

1 Outcomes of patients with calcific aortic
2 valve disease according to the extent of
3 cardiac damage
4

5 Running title: Outcomes in CAVD with associated cardiac damage

6

7 Matthew K Moore¹, Gregory T Jones², Gillian Whalley¹, Bernard Prendergast³, Michael
8 J.A. Williams, Sean Coffey^{1, 4}

9 ¹ Department of Medicine, HeartOtago, Dunedin School of Medicine, University of Otago,
10 Dunedin, New Zealand

11 ² Department of Surgical Sciences, Dunedin School of Medicine, University of Otago,
12 Dunedin, New Zealand

13 ³ St Thomas' Hospital and Cleveland Clinic London, United Kingdom

14 ⁴ Department of Cardiology, Dunedin Hospital, Te Whatu Ora, Dunedin, New Zealand

15

16 Corresponding author: Sean Coffey, sean.coffey@otago.ac.nz

1 **Text abstract and keywords**

2 **Title**

3 Outcomes of patients with calcific aortic valve disease according to the extent of cardiac
4 damage.

5 **Background**

6 A staging system for aortic stenosis (AS) based upon the extent of cardiac damage has been
7 proposed to better stratify risk and evaluate the benefit of aortic valve intervention (AVI),
8 especially in those with moderate AS. We sought to evaluate the prognostic value of this
9 staging system.

10 **Methods**

11 Data from initial clinically indicated echocardiograms performed between 2010 and 2018 in
12 patients >18 years of age were extracted and linked to national outcome data. The combined
13 primary outcome was mortality or hospitalization with heart failure.

14 **Results**

15 Amongst 24,699 patients, 513 and 920 had moderate and mild AS, respectively. In moderate
16 AS, Stage 0 cardiac damage was present in 9.4%, Stage 1 in 53.7%, Stage 2 in 31.1%, Stage
17 3 in 3.2%, and Stage 4 in 2.6%. In mild AS, rates were 11.5%, 57.8%, 25.0%, 2.6%, and
18 3.0% for each consecutive stage. Increasing stage was associated with increased risk of the
19 primary outcome in both moderate (HR 1.62/stage) and mild AS (HR 1.93/stage). After
20 censoring at the time of AVI, increasing stage was also associated with mortality in moderate
21 (HR 1.97/stage) and mild AS (HR 2.06/stage).

1 **Conclusion**

2 Stage of cardiac damage predicts prognosis in both moderate and mild AS to a similar extent.

3 Outcomes may therefore not be fully related to the haemodynamic consequences of valve

4 disease, and hence may not be entirely reversible after valve intervention. Revised

5 management algorithms focusing on earlier intervention and novel treatment strategies

6 targeting cardiac damage are needed to improve clinical outcomes in patients with AS.

7

1 **Background**

2 Calcific aortic valve disease (CAVD) poses an increasing challenge to health and the
3 increasing incidence in aging populations creates a need to improve our ability to identify
4 those who may benefit most from early intervention. Whilst current indications for
5 intervention are largely directed by symptom status, cardiac damage is increasingly
6 recognised in this patient cohort and associated with mortality in both moderate and severe
7 aortic stenosis (AS) (1-4). A staging system for the classification of cardiac damage
8 demonstrates that baseline abnormalities predict poor outcomes, whilst improved staging
9 following aortic valve intervention (AVI) is associated with reduced mortality at two year
10 follow up (5).

11 Use of this staging system to identify cardiac damage could improve outcomes following
12 AVI compared to the current “wait for symptoms” approach and facilitate the identification
13 of those who may benefit most from intervention. However, the utility of the system depends
14 on its ability to clearly delineate between severe haemodynamic effects related to AS and
15 those related to other pathologies. In this study, we aim to assess the use of this staging
16 system in both mild and moderate AS, and clarify whether adverse outcomes are driven by
17 the valve pathology.

