#### 1 Long-Term Outcomes After Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement: Meta-Analysis of

## 2 Kaplan-Meier-Derived Individual Patient Data

- 3
- 4 Junichi Shimamura, MD<sup>a</sup>, Sho Takemoto, MD<sup>b</sup>, Shinichi Fukuhara, MD<sup>c</sup>, Yoshihisa
- 5 Miyamoto, MD<sup>d</sup>, Yujiro Yokoyama, MD<sup>e</sup>, Hisato Takagi, MD, PhD<sup>f</sup>, Polydoros N
- 6 Kampaktsis, MD<sup>g</sup>, Dhaval Kolte MD, PhD<sup>h</sup>, Kendra J Grubb, MD, MHA<sup>a</sup>, and Toshiki Kuno,
- 7 MD, PhD <sup>i#</sup>, Azeem Latib MD <sup>i#</sup>
- 8 <sup>a</sup> Division of Cardiothoracic Surgery, Department of Surgery, Emory University School of
- 9 Medicine, Atlanta, GA
- <sup>b</sup> Department of Cardiovascular Surgery, Kyushu University Hospital, Fukuoka, Japan
- <sup>c</sup> Department of Cardiac Surgery, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI
- <sup>d</sup> Division of Nephrology and Endocrinology, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan
- 13 <sup>e</sup> Department of Surgery, St. Luke's University Health Network, PA, USA
- <sup>14</sup> <sup>f</sup> Department of Cardiovascular Surgery, Shizuoka Medical Center, Shizuoka, Japan
- 15 <sup>g</sup> Division of Cardiology, Columbia University Irving Medical Center, New York City, NY
- <sup>h</sup> Division of Cardiology, Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School,

17 Boston, MA

- <sup>1</sup>Division of Cardiology, Montefiore Medical center, Albert Einstein Medical College, NY
- 19 # Contributed equally as co-senior authors
- 20
- 21 Short title: Long-Term Outcomes After TAVR: Meta-Analysis

22

#### 23 Address correspondence to

- 24 Shinichi Fukuhara, MD, Department of Cardiac Surgery, University of Michigan.
- 25 1500 E Medical Center Dr, Ann Arbor, MI 48109. Email: fukuhara@med.umich.edu

26	Toshiki Kuno, MD, PhD, Division of Cardiology, Montefiore Medical Center, Albert Einstein
27	College of Medicine. 111 East 210th St, New York, NY 10467-2401
28	E-mail: tkuno@montefiore.org +1-718-920-2057
29	*Drs Kuno and Fukuhara contributed equally as co-senior authors
30	
31	Total Word count: 4300
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	

51	Glossary	of Abbreviations	
----	----------	------------------	--

- 52 SAVR surgical aortic valve replacement
- 53 STS the Society of Thoracic Surgeons
- 54 SVD structural valve deterioration
- 55 TAVR transcatheter aortic valve replacement
- 56 THV transcatheter heart valve
- 57 PROM predictaed risk of mortality
- 58 PPM prosthesis patient mismatch
- 59
- 60

61 What is nev	٧?
----------------	----

- 62 Meta-analysis of time-to-event data was performed to assess long-term outcomes
- 63 following transcatheter aortic valve replacement in a large population.
- 64 Six studies, including 4,910 patients with follow-up periods of more than 20 years were
- 65 identified and analyzed.
- 66 Nearly 88% of patients who underwent transcatheter aortic valve replacement died within
- 67 10 years, while 85% remained free from structural valve deterioration at 8 years.
- 68

#### 69 Perspective Statement What are the clinical implications?

- 70 This meta-analysis demonstrated excellent freedom from structural valve deterioration in
- 71 intermediate- to high elderly risk patients.
- 72 Baseline patient characteristics correlated with high mortality at 10 years.
- Further investigation into the outcomes in younger and lower-risk populations is
  imperative to evaluate the future expanded indications for transcatheter aortic valve
  replacement.

76

#### 77 Abstract

- 78 Background: Transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) is as an alternative treatment to
- remain unclear. This study aimed to
- 80 analyze long-term outcomes following TAVR using meta-analysis.
- 81 Methods: A literature search was performed with MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Library,
- 82 Web of Science, and Google Scholar through December 2022; studies reporting clinical
- 83 outcomes of TAVR with follow-up periods of  $\geq 8$  years were included. The outcomes of
- 84 interest were overall survival and/or freedom from structural valve deterioration (SVD).
- 85 Surgical risk was assessed with the Society of Thoracic Surgeons (STS) predicted risk of
- 86 mortality (PROM) score. A subgroup analysis was conducted for intermediate-/high-surgical
- 87 risk patients only.
- 88 **Results:** Eleven studies including 5,458 patients were identified and analyzed. The mean age
- 89 was  $82.0 \pm 6.5$  years, and mean STS PROM score ranged from 2.9 to 10.6%. Survival rate at 5
- **90** and 10 years was  $47.7\% \pm 1.4\%$  and  $12.1 \pm 2.0\%$ . Five studies including 1,509 patients were
- analyzed for SVD. Freedom from SVD at 5 and 8 years was  $95.5 \pm 0.7\%$  and  $84.9 \pm 3.1\%$ .
- 92 Similar results for survival and SVD were noted in the subgroup analysis of
- 93 intermediate-/high-risk patients.
- 94 Conclusions: Following TAVR, approximately 88% of patients died within 10 years, whereas
- 85% were free from SVD at 8 years. These date suggest that baseline patient demographic have
- 96 the greatest impact on survival, and SVD does not seem to have a prognostic impact in this
- 97 population. Further investigations on longer-term outcomes of younger and lower-risk patients98 are warranted.
- 99 Keyword: Transcatheter aortic valve replacement, structural valve deterioration, aortic valve,100 aortic stenosis

