





### Patients at intermediate surgical risk undergoing isolated interventional or surgical aortic valve replacement for severe symptomatic aortic valve stenosis. One year results from the <u>German Aortic Valve Registry</u> (GARY).

Nicolas Werner, Ralf Zahn, Andreas Beckmann, Timm Bauer, Christian W. Hamm, Friedrich W. Mohr, Alexander Berkowitsch, Sandra Landwehr, Stephan Ensminger, Christian Frerker, Helge Möllmann, Thomas Walther, Steffen Schneider and Rüdiger Lange

on behalf of the GARY Executive Board.



Nicolas Werner

Medical Clinic B, Klinikum Ludwigshafen, Germany.

AHA's Scientific Sessions, Monday, November 14, 2016



#### **Declaration of interest**

Nicolas Werner has no conflict of interest



# Background



- Transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI) is currently the recommended treatment option for Aortenklappenregister patients with severe aortic valve stenosis, who are inoperable or at high surgical risk.
- PARTNER II has proven TAVI to be non-inferior compared to SAVR in terms of mid-term mortality and disabling stroke in a selected population of patients at intermediate surgical risk (STS Score 4-8%).
- However, RCTs usually cover selected populations and their results do not reflect a real world situation.
- Large clinical registries, like GARY, are important additional tools to gain information on the use, selection of patients, safety and efficacy of a treatment strategy, like TAVI, in a real world population today.

# **Objectives**

#### Purpose of the present study

- > number of patients at intermediate surgical risk undergoing TAVI or SAVR in Germany today
- compare clinical characteristics and outcome of an all-comers clinical population at intermediate surgical risk undergoing isolated TAVI or SAVR for severe aortic valve stenosis in clinical practice today

#### German Aortic Valve Registry (GARY)

Supported by:	German Cardiac Society (DGK), German Society for Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery, German Heart Foundation.
≻ <u>Design</u> :	<ul> <li>prospective and multicenter registry</li> <li>follow-up at 30d, 1-, 3- and 5-years after index procedure</li> <li>covering 87% of all aortic valve procedures performed in Germany from 2011-2013</li> </ul>
➤ Inclusion:	all consecutive patients undergoing an invasive aortic valve therapy for acquired aortic valve disease ("all-comers-design")
Exclusion:	missing informed consent



### **Methods / Statistics**

> 49.660 patients enrolled into GARY from Jan. 2011 until Dec. 2013 were screened

 $\rightarrow$  22.7% (n=11.286/49.660)  $\rightarrow$  intermediate surgical risk / Log. EuroSCORE I 10-20%

 $\rightarrow$  Log. EuroSCORE I: widespread use in Europe; recommended by ESC-guidelines

→ 46.6% treated by TAVI (n=5.257/11.286), 53.4% treated by SAVR (n=6.029/11.286)

#### After exclusion process:

- → 5.997 patients with isolated TAVI or SAVR were included in the underlying analysis (represent 12% of total population)
- Univariate comparison
  between treatment groups
- Multivariable analysis
- Propensity Score analysis

for adjusted comparison of one-year mortality of patients treated by TAVI vs. SAVR

on independent clinical predictors for TAVI







#### **Results I – Baseline characteristics**

	SAVR (n = 1896)	TAVI (n = 4101)	p-value
Age	$75.9 \pm 6.7$	81.8 ± 5.4	< 0.001
Female	54.1%	61.6%	< 0.001
Log. EuroSCORE I	$13.4\pm2.7$	14.4 ± 2.9	< 0.001
STS Score	$3.7\pm2.1$	5.2 ± 2.8	< 0.001
Body mass index (BMI)	$28.2 \pm 4.8$	27.2 ± 5.0	< 0.001
NYHA III – IV	72.4%	83.7%	< 0.001
Hypertension	87.4%	88.4%	0.282
Diabetes mellitus	31.5%	30.8%	0.602
Prior myocardial infarction	8.0%	10.5%	0.003
Mean ejection fraction (%)	$54.5 \pm 13.8$	$55.5 \pm 12.2$	0.094
Pulmonary hypertension	21.7%	26.6%	0.008
Previous cardiac surgery	14.4%	10.0%	< 0.001
Atrial fibrillation	20.6%	29.0%	< 0.001
Mitral regurgitation ≥ 2°	13.5%	26.0%	< 0.001
Permanent pacemaker	5.8%	10.4%	< 0.001
Creatinine > 2 mg/dl	2.5%	4.0%	0.004
Peripheral arterial vascular disease	10.4%	11.1%	0.431