18 **Methods**

19 *Study cohort*

20 The local regional health authority (Te Whatu Ora – Southern) provides secondary and
21 tertiary cardiology services to the lower part of New Zealand’s South Island, with
22 approximately 5000-6500 echocardiograms performed annually amongst the 330,000
23 inhabitants. Our cohort comprised all patients aged >18 years undergoing a clinically
24 indicated echocardiogram at Dunedin and Invercargill Hospitals, New Zealand over a nine-

1 year period (January 1st 2010 - December 31st 2018). Only those with mild or moderate AS
2 were included in the primary analysis.

3 *Collection of echocardiographic data*

4 This was a retrospective study of routinely acquired clinical information, and details of data
5 acquisition and cleaning are fully described elsewhere (6). Data were housed in the Syngo
6 Dynamics echocardiographic picture archiving and communication system (PACS) (version
7 VA20F, Siemens Healthineers, Erlangen, Germany), and studies were extracted using the
8 proprietary Syngo Dynamics Data Miner in a comma-delimited file. In all, 42,517 studies
9 were extracted and underwent data cleaning, using previously described variable definitions
10 and methods (6). Only the first study for each individual was included, and those with
11 missing CAVD status (n=1,323) were excluded, leading to a final sample size of 24,699
12 patients who were linked by national health index (NHI) number to provide outcome data.

13 Qualitative categorical variables were extracted from the echocardiogram report using
14 tailored functions to analyse free text fields for relevant variables, and the report text used to
15 categorize CAVD status. The classification of CAVD was based on the reading cardiologist's
16 clinical description in the echocardiogram report. Thus, "sclerosis" was reported if the valve
17 was described as sclerosed, thickened, or calcified, in the absence of higher levels of severity.
18 Clinically reported mild-to-moderate and moderate-to-severe CAVD were collapsed down to
19 mild and moderate disease, respectively. Aortic valve morphology was recorded as bicuspid
20 if explicitly stated, and otherwise as tricuspid. Patients who had undergone previous surgical
21 or transcatheter aortic valve intervention were described separately. Information on other
22 cardiovascular comorbidities (such as diabetes, hypertension, or chronic kidney disease) were
23 not available in our dataset.

1 *Data validation*

2 To determine the accuracy of the Data Miner output, 100 studies were randomly selected and
3 full data extraction was compared to the final clinical echocardiogram report in the electronic
4 health record, which showed excellent agreement (6).

5 *Staging of CAVD*

6 Stages of extra-valvular cardiac damage were classified based upon a modification of
7 previous descriptions (1):

- 8 - **Stage 0:** no extra-valvular cardiac damage
- 9 - **Stage 1:** LV mass >224g (male) or >162g (female), E/e' >14 or not measured, or left
10 ventricular ejection fraction <40%
- 11 - **Stage 2:** moderate or greater left atrial dilation, atrial fibrillation, or moderate or more
12 mitral regurgitation
- 13 - **Stage 3:** right ventricular systolic pressure >60 mmHg or moderate or more tricuspid
14 regurgitation
- 15 - **Stage 4:** moderate or greater impairment of right ventricular systolic function

16 LV mass was calculated using the Devereaux formula. Body surface area was frequently not
17 available in our dataset, so the upper limits of the normal range of absolute LV mass were
18 used (7). Those with an LV mass >1000g were excluded since this value was unlikely to
19 reflect a true measurement. Similarly, E/e' was not measured in those with significant mitral
20 valve disease, mitral annular calcification, arrhythmia or other settings where this parameter
21 is inaccurate, and assumed to be abnormal if not recorded (8).

1 *Primary and secondary outcomes*

2 The pre-specified primary outcome was a composite of mortality and hospitalisation with a
3 primary diagnosis of heart failure (HHF). A time to first event analysis was pre-specified
4 since multiple events were possible in an individual patient.