101

## 102 Introduction

103	Transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) has been established as an alternative	
104	to surgical aortic valve replacement (SAVR) for most patients with severe aortic stenosis.	
105	Current practice guidelines recognize TAVR as a safe and effective option for patients across	
106	the surgical risk spectrum, for patients aged ≥65 years in the United States and ≥75 years in	
107	Europe[1, 2]. Although several randomized controlled trials have demonstrated short- and	
108	mid-term non-inferiority between the treatment with TAVR and SAVR in intermediate and	
109	low-surgical risk patients [3-5], data on long-term outcomes are still limited. Therefore,	
110	long-term durability of TAVs remains largely uncertain and there are concerns regarding the	
111	lack of data on long-term mortality and structural valve deterioration (SVD). In this context,	
112	we conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to evaluate the long-term results beyond	
113	five years following TAVR.	
114		
115	Methods	
116	This study complies with the Preferred Reporting Items for System and Reviews and	
117	Meta-Analysis statement standards[6]. Studies were included if the following criteria were	
118	met;	
119	(1) The study design was randomized or nonrandomized, retrospective or prospective	
120	observational study with matched or unmatched populations;	
121	(2) The study included patients with aortic stenosis who underwent TAVR;	
122	(3) The study reported survival and/or incidence of SVD or freedom from SVD;	
123	(4) Kaplan-Meier curves were available with numbers at risk present $\geq$ eight years.	
124	The included studies were not restricted to any language. The eligible studies were	
125	identified using a 2-level strategy. First, databases including MEDLINE, EMBASE,	

126	Cochrane Library, Web of Science, and Google Scholar were searched through November
127	2022 using Web-based search engines. Search terms included "transcatheter aortic valve
128	replacement", "transcatheter aortic valve implantation", "transcatheter heart valve (THV)",
129	and "transcatheter aortic valve". Second, relevant articles were manually identified through
130	secondary sources, including the first identified studies' reference lists. Two authors (ST and
131	JS) independently reviewed extracted publications. Studies were included only if two
132	investigators agreed. Two independent investigators (ST and JS) evaluated the risk of bias in
133	individual studies using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal checklist
134	(Supplemental Table 1). The following information was extracted: authors, year of
135	publication, year of enrollment/procedure performed, sample size, age, follow-up periods,
136	predicted risk of mortality by the Society of Thoracic Surgeons (STS) predictaed risk of
137	mortality (PROM) score[7], New York Heart Association class III/IV heart failure and left
138	ventricular ejection fraction at the time of TAVR, history of diabetes mellitus, hypertension,
139	peripheral vascular disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, renal failure, myocardial
140	infarction, atrial fibrillation, and stroke, previous coronary artery bypass graft or any cardiac
141	surgery and pacemaker implantation, type of implanted valve and approach, 30-day mortality,
142	cardiovascular mortality, and incidence of SVD.
143	Outcomes of interest
144	The primary outcome of this study was overall survival. The secondary outcome of
145	interest was freedom from SVD.
146	Definition of SVD
147	The European guidelines task force committee definition was used by all studies[8].
148	Moderate SVD was present when any of the following was present; 1) mean trans-prosthetic

149 gradient  $\ge 20$  mmHg and < 40 mmHg; 2)  $\ge 10$  mmHg and < 20 mmHg increase from

150 baseline; 3) moderate new or worsening intra-prosthetic aortic regurgitation. Severe SVD was

151	present when any of the following was present; 1) mean trans-prosthetic gradient $\geq 40$
152	mmHg; 2) $\geq$ 20 mmHg increase from baseline; 3) severe new or worsening intra-prosthetic
153	aortic regurgitation.

154

155 Statistical analysis

156 We analyzed data from the included studies based on the approach demonstrated by 157 Liu et al. to obtain a merged Kaplan-Meier curve from individual Kaplan-Meier curves[9]. 158 First, raw data coordinates (time, survival probability, or freedom from SVD) were extracted 159 from Kaplan-Meier curves. If the incidence of moderate and severe SVD was reported 160 separately, only moderate SVD data was included to avoid underestimating the incidence of 161 SVD given the low incidence of severe SVD [10, 11]. Second, individual patient data in each 162 study were reconstructed from data coordinates and the numbers at risk at given timepoint 163 using the R package "IPDfromKM". Finally, we merged individual patient data of all eligible 164 studies, and drew the Kaplan-Meier curve. The analysis was conducted with R Statistical 165 Software (version 4.2.1, Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). Median 166 values in each study were converted to mean using the quantile estimation method reported 167 by McGrath et al. [12]. The converted mean data were combined into one group by 168 Cochrane's formula (https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-06). In addition, 169 we also performed a subgroup analysis of patients at intermediate- or high-surgical risk. 170

