitation after transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *EuroIntervention* 2022;18:33-42.
20. Dowling C, Gooley R, McCormick L, Firoozi S, Brecker SJ. Patient-specific computer simulation to predict long-term outcomes after transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *J Cardiovasc Comput Tomogr* 2021.
21. Grube E, Van Mieghem NM, Bleiziffer S et al. Clinical Outcomes With a Repositionable Self-Expanding Transcatheter Aortic Valve Prosthesis: The International FORWARD Study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2017;70:845-853.
22. Manoharan G, Grube E, Van Mieghem NM et al. Thirty-day clinical outcomes of the Evolut PRO self-expanding transcatheter aortic valve: the international FORWARD PRO study. *EuroIntervention* 2020;16:850-857.
23. Pascual I, Hernandez-Vaquero D, Alperi A et al. Permanent Pacemaker Reduction Using Cusp-Overlapping Projection in TAVR: A Propensity Score Analysis. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2022;15:150-161.
24. Hokken TW, Muhemin M, Okuno T et al. Impact of membranous septum length on pacemaker need with different transcatheter aortic valve replacement systems: The INTERSECT registry. *J Cardiovasc Comput Tomogr* 2022.

Figure legends

Figure 1: PPI-prediction




Figure 1: Prediction of permanent pacemaker implantations. Panel A: visualization of the FEops HEARTguide simulation: (top) prediction of the frame deformation after THV deployment, (bottom) visualization of the contact pressure (red spots) exerted on the aorta. The contact pressure index is defined as the relative area of contact within the region of interest (in black) and used as an indication for risk of conduction abnormalities. Panel B: the median contact pressure index, Panel C: the ROC curve to predict new PPI. PPI = permanent pacemaker implantation, AUC = Area under the Curve

Figure 2: PVL-prediction




Figure 2: prediction of paravalvular leakage: Panel A: Visualization of the FEops HEARTguide simulation for prediction of PVL: PVL leak is shown as orange streamlines from a front view (top) and a top view (bottom). Panel B: the median predicted PVL per PVL-grade, Panel C: the ROC curve to predict new >trace PVL. PVL = Paravalvular leakage, AUC = Area under the Curve

Table 1: baseline characteristics

	Patients
Age	79.9 (74.2-83.8)
Male gender	32 (41.6)
BMI	27.0 (22.8-34.0)
Medical history	
Hypertension	45 (58.4)
COPD	16 (20.8)
Diabetes	23 (29.9)
PAD	6 (7.8)
History of Ischemic heart disease	13 (16.9)
History of PCI	17 (22.1)
History of CABG	7 (9.1)
History of Stroke	17 (22.1)
Atrial fibrillation	21 (27.3)
Clinical presentation	
NYHA class >2	42 (54.6)
CCS class >2	6 (7.8)
Syncope	5 (6.5)
Frailty	27 (35.1)
STS-score	2.8 (1.8-4.1)
Echocardiography	
LVEF (%)	57 (55-60)
LVEDD (mm)	45.8 ± 6.5
Peak aortic gradient (mmHg)	76.2 ± 19.1
Mean aortic gradient (mmHg)	45 (38-55)
AV max velocity (m/s)	4.3 ± 0.6
AVA (cm ²)	0.74 ± 0.20
aortic regurgitation > mild	10 (13.0)
mitral regurgitation > mild	6 (7.8)
Tricuspid regurgitation > mild	7 (9.1)
MSCT analysis	
Bicuspid aortic valve	17 (22.1)
Annulus area	443.3 ± 91.3
Annulus mean diameter	23.9 ± 2.4
LVOT mean diameter	23.3 ± 2.7
SOV mean diameter	31.7 ± 4.0
Left coronary height	14.6 ± 2.6

Right coronary height	17.9 ± 3.0
Aortic valve calcification > moderate	57 (74.0)
Agatston score Males	4405 ± 978
Agatston score Females	2824 ± 1368
LVOT calcification > moderate	10 (13.0)
Indication PRECISE	
Bicuspid Aortic valve	17 (22.1)
small annulus	13 (16.9)
severe aortic calcification	47 (61.0)

Table 1: baseline characteristics. BMI = Body Mass index, COPD = Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, PAD = Peripheral Artery Disease, PCI = Percutaneous Coronary Intervention, CABG = Coronary Artery Bypass Graft, NYHA = New York Heart Association, CCS = Canadian Cardiovascular Society, STS = Society of Thoracic Surgeons, LVEF = Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction, LVEDD = Left Ventricular End Diastolic Dimensions, AV = Aortic Valve, AVA = Aortic Valve Area, LVOT = Left Ventricular Outflow tract, SOV = Sinus of Valsalva

Table 2: procedural characteristics

	patients
Procedural change	
computer simulations	
valve size	9 (11.7)
Larger valve	6 (7.8)
Smaller valve	3 (3.9)
implantation depth	18 (23.4)
Higher	14 (18.2)
Lower	4 (5.2)
Procedure	
Anesthesia	
local	63 (81.8)
general	14 (18.2)
Access	
Femoral	75 (97.4)
axillary	2 (2.6)
Cerebral embolic protection	27 (35.1)
Predilatation	48 (62.3)
Valve Size	
23	4 (5.2)
26	24 (31.2)
29	35 (45.5)
34	14 (18.2)
postdilatation	21 (27.3)
procedural complications	
procedural death	0
valve embolization	2 (2.6)
need for second valve	3 (3.9)
conversion to surgery	1 (1.3)
cardiac tamponade	3 (3.9)

Table 2: characteristics of the TAVR procedure .

Table 3: 30-day outcomes

	Patients
Death	1 (1.3)
Myocardial Infarction	0
Disabling Stroke	1 (1.3)
Acute Kidney Injury	1 (1.3)
Major bleeding	3 (3.9)
Major vascular complication	6 (7.8)
Pacemaker implantation	10 (13.0)
ECG	
Rhythm	
sinus rhythm	52 (70.3)
Atrial fibrillation	14 (18.2)
Paced	8 (10.4)
AV block	
new 1st degree AVB	9 (11.7)
Bundle Branch Block	
new LBBB	11 (14.2)
new RBBB	4 (5.2)
Echocardiography	
LVEF (%)	59 (55-60)
LVEDD (mm)	47.2 ± 5.6
Peak aortic gradient (mmHg)	15 (10-21)
Mean aortic gradient (mmHg)	8 (5-11)
AV max velocity (m/s)	1.9 (1.6-2.3)
AVA (cm ²)	1.7 (1.6-2.4)
PVL	
None-trace	55 (71.4)
Mild	17 (22.1)
moderate	5 (6.5)
mitral regurgitation > mild	5 (6.5)
Tricuspid regurgitation > mild	6 (7.8)

Table 3: 30-day Outcomes: AVB = atrioventricular block, LBBB = Left Bundle Branch Block, RBBB = Right Bundle Branch Block, LVEF = Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction, LVEDD = Left Ventricular End Diastolic Dimensions, AV = Aortic Valve, AVA = Aortic Valve Area, PVL = Paravalvular leakage

Supplemental Table 1

	Validated cut-off points	
	CPI \leq 14%	CPI >14%
New PPI	2 (4.3)	5 (31.3)
	PVL \leq 16mL/s	PVL >16mL/s
> Trace PVL	11 (19.3)	11 (61.1)

Supplemental table 1: table to show the differences in PPI and PVL in the validated cut-off points. PPI = permanent pacemaker implantation, CPI = contact pressure index, PVL = paravalvular leakage