5 Secondary outcomes were:

- 6 1) Aortic valve intervention (AVI) – surgical aortic valve replacement, transcatheter
7 aortic valve implantation or balloon aortic valvuloplasty
- 8 2) Hospitalisation with a primary diagnosis of heart failure (HHF)
- 9 3) All-cause mortality

10 *Acquisition and linkage of outcome data*

11 Clinical events in New Zealand public and private hospitals are entered into the National
12 Minimum Dataset (NMDS), whilst information concerning mortality is recorded in the
13 Mortality Collection. Both code events according to the International Statistical Classification
14 of Diseases and Related Health Problems (10th Revision, Australian Modification; ICD-10-
15 AM) and can be linked to an individual patient using a unique NHI number. Information
16 concerning discharges and interventions at public and private hospitals between January 1st
17 2010 and August 31st 2022 (including NHI number, date of admission/procedure, primary
18 diagnosis or procedure code, ethnicity, date of birth, and sex), plus mortality (date and
19 primary cause of death) over the same time period were provided by the Ministry of Health
20 and linked to each participant's echocardiographic data using their unique NHI number.

21 *Study approval*

22 Consultation with Māori was undertaken with the Ngāi Tahu Research Consultation
23 Committee. The study received ethical approval from the New Zealand Central Health and

1 Disability Ethics Committee (ref: 21/CEN/15) and locality approval from Te Whatu Ora –
2 Southern.

3 *Statistical analysis*

4 All analyses were performed on a de-identified dataset with NHI numbers replaced by
5 anonymous identifiers. Continuous data are expressed as mean (standard deviation) if
6 normally distributed, and otherwise as median (interquartile range). Data were analysed using
7 the Mann-Whitney *U*-test if continuous and non-normally distributed, and with ANOVA if
8 normally distributed. Categorical variables were analysed using the Chi-square test.
9 Kaplan-Meier survival curves were produced for the primary and secondary outcomes, and
10 stratified according to severity of CAVD. Group differences were assessed using the log-rank
11 test with Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple testing. Assessment of the proposed
12 causal diagrams demonstrated that estimation of the effect of CAVD on outcomes was not
13 possible (due to lack of information concerning cardiovascular risk factors). This particular
14 analysis was therefore restricted to descriptive statistics. All analyses (including data
15 cleaning) were performed using RStudio with R version 3.6.3 (9, 10).

16 **Results**

17 The final cohort numbered 24,699 people after exclusion of those with missing CAVD status
18 and an LV mass >1000g. Of these, 8,066 had aortic sclerosis, 920 had mild AS, and 531 had
19 moderate AS. Patients were followed up for a median of 8.1 years (IQR: 5.6 – 10.5,
20 maximum 12.6 years) and 7,898 (38.8%) of those with at least five years follow-up
21 (n=20,371) experienced the primary composite outcome (all-cause mortality, n=7,246; HHF,
22 n=652), and 2,106 (35.6%) experienced HHF. Amongst those with moderate AS and at least
23 five years follow-up (n=436), 267 (61.2%) experienced the primary outcome (all-cause
24 mortality, n=254; heart failure hospitalisation, n=84, with all but 13 of these subsequently

1 dying). Similarly, in mild AS (n=720), 416 (57.8%) experienced the primary outcome (all-
2 cause mortality, n=383; heart failure hospitalisation, n=118, with all but 33 of these
3 subsequently dying).

4

5

6 **Table 1 (following page):** Baseline characteristics of the cohort for survival analysis. Cells
7 are formatted as n (%) unless otherwise specified.