171 Results

## 172 Literature selection results

A total of 11,987 studies were identified, published from 2002 to 2016, after removal
of duplicates and evaluation based on the selection criteria, 12 studies were included in the
meta-analysis (Figure 1). Eleven studies with a total of 5,458 patients were included in the

176	survival analysis[11, 13-22]. One study was a randomized controlled trial and remaining ten
177	studies were observational. Five studies with 1,509 patients were included in the analysis of
178	freedom from SVD [10, 11, 16, 17, 19]. One study was a randomized controlled trial, and
179	remaining studies were observational. Four of these five studies were also included in the
180	survival analysis[11, 16, 17, 19]. The included studies are summarized in Table 1. The
181	studies were conducted between 2002 and 2016. Only one study (the NOTION trial) included
182	145 patients with low-surgical risk (2.7% for survival analysis and 9.6% for SVD analysis of
183	the study population).
184	
185	Patient and procedure characteristics
186	Patient characteristics are summarized in Table 1. In the survival analysis, the longest
187	follow-up ranged from 8 to 12.4 years among included studies, with a weighted median of 4.9
188	years. Pooled mean age was $82.0 \pm 6.5$ years, and the mean STS PROM score ranged from
189	2.9 to 10.6%. Regarding the implantation approach, 76.5% (4,175/5,458) of cases were
190	transfemoral TAVR. In the freedom from SVD analysis, the mean age was $80.1\pm7.1$ years,
191	and a weighted median follow-up period was 5.8 years. The longest follow-up period ranged
192	from 8 to 11 years. Valve types are described in Table 2. In five studies reporting freedom
193	from SVD, 722 (47.8%) TAVRs were performed using SAPIEN <sup>®</sup> , SAPIEN XT <sup>®</sup> , or SAPIEN
194	3 <sup>®</sup> valves (Edwards Lifesciences, Irvine, California, USA), and 643 (42.6%) using
195	CoreValve® (Medtronic, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA). Early-generation THVs (SAPIEN,
196	SAPIEN XT, CoreValve) accounted for 90.5% of patients.
197	
198	All-cause mortality and freedom from SVD
199	Survival rate and freedom from SVD in each study are summarized in Supplemental

**200** Tables 2A and 2B. Aggregated survival rate was  $47.7 \pm 1.4\%$  and  $12.1 \pm 2.0\%$  at 5 and 10

201	years, respectively (Figure 2A). Incidence rate of death was 13.8 per 100 person-years (i.e.,
202	13.8% annually). Aggregated freedom from SVD was 95.5 $\pm$ 0.7% and 84.9 $\pm$ 3.1% at 5 and
203	8 years, respectively (Figure 3A). The 11 studies in the survival analysis did not provide
204	information on the specific causes of death; however, 6 of the 11 studies disclosed the
205	percentages of cardiovascular death to overall death, which ranged from 7.6% to 60.5%.
206	Timing of death, the incidence of early and late mortality, and incidence of cardiovascular
207	death are summarized in Supplemental Table 3.
208	
209	Subgroup analysis of intermediate- or high-surgical risk patients
210	In the subgroup analysis excluding the one study with low-surgical risk patients, the
211	mean age was $82.1 \pm 6.6$ years old, and the mean STS PROM score ranged from 4.6 to 10.6%.
212	Survival rate at 5 and 10 years was $47.0\% \pm 1.3\%$ and $11.4 \pm 2.2\%$ , respectively (Figure 2B).
213	Freedom from SVD at 5 and 8 years was $95.5 \pm 0.7\%$ and $85.0 \pm 3.3\%$ , respectively (Figure
214	3B).
215	
216	Discussion
217	In this meta-analysis of 11 studies (5,458 patients with an average age of 82 years and
218	mostly high/intermediate-surgical risk), we report the following important findings: (1)
219	overall survival following TAVR at 10 years was $12.1 \pm 2.0\%$ ; (2) freedom from SVD at 8
220	years was $84.9 \pm 3.1\%$ .
221	
222	Long-term survival
223	The high late mortality rate in our study was mainly attributed to the elderly
224	population with a short life expectancy and significant comorbidities reflected in the high
225	STS PROM scores. This data must be interpreted based on the natural history of severe aortic

226 stenosis, life expectancy of the matched population, and mortality following surgical aortic 227 valve replacement (SAVR). If severe aortic stenosis is left untreated, the annual mortality rate 228 of patients with untreated severe aortic stenosis is known to be approximately 25%[23]. Also, 229 patients who did not undergo TAVR had 5-year mortality of 93.6%, which is higher than 230 10-year mortality among patients who underwent TAVR in this study[24]. 231 Regarding long-term survival following SAVR, Malvindi et al. analyzed 1,870 232 patients aged 80 years and over with logistic EuroSCORE of 13.3 % who underwent SAVR 233 and reported that the survival rate was 31% at 10 years, which was similar to the expected

survival of a sex- and aged -matched population[25]. Similarly, in a study by Brennan et al.

