Transcatheter, sutureless and conventional aortic-valve replacement: a network meta-analysis of 16,432 patients

Edwards

Lloyd D et al. J Thorac Dis. 2019; 11: 188–99.

Study details

- Aim: To compare VARC-2 clinical outcomes for transcatheter, sutureless and conventional AVR
- Study type: A Bayesian network analysis
- Endpoints: 30-day all-cause mortality, stroke, myocardial infarction, major bleeding or bleeding requiring surgical re-exploration, mild/trace paravalvular regurgitation, moderate/severe paravalvular regurgitation, acute kidney injury and PPI

Methods:

- Searches of electronic databases identified seven two-arm RCTs and 25 propensity score-matched studies comparing clinical outcomes of transcatheter, sutureless and conventional AVR
- Bayesian Markov chain Monte Carlo modelling was used to analyse VARC-2 clinical outcomes

Key study results (1/2)

Patient characteristics

- Conventional AVR: 8,138 patients
- Sutureless AVR: 1,238 patients
- TAVR: 7,056 patients
- Diabetes was more common in patients receiving sutureless versus conventional valves (OR 0.64, 95% CI 0.44–0.93, p=0.02)
- Otherwise, no significant differences

Key study results (2/2)

VARC-2 outcomes

- No differences in perioperative mortality or stroke

	OR		
VARC-2 outcome	Transcatheter versus conventional	Sutureless <i>versus</i> conventional	Transcatheter <i>versus</i> sutureless
Mortality	0.93	0.79	1.18
Stroke	0.94	0.81	1.16
Myocardial infarction	0.59	0.65	0.91
Major bleeding*	0.41	0.56	0.72
Trace/mild paravalvular regurgitation*	11.11	0.50	20.00
Moderate/severe paravalvular regurgitation	9.09	0.72	12.50
Acute kidney injury*	0.59	0.60	1.01
PPI*	3.03	2.70	1.12

Significant associations

*Outcomes with high heterogeneity

Table reports ORs as random effects with informative priors. Where the publication reported ORs for the converse associations to those in the table headings (e.g. conventional *vs* transcatheter), the reciprocal of the published OR is presented. OR: odds ratio; PPI: permanent pacemaker implantation; VARC-2: Valve Academic Research Consortium-2

Study limitations and conclusion

Limitations

- Pooling of data contributes to the heterogeneity observed between the studies
- The three broad categories of AVR were unable to account for different practices, vascular access routes and types of valves implanted

Conclusion

This analysis found no differences in perioperative mortality or stroke between patients who underwent transcatheter, conventional or sutureless AVR, suggesting that transcatheter and sutureless AVR are feasible alternatives to conventional AVR in selected patients. However, TAVR was associated with increased paravalvular regurgitation compared with conventional AVR, and both TAVR and sutureless AVR were associated with increased PPI. Heart teams should consider these increased risks when choosing an appropriate intervention for their patients.

This document is a summary of the Lloyd D et al. paper and covers key information including aim, type of study, methods, results, limitations and conclusions.

The full publication is available at: http://bit.ly/lloyd2019

Abbreviations

AVR: aortic valve replacement CI: confidence interval OR: odds ratio PPI: permanent pacemaker implantation RCT: randomised controlled trial TAVR: transcatheter aortic valve replacement VARC-2: Valve Academic Research Consortium-2

Important safety information:

Use of the EDWARDS INTUITY Elite valve system may be associated with new or worsened conduction disturbances, which may require a permanent cardiac pacemaker implant (PPI). The rate of PPI for the EDWARDS INTUITY Elite valve is within the range reported in the literature for various rapid deployment valves, but higher than that reported for surgical aortic valves. Physicians should assess the benefits and risks of the EDWARDS INTUITY Elite valve prior to implantation. See instructions for use for additional information.

For professional use. See instructions for use for full prescribing information, including indications, contraindications, warnings, precautions and adverse events.

Edwards Lifesciences devices placed on the European market meeting the essential requirements referred to in Article 3 of the Medical Device Directive 93/42/EEC bear the CE marking of conformity.

Edwards, Edwards Lifesciences, the stylized E logo, EDWARDS INTUITY and EDWARDS INTUITY Elite are trademarks of Edwards Lifesciences Corporation or its affiliates. All other trademarks are the property of their respective owners.

© 2019 Edwards Lifesciences Corporation. All rights reserved. E9681/05-19/SUR

Edwards Lifesciences • Route de l'Etraz 70, 1260 Nyon, Switzerland • edwards.com