8 Abbreviations: AVI, aortic valve intervention; SD, standard deviation; MELAA, Middle
9 Eastern, Latin American, or African; CAVD, calcific aortic valve disease

10


11

1


	AVI (N=552)	No CAVD (N=14257)	Stage 0 (N=1379)	Stage 1 (N=5157)	Stage 2 (N=2583)	Stage 3 (N=291)	Stage 4 (N=480)	Overall (N=24699)
Age (years)								
Mean (SD)	69.90 (14.10)	56.80 (16.80)	70.90 (10.80)	72.70 (11.30)	77.00 (9.51)	81.20 (8.53)	75.00 (11.60)	63.90 (17.00)
Sex								
Female	184 (33.3)	6875 (48.2)	636 (46.1)	2490 (48.3)	1012 (39.2)	180 (61.9)	163 (34.0)	11540 (46.7)
Male	368 (66.7)	7382 (51.8)	743 (53.9)	2667 (51.7)	1571 (60.8)	111 (38.1)	317 (66.0)	13159 (53.3)
Ethnicity								
European	524 (94.9)	12549 (88.0)	1294 (93.8)	4836 (93.8)	2434 (94.2)	263 (90.4)	423 (88.1)	22323 (90.4)
Māori	21 (3.8)	915 (6.4)	53 (3.8)	178 (3.5)	95 (3.7)	12 (4.1)	38 (7.9)	1312 (5.3)
Pacific Peoples	6 (1.1)	255 (1.8)	7 (0.5)	35 (0.7)	19 (0.7)	8 (2.7)	11 (2.3)	341 (1.4)
Asian	0 (0.0)	350 (2.5)	12 (0.9)	52 (1.0)	12 (0.5)	5 (1.7)	3 (0.6)	434 (1.8)
MELAA	0 (0.0)	96 (0.7)	6 (0.4)	17 (0.3)	2 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	121 (0.5)
Other	1 (0.2)	92 (0.6)	7 (0.5)	39 (0.8)	21 (0.8)	3 (1.0)	5 (1.0)	168 (0.7)
Aortic valve maximum velocity (m/s)								
Mean (SD)	2.07 (1.50)	1.23 (0.54)	1.66 (0.79)	1.76 (1.04)	1.78 (1.18)	1.84 (1.12)	1.45 (0.90)	1.46 (0.86)
Not reported	16 (3.0)	1834 (14.8)	113 (8.9)	282 (5.8)	177 (7.4)	20 (7.4)	58 (13.7)	2500 (11.3)
CAVD severity								
No CAVD	0 (0.0)	14257 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	14257 (57.7)
Sclerosis	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1208 (87.6)	4187 (81.2)	2021 (78.2)	228 (78.4)	422 (87.9)	8066 (32.7)
Mild	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	106 (7.7)	532 (10.3)	230 (8.9)	24 (8.2)	28 (5.8)	920 (3.7)
Moderate	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	50 (3.6)	285 (5.5)	165 (6.4)	17 (5.8)	14 (2.9)	531 (2.1)
Severe	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	15 (1.1)	153 (3.0)	167 (6.5)	22 (7.6)	16 (3.3)	373 (1.5)
AVR	552 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	552 (2.2)
Mitral annular calcification								
Yes	185 (33.5)	627 (4.4)	250 (18.1)	1266 (24.5)	836 (32.4)	109 (37.5)	102 (21.2)	3375 (13.7)
No	361 (65.4)	13386 (93.9)	1109 (80.4)	3836 (74.4)	1715 (66.4)	179 (61.5)	372 (77.5)	20958 (84.9)
Not reported	6 (1.1)	244 (1.7)	20 (1.5)	55 (1.1)	32 (1.2)	3 (1.0)	6 (1.2)	366 (1.5)
Tricuspid regurgitation								
None	297 (53.8)	10098 (70.8)	1083 (78.5)	3839 (74.4)	1425 (55.2)	12 (4.1)	109 (22.7)	16863 (68.3)
Mild	120 (21.7)	1084 (7.6)	164 (11.9)	598 (11.6)	923 (35.7)	34 (11.7)	194 (40.4)	3117 (12.6)
Moderate	27 (4.9)	150 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	217 (74.6)	119 (24.8)	513 (2.1)
Severe	3 (0.5)	12 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	23 (7.9)	21 (4.4)	59 (0.2)
Not reported	105 (19.0)	2913 (20.4)	132 (9.6)	720 (14.0)	235 (9.1)	5 (1.7)	37 (7.7)	4147 (16.8)
Bicuspid aortic valve								
Yes	0 (0.0)	100 (0.7)	31 (2.2)	139 (2.7)	41 (1.6)	1 (0.3)	8 (1.7)	320 (1.3)
No	552 (100.0)	14157 (99.3)	1348 (97.8)	5018 (97.3)	2542 (98.4)	290 (99.7)	472 (98.3)	24379 (98.7)
Cardiac rhythm								
Sinus rhythm	306 (55.4)	10805 (75.8)	1268 (92.0)	4314 (83.7)	1124 (43.5)	103 (35.4)	212 (44.2)	18132 (73.4)
Atrial fibrillation or flutter	77 (13.9)	1073 (7.5)	1 (0.1)	29 (0.6)	1176 (45.5)	145 (49.8)	206 (42.9)	2707 (11.0)
Heart block	4 (0.7)	99 (0.7)	8 (0.6)	61 (1.2)	21 (0.8)	1 (0.3)	5 (1.0)	199 (0.8)
Other	44 (8.0)	202 (1.4)	7 (0.5)	122 (2.4)	83 (3.2)	10 (3.4)	22 (4.6)	490 (2.0)
Not reported	121 (21.9)	2078 (14.6)	95 (6.9)	631 (12.2)	179 (6.9)	32 (11.0)	35 (7.3)	3171 (12.8)