analyzing over 43,000 patients who underwent SAVR with either mechanical or bioprosthetic

236 prosthesis primarily for aortic stenosis, the survival rate for high-risk patients was

approximately 20% at 8 years[26]. In contrast, the NOTION trial included patients of similar

age (mean age, 79) but low surgical risk and treated with self-expanding CoreValve, and the

survival rate was higher with 51.8% at 8 years following TAVR[17]. Given the small number

of patients in NOTION in our study, the survival rate was similar with or without low

surgical-risk patients included, resulting in mostly intermediate-high risk patients with a

242 higher mortality rate. Nonetheless, to understand the accurate survival of elderly patients

243 undergoing TAVR with low-/intermediate-risk, especially over 75 years of age, a further

analysis based on the surgical risk stratification is warranted. Moreover, since the cut-off age

245 for TAVR is still controversial and there exists a difference between the two major

246 guidelines[1, 2], understanding the long-term survival data in younger patients, such as those

247 between 65-75 years of age, is essential before expanding the indication for TAVR.

248 Prosthesis-patient mismatch (PPM) is another important consideration. Despite
249 technological advances in valve design, PPM is an unsolved complication following SAVR

250	and TAVR. Although the impact of post-SAVR PPM on survival has been well-recognized,
251	the evidence regarding post-TAVR PPM remains limited[27] with some data that PPM may
252	influence the survival following TAVR[28]. The incidence of PPM appears higher with
253	balloon-expandable valve than self-expandable valve, whereas the impact on survival seems
254	to be higher with self-expandable valve than balloon-expandable valves[29, 30]. Further
255	assessment of PPM incidence and its prognostic significance stratified by valve type are
256	needed.
257	Freedom from SVD
258	Our meta-analysis of SVD at 8-year provides insights into long-term THV
259	performance. Studies reporting durability of the THVs according to the new standardized
260	criteria of the 2017 EAPCI/ESC/EACTS consensus, moderate SVD was reported at
261	3.6-14.9%, severe at 0.8-3.7% at follow-up of 5-8 years[10, 11, 16, 17, 19].
262	Due to the extremely low late survival and the resultant influence on the SVD rate as
263	competing events, our results should be interpreted with caution. Nevertheless, we
264	demonstrate acceptable durability of TAVR at 8 years with over 85% of patients were free
265	from SVD. We elected to use the 2017 consensus document definition of SVD as it better
266	corresponded with the era of the trials included in this meta-analysis. The Valve Academic
267	Research Consortium 3 definitions were published subsequently and may provide a more
268	consistent definition of SVD going forward[31].
269	A main clinical concern currently is whether TAVR valves show non-inferior durability
270	compared to bioprosthetic SAVR valves. The frequency of SVD based on reintervention of
271	the Carpentier-Edward PERIMOUNT aortic valve at 10 and 20 years were 1.9% and 15%
272	overall[32] in a study of 12,569 patients (mean age,71). Few randomized trials have
273	compared long-term durability of TAVR valves vs bioprosthetic SAVR and results are
274	conflicting. In NOTION trial, 280 patients (mean age, 79.1) with low surgical risk were
	11

275	randomized. At 8 years of follow-up SVD was lower in TAVR than SAVR (13.9% vs 28.3%).
276	In the post hoc analysis of pooled date from the CoreValve US High Risk Pivotal and
277	SURTAVI trials, a total of 2,099 patients (mean age, 82.1) were included. At 5 years of
278	follow-up, cumulative incidence of SVD treating death as a competing risk was lower in
279	patients undergoing TAVR than SAVR (TAVR, 2.2%; SAVR 4.38%). SVD was associated
280	with a two-fold increased risk of 5-year all-cause mortality[32]. Ueyama et al. performed a
281	network meta-analysis to compare the durability of the THVs (balloon-expandable and
282	self-expandable) and SAVR prosthesis[33]. They reported that self-expandable valves
283	demonstrated significantly larger effective orifice area, lower mean aortic valve gradient, and
284	lower incidence of SVD compared with balloon-expandable and SAVR valves at 5 years.
285	Both TAVR valves suffered an increased risk of aortic regurgitation and re-intervention
286	compared with SAVR valves. The latest generation bioprosthesis for SAVR, the INSPIRIS
287	RESILIA® aortic valve (Edwards Lifesciences LLC, Irvine, CA) using calcification-prevent
288	technology, has demonstrated 100% of freedom from SVD in 689 patients at 5 years,
289	expecting further longer-term durability[34]. Similarly, SAPIEN 3 Ultra RESILLIA which
290	has been recently launced has enhanced calcium blocking properties and future THVs also
291	may be able to provide better durability with technological advances. For the accurate
292	understanding of the THV durability, even longer follow-up, assessment stratified by valve
293	type and generation, and echocardiographic data are essential.
294	In our study, both balloon-expandable valve and self-expandable valves were used
295	(only balloon-expandable in two, only self-expandable in one, and both valves in two studies).
296	A comparative study between CoreValve and SAPIEN up to 7 years was performed by
297	Deutsch et al., demonstrated favorable outcomes in SVD with CoreValve[35]. (11.8% in
298	CoreValve vs 22.6% in SAPIEN). This result may be explained by supra-annular
299	configuration of self-expandable valves, which provides a larger effective orifice area than