LV systolic impairment								
Normal	373 (67.6)	11215 (78.7)	1222 (88.6)	3794 (73.6)	1475 (57.1)	164 (56.4)	136 (28.3)	18379 (74.4)
Hyperdynamic	7 (1.3)	159 (1.1)	35 (2.5)	78 (1.5)	28 (1.1)	1 (0.3)	7 (1.5)	315 (1.3)
Mild	78 (14.1)	1163 (8.2)	27 (2.0)	539 (10.5)	364 (14.1)	33 (11.3)	49 (10.2)	2253 (9.1)
Moderate	44 (8.0)	642 (4.5)	3 (0.2)	257 (5.0)	279 (10.8)	30 (10.3)	63 (13.1)	1318 (5.3)
Severe	22 (4.0)	422 (3.0)	1 (0.1)	106 (2.1)	179 (6.9)	22 (7.6)	130 (27.1)	882 (3.6)
Not reported	28 (5.1)	656 (4.6)	91 (6.6)	383 (7.4)	258 (10.0)	41 (14.1)	95 (19.8)	1552 (6.3)

1



2



1

2

	Univariate		Age and sex adjusted	
	Hazard ratio	P value	Hazard ratio	P value
Stage 1	2.00 (1.15 – 3.48)	<0.05	1.61 (0.92 – 2.81)	0.09
Stage 2	4.03 (2.28 – 7.12)	<0.001	2.71 (1.53 – 4.81)	<0.001
Stage 3 or 4	5.81 (2.94 – 11.48)	<0.001	3.97 (1.99 – 7.95)	<0.001

Table 2: Cox proportional hazards model for mortality or heart failure hospitalisation in moderate AS according to stage of cardiac damage. Reference value: Stage 0.

3

4

1

	Univariate		Age and sex adjusted	
	Hazard ratio	P value	Hazard ratio	P value
Stage 1	1.23 (0.86 – 1.76)	0.25	1.28 (0.89 – 1.83)	0.18
Stage 2	3.50 (2.41 – 5.09)	<0.001	2.76 (1.89 – 4.03)	<0.001
Stage 3 or 4	7.07 (4.49 – 11.14)	<0.001	5.62 (3.56 – 8.89)	<0.001

Table 3: Cox proportional hazards model for mortality or heart failure hospitalisation in mild AS according to stage of cardiac damage. Reference value: Stage 0.


2

3 Worsening stage of cardiac damage was associated with an increased rate of the primary
4 outcome for both mild and moderate AS (**Figure 1** and **Figure 2**, **Table 2** and **Table 3**).

5 *Mortality censored at the time of aortic valve intervention (AVI)*

6 To remove the potential effect of AVI on mortality, Kaplan-Meier curves of mortality
7 stratified according to stage of cardiac damage and censored at time of AVI or completion of
8 follow-up are presented for both moderate (**Figure 3A**) and mild AS (**Figure 3B**). The risk of
9 mortality increased according to the stage of cardiac damage, even before any AVI.

10 Similarly, Cox proportional hazards models are reported in **Table 4** for mortality stratified
11 according to stage of cardiac damage and censored at the time of AVI or completion of
12 follow up. All stages of cardiac damage were significantly associated with mortality in
13 moderate AS (compared to Stage 0), whereas stages 2, 3 and 4 cardiac damage were
14 significantly associated with mortality in mild AS.



1

	Hazard ratio	95% confidence interval	P value
Moderate AS			
Stage 1	1.99	1.09 – 3.61	0.024
Stage 2	4.18	2.29 – 7.63	<0.001
Stage 3/4	7.01	3.43 – 14.33	<0.001
Mild AS			
Stage 1	1.40	0.98 – 1.99	0.06
Stage 2	3.22	2.22 – 4.66	<0.001
Stage 3/4	6.87	4.35 – 10.84	<0.001

Table 4: Cox proportional hazards model for mortality in mild or moderate AS stratified according to stage of cardiac damage, adjusted for age and sex, and censored at the time of AVI or completion of follow-up. Reference level: Stage 0.

2

3 **Discussion**

4 In this large study of over 20,000 patients undergoing clinically indicated echocardiography,
5 we examined a primary outcome of frequency of hospitalisation with heart failure or
6 mortality in those with moderate and mild AS. Cardiac damage was common in both cohorts
7 and increasing levels were significantly associated with the primary outcome after adjustment
8 for age and sex. Furthermore, similiar observations were seen even prior to any AVI.

9

10 Staging systems to quantify and assess the impact of cardiac damage associated with CAVD
11 were first conceived in 2017(1) and previous studies have generally focused on their utility in

1 cohorts with severe AS. In comparison with another study restricted to moderate AS patients,
2 our cohort had a slightly lower prevalence of stage 3 or 4 cardiac damage (3.2% and 2.6%
3 compared to 10.6% and 6.9%, respectively) (11), but a greater hazard ratio for mortality
4 across all stages of cardiac damage (for instance, 7.01 compared with 4.46 for Group 4 vs.
5 Group 0) (11). Unfortunately, our dataset did not contain information concerning other
6 cardiovascular risk factors, thereby making further comparisons challenging. Risk factors and
7 comorbidities almost certainly confound the relationship between the stage of cardiac damage
8 and all-cause mortality. Our data demonstrate that each incremental stage of cardiac damage
9 was associated with a HR of 1.62 for the composite outcome, exceeding the ratios of 1.31 and
10 1.45 reported previously in patients with moderate to severe AS (1, 2).

11

12 A key question of any staging system for cardiac damage associated with CAVD is whether it
13 can better identify patients who will benefit from AVI (and when such intervention should
14 take place). Evidence from clinical cohorts in Australia and the United States suggest that
15 moderate AS is a subgroup requiring closer surveillance given higher observed mortality
16 rates compared to mild or no AS (12, 13). Current guidelines do not recommend AVI in
17 moderate AS, despite observational data suggesting that early AVI is associated with a 45%
18 reduction in the risk of all-cause mortality this group (14, 15). However, such data are
19 potentially confounded by the fact that those who undergo AVI are far more likely to have
20 fewer medical comorbidities that impact upon survival. Randomised controlled trials have
21 demonstrated the benefit of early surgery in patients with asymptomatic severe AS and
22 normal left ventricular function (16) and ongoing trials, such as the PROGRESS trial of AVI
23 vs medical surveillance, are addressing the same question in patients with moderate AS (17).