300	balloon-expandable valves with intra-annular leaflet design. Devices of different generations
301	were also included in our study. Early-generation THVs (SAPIEN, SAPIEN XT, CoreValve)
302	accounted for 90.5% of patients in the current SVD analysis. Further study is warranted
303	regarding the incidence of SVD in patients treated with newer generation valves and
304	performance of each THVs should be assessed individually.
305	
306	Limitations
307	This study has several limitations. First, our study included only one randomized study
308	and has the inherent limitations of meta-analysis related to the retrospective observational
309	studies. Therefore, we could only perform a single arm analysis of patients underwent TAVR.
310	Second, follow-up on valve durability was performed in a survival cohort with death exerting
311	a competing risk and it may have biased and underestimated the SVD rate. Third, as in all
312	studies with long-term follow-up, patient cohort and utilized THVs (type or generation) and
313	approaches differ from the current population and technologies. Causes of death were not
314	available in most of the studies, resulting in the difficulty to assess the impact of
315	cardiovascular events on mortality.
316	
317	Conclusions
318	Among elderly TAVR recipients in the intermediate- to high-risk category, approximately
319	88% died within 10 years, which is markedly superior compared to the untreated severe AS
320	population. Over 85% of patients were free from SVD at eight years, suggesting acceptable
321	durability of the early generation TAVR valves. Further longer-term investigations in
322	younger and lower-risk patients with newer generation TAVR valves are warranted.
323	
324	

^	^	-
٠,	•,	h
• •	/	.,
_	_	-

## 326 Funding: None

- 327 Disclosure: Dr. Fukuhara serves as a consultant for Terumo Aortic, Artivion, and Medtronic
- 328 Inc. Dr. Grubb serves as a consultant or receives an honorarium from Medtronic, Abbott,
- 329 Boston Scientific, 4C Medical, Ancora, and educational funding from Edwards Lifesciences,
- 330 Dr Latib is a consultant and/or has served on the advisory board of Medtronic, Boston
- 331 Scientific, Edwards Lifesciences, Abbott, and Anteris.

350

#### 351 Reference

- 3531.Otto, C.M., et al., 2020 ACC/AHA Guideline for the Management of Patients With Valvular Heart354Disease: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Joint Committee355on Clinical Practice Guidelines. Circulation, 2021. 143(5): p. e72-e227.
- 3562.Vahanian, A., et al., 2021 ESC/EACTS Guidelines for the management of valvular heart disease:357Developed by the Task Force for the management of valvular heart disease of the European Society of358Cardiology (ESC) and the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS). Rev Esp Cardiol359(Engl Ed), 2022. **75**(6): p. 524.
- 360 3. Leon, M.B., et al., Outcomes 2 Years After Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients at Low
   361 Surgical Risk. J Am Coll Cardiol, 2021. 77(9): p. 1149-1161.
- Makkar, R.R., et al., *Five-Year Outcomes of Transcatheter or Surgical Aortic-Valve Replacement*. N Engl J Med, 2020. **382**(9): p. 799-809.
- 364 5. Popma, J.J., et al., *Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement with a Self-Expanding Valve in Low-Risk* 365 *Patients*. N Engl J Med, 2019. 380(18): p. 1706-1715.
- 366 6. Moher, D., et al., Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. PLoS Med, 2009. 6(7): p. e1000097.
- 368 7. Shahian, D.M., et al., *The Society of Thoracic Surgeons 2018 Adult Cardiac Surgery Risk Models:* 369 *Part 1-Background, Design Considerations, and Model Development.* Ann Thorac Surg, 2018. 105(5): p.
   370 1411-1418.
- 3718.Capodanno, D., et al., Standardized definitions of structural deterioration and valve failure in assessing372long-term durability of transcatheter and surgical aortic bioprosthetic valves: a consensus statement373from the European Association of Percutaneous Cardiovascular Interventions (EAPCI) endorsed by the374European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery375(EACTS). Eur J Cardiothorac Surg, 2017. 52(3): p. 408-417.
- 3769.Liu, N., Y. Zhou, and J.J. Lee, IPDfromKM: reconstruct individual patient data from published377Kaplan-Meier survival curves. BMC Med Res Methodol, 2021. 21(1): p. 111.
- 378 10. Blackman, D.J., et al., Long-Term Durability of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Prostheses. J Am Coll Cardiol, 2019. 73(5): p. 537-545.
- 380 11. Erlebach, M., et al., *The 10-year horizon: Survival and structural valve degeneration in first-generation transcatheter aortic valves.* Arch Cardiovasc Dis, 2022. **115**(6-7): p. 369-376.
- 38212.McGrath, S., et al., Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from commonly reported383quantiles in meta-analysis. Stat Methods Med Res, 2020. 29(9): p. 2520-2537.
- 38413.Barbanti, M., et al., Incidence of Long-Term Structural Valve Dysfunction and Bioprosthetic Valve385Failure After Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. J Am Heart Assoc, 2018. 7(15): p. e008440.
- 38614.Brízido, C., et al., Surgical versus transcatheter aortic valve replacement in low-risk patients: A387Iong-term propensity score-matched analysis. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv, 2021. 98(7): p. E1033-e1043.
- 38815.Durand, E., et al., Assessment of Long-Term Structural Deterioration of Transcatheter Aortic389Bioprosthetic Valves Using the New European Definition. Circ Cardiovasc Interv, 2019. 12(4): p.390e007597.
- 391 16. Eltchaninoff, H., et al., Assessment of structural valve deterioration of transcatheter aortic
   392 bioprosthetic balloon-expandable valves using the new European consensus definition.
   393 EuroIntervention, 2018. 14(3): p. e264-e271.
- 39417.Jørgensen, T.H., et al., Eight-year outcomes for patients with aortic valve stenosis at low surgical risk395randomized to transcatheter vs. surgical aortic valve replacement. Eur Heart J, 2021. 42(30): p.3962912-2919.
- **397**18.Panico, R.A., et al., Long-term results and durability of the CoreValve transcatheter aortic**398**bioprosthesis: outcomes beyond five years. EuroIntervention, 2019. **14**(16): p. 1639-1647.
- 39919.Sathananthan, J., et al., Ten year follow-up of high-risk patients treated during the early experience400with transcatheter aortic valve replacement. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv, 2021. 97(3): p. E431-e437.
- 40120.Scotti, A., et al., 10-Year Impact of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement Leaflet Design (Intra-402Versus Supra-Annular) in Mortality and Hemodynamic Performance. Front Cardiovasc Med, 2022. 9: p.

403		924958.
404	21.	Testa, L., et al., Long-term clinical outcome and performance of transcatheter aortic valve replacement
405		with a self-expandable bioprosthesis. Eur Heart J, 2020. 41(20): p. 1876-1886.
406	22.	Vriesendorp, P.A., et al., Short- and Long-Term Outcomes After Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation
407		in Public and Private Hospital Settings: A Propensity-Matched Analysis. Heart Lung Circ, 2021. 30(12):
408		р. 1910-1917.
409	23.	Clark, M.A., et al., Five-year clinical and economic outcomes among patients with medically managed
410		severe aortic stenosis: results from a Medicare claims analysis. Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes, 2012.
411		<b>5</b> (5): p. 697-704.
412	24.	Kapadia, S.R., et al., 5-year outcomes of transcatheter aortic valve replacement compared with
413		standard treatment for patients with inoperable aortic stenosis (PARTNER 1): a randomised controlled
414		<i>trial</i> . Lancet, 2015. <b>385</b> (9986): p. 2485-91.
415	25.	Malvindi, P.G., et al., Long-term survival after surgical aortic valve replacement in patients aged 80
416		years and over. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg, 2021. 60(3): p. 671-678.
41/	26.	Brennan, J.M., et al., Long-term survival after aortic valve replacement among high-risk elderly
418		patients in the United States: insights from the Society of Thoracic Surgeons Adult Cardiac Surgery
419	27	<i>Database, 1991 to 2007.</i> Circulation, 2012. <b>126</b> (13): p. 1621-9.
420	27.	Sa, M., et al., Surgical aortic valve replacement and patient-prostnesis mismatch: a meta-analysis of
421	20	108 182 patients. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg, 2019. <b>56</b> (1): p. 44-54.
422	28.	Sa, M.P., et al., Impact of Prostnesis-Patient Mismatch After Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement:
423	20	Weild-Analysis of Kuplun-Weler-Derived Individual Patient Data. JACC Caldiovasc Inlaging, 2022.
425	29.	Replacement: From the STS/ACC TVT Registry 1 Am Coll Cardiol 2018 <b>72</b> (22): p. 2701-2711
426	30	Tang G H L et al. Outcomes of Prosthesis-Patient Mismatch Following Sunra-Annular Transcatheter
427	50.	Antic Valve Replacement: From the STS/ACC TVT Registry JACC Cardiovasc Interv 2021 14(9): p
428		964-976
429	31.	Généreux, P., et al., Valve Academic Research Consortium 3: Undated Endpoint Definitions for
430		Aortic Valve Clinical Research. J Am Coll Cardiol, 2021. <b>77</b> (21): p. 2717-2746.
431	32.	Johnston, D.R., et al., Long-term durability of bioprosthetic aortic valves: implications from 12,569
432		implants. Ann Thorac Surg, 2015. 99(4): p. 1239-47.
433	33.	Ueyama, H., et al., Meta-Analysis Comparing Valve Durability Among Different Transcatheter and
434		Surgical Aortic Valve Bioprosthesis. Am J Cardiol, 2021. <b>158</b> : p. 104-111.
435	34.	Bavaria, J.E., et al., Five-year Outcomes of the COMMENCE Trial Investigating Aortic Valve
436		Replacement with RESILIA Tissue. Ann Thorac Surg, 2022.
437	35.	Deutsch, M.A., et al., Beyond the five-year horizon: long-term outcome of high-risk and inoperable
438		patients undergoing TAVR with first-generation devices. EuroIntervention, 2018. 14(1): p. 41-49.
439		
440		
441		
442		
443		
<b>111</b>		
445		
440		
440		
446		
447		
44/		