24

1 **Mild AS**

2 To our knowledge, our study is the first to demonstrate that mortality is linked to the stage of
3 cardiac damage in mild AS, and it is noteworthy that the magnitude of this association was
4 not significantly different between mild and moderate AS. The haemodynamic impact of
5 mild AS is unlikely to be sufficient to produce Stage 3 or Stage 4 cardiac damage, and other
6 comorbidities are therefore likely to be influential.

7

8

9 **Utility of the staging system**

10 Our data suggest that the stage of cardiac damage predicts prognosis in both moderate and
11 mild AS to a similar extent. If the haemodynamic consequences of AS were solely
12 responsible for this association, then it would stand to reason that worsening haemodynamic
13 profiles would result in higher event rates. However, our observations do not support this
14 argument, suggesting that outcomes may not be directly attributable to the haemodynamic
15 consequences of valve disease and are unlikely to be restored to by AVI alone. Nevertheless,
16 the prognostic information provided by systems for the staging of cardiac damage may be
17 useful to identify patients at particular risk, direct the introduction of optimal medical therapy
18 and determine the mode and timing of AVI.

19

20 **Strengths and limitations**

21 To our knowledge, this is the first study to apply the concept of cardiac damage staging to a
22 large number of patients with mild and moderate AS, and to examine non-mortality outcomes
23 such as heart failure hospitalisation. A particular strength of our study is the large number of

1 patients involved with prolonged follow up (median 8 years) and a sufficient number of
2 clinical events to provide robust analysis. Furthermore, the likelihood of “missed” events is
3 low, given New Zealand’s centralised hospital reporting system and the inclusion of private
4 hospital data. Our study also drew on a complete echocardiographic dataset and is therefore
5 representative of the population undergoing clinically indicated investigations. However, we
6 lacked information on cardiovascular risk factors, which potentially confound the relationship
7 between valve disease and prognostic outcome, and would help to further elucidate the
8 connection between cardiac damage and adverse events. Information on the progression of
9 AS was similarly not available and thus could not be accounted for. Finally, the numbers of
10 patients with stage 3 or 4 cardiac damage were relatively small and these groups were
11 therefore combined for analysis, thereby limiting our ability to examine the difference in
12 event rates between them.

13

14 **Conclusions**

15 The stage of cardiac damage associated with CAVD predicts prognosis to a similar extent in
16 both moderate and mild AS, suggesting that this association is at least partly independent of
17 haemodynamic effects and may not be completely reversible by AVI alone. Nevertheless,
18 systems for the staging of cardiac damage provide a clear delineation of risk that may
19 facilitate clinical decision making concerning the implementation of medical therapy and the
20 timing and mode of AVI. Aortic stenosis is a disease of the valve and myocardium, and
21 enhanced strategies to identify and treat cardiac damage in conjunction with AVI are now
22 required.

23

1 **Authors' contribution**

2 MKM developed the protocol, performed the measurements and analysis, and wrote the first
3 draft of the manuscript. SC and GJT conceived the study and contributed to the protocol
4 design. All authors contributed to the analysis of results, and reviewed and approved the final
5 manuscript.

6

7 **Funding sources**

8 This study was funded by a grant from the Otago Medical School's Research Student Support
9 Committee. MKM was supported by the New Zealand Heart Foundation and the E & W
10 White Parsons Charitable Trust.