448	
449	
450	Figure Legend
451	Figure 1. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)
452	flow diagram.
453	Figure 2. Kaplan-Meir curve describing overall survival following TAVR with 95%
454	confidence intervals reconstructed from pooled individual patient data. TAVR: transcatheter
455	aortic valve replacement.
456	A: overall cohort
457	B: cohort excluding patients with low surgical risk
458	Figure 3. Kaplan-Meir curve describing freedom from SVD following TAVR with 95%
459	confidence intervals reconstructed from pooled individual patient data. SVD: structural valve
460	deterioration; TAVR: transcatheter aortic valve replacement.
461	A: overall cohort
462	B: cohort excluding patients with low surgical risk
463	
464	
465	

Author	N of patients	Country	Design	Study Period	Median follow-up period, years	Age	Male	NYHA III-IV	Diabetes	Hypertension	PVD	COPD	Renal failure	Prior MI	Prior AF	Prior stroke	Prior pacem aker	Prior PCI	Prior CAB G	Prior Cardiac Surgery	STS score, %	LVEF, %
Eltchani noff et al, 2018	378	France	Prospe ctive Cohort	April 2002 to Septemb er 2012	3.1 (0.9-5.0)	83.3±6.8	177 (45.9)	290 (75.1)	83 (21.5)	216 (56.0)	304 (80.4)	NA	289 (74.9)	91 (23.6)	148 (38.3)	23 (6.0)	48 (12.4)	105 (27.2)	71 (18.4)	NA	10.6± 8.5	55.0±16. 3
Barbanti et al, 2018	287	Italy	Prospe ctive Cohort	June 4, 2007 to March 30, 2012	6.7	80.7±5.3	120 (41.7)	195 (67.7)	76 (26.4)	248 (86.1)	17 (5.9)	102 (35.4)	59 (20.5)	53 (18.4)	44 (15.3)	18 (6.3)	28 (9.7)	88 (30.6)	31 (10.8)	NA	8.1±5. 1	53.3±15. 9
Panico et al, 2019	278	Italy	Prospe ctive Cohort	Septemb er 2007 to July 2013	6.8	82.3±5.5	132 (47.5)	NA	84 (30.2)	234 (84.2)	82 (29.5)	46 (16.55)	NA	40 (14.4)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6.4±5. 0	NA
Durand et al, 2019	1264	France	Prospe ctive Cohort	April 2002 to Decemb	3.9 (1.9-5.1)	82.6±7.5	651 (51.8)	1013 (83.0)	301 (24.0)	859 (68.5)	333 (26.6)	NA	867 (71.1)	238 (18.9)	377 (32.4)	117 (9.3)	181 (14.9)	NA	235 (22.7)	NA	NA	52.8±14. 4
Testa et al, 2020	990	Italy	Prospe ctive Cohort	June 2007 to Decemb	4.4 (1.5-6.7)	82±6	450 (45.5)	733 (74.0)	266 (26.9)	805 (81.3)	NA	256 (25.9)	220 (22.2)	187 (18.9)	NA	157 (15.9)	NA	296 (29.9)	143 (14.4)	NA	9±10	51±12
Sathana nthan et al, 2020	235	Canada	Retros pective Cohort	2005 to 2009	NA	82.4±7.9	118 (50.2)	NA	59 (25.1)	165 (70.2)	75 (31.9)	62 (26.4)	129 (54.9)	127 (54.0)	104 (44.3)	44 (18.7)	38 (16.2)	NA	NA	86 (36.6)	NA	NA
Vriesen dorp et al, 2021 (public)	344	Australia	Prospe ctive Cohort	August 2008 to July 2019	3.3 (2.2-5.0)	83.8±5.5	278 (44.8)	NA	154 (30.4)	365 (72.0)	71 (14.0)	115 (22.7)	36 (7.1)	NA	178 (35.1)	81 (16.0)	NA	NA	NA	110 (21.7)	4.6±3. 4	NA
Vriesen dorp et al, 2021 (private)	344	Australia	Prospe ctive Cohort	August 2008 to July 2019	2.8 (1.5-4.7)	83.6±5.6	224 (51.4)	NA	96 (22.0)	283 (64.9)	96 (22.0)	39 (8.2)	37 (8.5)	NA	117 (26.8)	50 (11.4)	NA	NA	NA	102 (23.4)	5.0±3. 1	NA
Brizido et al, 2021	79	Portugal	Retros pective Cohort	June 2009 to July 2017	NA	81±8	39 (49)	38 (48.1)	25 (32)	35 (44)	NA	14 (18)	18 (23)	NA	16 (20)	9 (11)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jørgense n et al, 2021	145	Denmark, Sweden	Prospe ctive Cohort	Decemb er 2009 to Decemb er 2012	NA	79.2±4.9	78 (53.8)	70 (48.6)	26 (17.9)	103 (71.0)	6 (4.1)	17 (11.7)	NA	8 (5.5)	40 (27.8)	24 (16.6)	5 (3.4)	11 (7.6)	NA	NA	2.9±1. 6	NA
Erlebach et al, 2022	510	Germany	Prospe ctive Cohort	June 2007 to Decemb	4.6±3.3	79.6±6.7	193 (37.8)	NA	131 (25.7)	404 (79.2)	NA	92 (18.1)	NA	NA	NA	72 (14.2)	39 (7.6)	NA	NA	128 (25)	6.0±3. 1	NA
Scotti et al, 2022	604	Italy	Prospe ctive Cohort	June 2007 to Decemb	4.9 (2.5-6.2)	82 (78, 85)	283 (46.9)	339 (56)	175 (29)	543 (91)	NA	151 (25)	295 (49)	111 (18)	195 (33)	78 (13)	51 (8)	198 (33)	75 (12)	93 (15)	4.8 (3.1, 10.2)	55±15
Blackma n et al, 2019	241	United Kingdom	Prospe ctive Cohort	2007 to 2011	5.8 (5.3-7.7)	79.3±7.5	126 (54.0)	NA	52 (23.3)	NA	60 (26.0)	60 (26.9)	NA	60 (25.6)	54 (25.0)	43 (19.3)	NA	NA	NA	92 (41.3)	NA	NA

# 466Table 1. Summary of included studies and patient characteristics

- 469 Values are n (%), mean  $\pm$  SD, or median (range)
- 470 NYHA: New York Heart Association; PVD: peripheral vascular disease; COPD: chronic pulmonary disease; HF: heart failure; MI: myocardial infarction; AF:
- 471 atrial fibrillation; PCI: percutaneous coronary intervention; CABG: coronary artery bypass grafting; STS: The Society of Thoracic Surgeons; LVEF: left
- 472 ventricular ejection fraction; NA: not applicable.
- 473
- 474

# 475 Table 2. Procedural data

Author	Yea r	PVT/Cribier-Edward s	SAPIE N	SAPIE N XT	SAPIE N family	CoreValv e	Evolut R or family	Jen a	Portic 0	Lotu s	Acurat e	Balloon-expandabl e	Self-expandabl e	23 mm	26 mm	29 mm	≥ 26 mm	Valve in valve	New pacemake r
Eltchaninoff et al	2018	73 (20.5)	83 (21.5)	216 (56.0)	299 (77.5)	0	0	0	0	0	0	378 (100)	0	207 (53.6	167 (43.3	4 (1.0)	171 (44.3	0	21 (5.6)
Barbanti <i>et al</i>	2018	NA	NA	48 (16.7)	48 (16.7)	238 (82.6)	0	0	0	0	0	48 (16.7)	238 (82.6)	) 31 (10.8	) 149 (51.7	95 (33.0	) 244 (84.7	0	47 (16.3)
Panico et al	2019	0	0	0	0	278 (100)	0	0	0	0	0	0	278 (100)	) NA	) NA	) NA	) NA	0	98 (35.3)
Durand et al	2019	70 (5.5)	475 (37.6)	512 (40.5)	987 (78.1)	199 (15.7)	0	7 (0.6)	0	0	0	1057 (83.6)	206 (16.3)	471 (37.7	NA	NA	779 (62.3	0	147 (14.9)
Testa et al	2020	0	0	0	0	990 (100)	NA	0	0	0	0	0	990 (100)	NA	257 (54.2	439 (44.3	) 711 (100)	0	NA
Sathananthan <i>et</i> al	2020	49 (20.9)	182 (77.4)	0	182 (77.4)	4 (1.7)	0	0	0	0	0	231 (98.3)	4 (1.7)	58 (24.7	) 174 (74.0	) 3 (1.3)	177 (75.3	5 (2.1)	NA
Vriesendorp <i>et al</i>	2021	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	150 (29.6)	36 (8.3)	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	59 (17.2)
(private)	2021	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	357 (70.4)	400 (91.7)	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	71 (20.6)
Brizido et al	2021	NA	NA	NA	28 (35.4)	NA	41 (51.9)	0	8 (10-1)	2 (3)	0	28 (35)	49 (62)	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	15 (19)
Jørgensen et al	2021	0	0	0	0	142 (100)	0	0	0	0	0	0	142 (100)	2 (1.4)	57 (40.1	69 (48.6	140 (98.6	0	42.5 (11.0)
Erlebach et al	2022	NA	147 (28.9)	14 (2.7)	161 (31.2)	348 (68.2)	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	161 (31.2)	348 (68.2)	58 (11.4	236 (46.4	215 (42.2	451 (88.6	0	101 (19.8)
Scotti et al	2022	0	NA	230 (38.1)	425 (70.4)	99 (16.4)	0	0	0	57 (9.4)	23 (3.8)	425 (70.4)	179 (29.6)	) 192 (31.8	) 249 (41.2	) 65 (10.8	) 384 (63.6	0	NA
Blackman et al	2019	0	45 (19.3)	35 (15.0)	80 (34.3)	149 (64.0)	0	0	4 (1.7)	0	0	80 (33.2)	153 (63.5)	) NA	) NA	) NA	) NA	16 (6.8)	39 (17.6)

477 Values are n (%).

PVT: Percutaneous Valve Technologies, NA: not applicable.