11

12 **Conflict of interests**

13 The authors have no conflict of interest to disclose.

1 References

- 2 1. Genereux P, Pibarot P, Redfors B, Mack MJ, Makkar RR, Jaber WA, et al. Staging classification
3 of aortic stenosis based on the extent of cardiac damage. *Eur Heart J*. 2017;38(45):3351-8.
- 4 2. Tastet L, Tribouilloy C, Marechaux S, Vollema EM, Delgado V, Salaun E, et al. Staging Cardiac
5 Damage in Patients With Asymptomatic Aortic Valve Stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2019;74(4):550-63.
- 6 3. Vollema EM, Amanullah MR, Ng ACT, van der Bijl P, Prevedello F, Sin YK, et al. Staging
7 Cardiac Damage in Patients With Symptomatic Aortic Valve Stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*.
8 2019;74(4):538-49.
- 9 4. Coisne A, Scotti A, Latib A, Montaigne D, Ho EC, Ludwig S, et al. Impact of Moderate Aortic
10 Stenosis on Long-Term Clinical Outcomes: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *JACC Cardiovasc*
11 *Interv*. 2022;15(16):1664-74.
- 12 5. Genereux P, Pibarot P, Redfors B, Bax JJ, Zhao Y, Makkar RR, et al. Evolution and Prognostic
13 Impact of Cardiac Damage After Aortic Valve Replacement. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2022;80(8):783-800.
- 14 6. Moore MK, Whalley G, Jones GT, Coffey S. Use of an ultrasound picture archiving and
15 communication system to answer research questions: Description of data cleaning methods.
16 *Australas J Ultrasound Med*. 2024;27(1):49-55.
- 17 7. Lang RM, Badano LP, Mor-Avi V, Afilalo J, Armstrong A, Ernande L, et al. Recommendations
18 for cardiac chamber quantification by echocardiography in adults: an update from the American
19 Society of Echocardiography and the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging. *Eur Heart J*
20 *Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2015;16(3):233-70.
- 21 8. Nagueh SF, Smiseth OA, Appleton CP, Byrd BF, 3rd, Dokainish H, Edvardsen T, et al.
22 Recommendations for the Evaluation of Left Ventricular Diastolic Function by Echocardiography: An
23 Update from the American Society of Echocardiography and the European Association of
24 Cardiovascular Imaging. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2016;29(4):277-314.
- 25 9. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria: R
26 Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2020.
- 27 10. RStudio Team (2020). RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, PBC, Boston, MA.
- 28 11. Amanullah MR, Pio SM, Ng ACT, Sin KYK, Marsan NA, Ding ZP, et al. Prognostic Implications
29 of Associated Cardiac Abnormalities Detected on Echocardiography in Patients With Moderate
30 Aortic Stenosis. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2021;14(9):1724-37.
- 31 12. Strom JB, Playford D, Stewart S, Li S, Shen C, Xu J, et al. Increasing risk of mortality across the
32 spectrum of aortic stenosis is independent of comorbidity & treatment: An international, parallel
33 cohort study of 248,464 patients. *Plos One*. 2022;17(7):e0268580.
- 34 13. Strange G, Stewart S, Celermajer D, Prior D, Scalia GM, Marwick T, et al. Poor Long-Term
35 Survival in Patients With Moderate Aortic Stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2019;74(15):1851-63.
- 36 14. Franke KB, Bhatia D, Roberts-Thomson RL, Psaltis PJ. Aortic valve replacement reduces
37 mortality in moderate aortic stenosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Geriatr Cardiol*.
38 2023;20(1):61-7.
- 39 15. Vahanian A, Beyersdorf F, Praz F, Milojevic M, Baldus S, Bauersachs J, et al. 2021 ESC/EACTS
40 Guidelines for the management of valvular heart disease. *Eur Heart J*. 2022;43(7):561-632.
- 41 16. Banovic M, Putnik S, Penicka M, Doros G, Deja MA, Kockova R, et al. Aortic Valve
42 Replacement Versus Conservative Treatment in Asymptomatic Severe Aortic Stenosis: The AVATAR
43 Trial. *Circulation*. 2022;145(9):648-58.
- 44 17. PROGRESS: Management of Moderate Aortic Stenosis by Clinical Surveillance or TAVR
45 (PROGRESS) [Internet]. National Library of Medicine (US). Identifier NCT04889872 [cited 2024 Apr 2].
46 Available from: <https://classic.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT04889872>.

47