### **Results II – Indication and procedural characteristics**

	TAVI (n = 4101)
Indication for TAVI	
- Age	77.2%
- Frailty	47.3%
- Requested by patient	24.9%
- Malignoma	0.8%
- Heart Team decision	90.8%
Procedural characteristics	
TAVI with transfemoral access	75.0%
TAVI with transapical access	25.0%



#### **Results – Differences between sites**





Major differences in the amount of patients treated by TAVI at intermediate surgical risk between the 88 sites

Range: 0 to 100%!

 $\rightarrow$  Large site-depending effect

# Independent predictors for TAVI

Variable	Wald	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI
Age (per year)	819.690	<0.001	1.23	(1.21-1.25)
Calcium Score Grade < 3	102.702	<0.001	2.07	(1.79-2.38)
Prior cardiac decompensation	83.020	<0.001	2.11	(1.80-2.49)
Coronary artery disease	71.072	<0.001	2.00	(1.70-2.35)
Pulmonary hypertension	58.940	<0.001	1.90	(1.61-2.24)
NYHA class III-IV	57.333	<0.001	1.83	(1.57-2.15)
No previous CABG	47.848	<0.001	2.22	(1.77-2.79)
Mitral valve regurgitation II-IV*	30.994	<0.001	1.67	(1.39-2.00)
Tricuspid valve regurgitation II-III*	30.917	<0.001	1.95	(1.54-2.47)
Prior PCI	15.053	<0.001	1.50	(1.22-1.84)
No peripheral arterial disease	14.849	<0.001	1.39	(1.17-1.64)
BMI < 22 (body mass index)	14.591	<0.001	1.63	(1.26-2.09)
Female gender	10.159	0.001	1.25	(1.09-1.44)





#### **Results III – Clinical outcome**

	SAVR (n = 1896)	TAVI (n = 4101)	p-value
In-hospital complications			
Major / minor stroke	1.2% / 1.3%	1.5% / 1.2%	0.281/ 0.816
Myocardial infarction	0.5%	0.3%	0.114
New onset pacer / ICD	5.3%	19.1%	< 0.001
Vascular complications	1.1%	7.7%	< 0.001
Aortic valve regurgitation ≥ grade II	0.4%	4.7%	< 0.001
Conversion to open heart surgery		1.0%	
Bleeding ≥ 2 RBC units	51.5%	25.0%	< 0.001
Reintervention for bleeding	4.5%	1.3%	< 0.001
Pericardial tamponade	1.1%	0.3%	< 0.001
New onset dialysis (temporary)	3.6%	2.3%	0.024

#### **Results III – Clinical outcome (all-cause mortality)**





### **Unadjusted all-cause mortality (1-year FU)**

(Completeness of data: TAVI 97.5%; SAVR 98.9%)



#### **Propensity Score analysis**



> adjusted comparison of one-year mortality rate of patients treated by TAVI vs. SAVR

PS calculated by using the logistic regression model

 $\succ$  Resulting PS  $\rightarrow$  estimators of the probability receiving TAVI

> One-year mortality rates were presented for propensity score quintiles

### **Propensity Score analysis**

All cause one-year mortality rates for SAVR and TAVI according to propensity score quintile

#### SAVR vs. TAVI (transfemoral and transapical)

Stratified estimate for whole population	SAVR			ΤΑνι	Difference; (95% Cl)	p-value
	Counts (n/N)	Mortality (%)	Counts (n/N)	Mortality (%)		
Quintile 1	65/875	7.43%	14/326	12.58%	5.15%; (1.44-9.48)%	.004
Quintile 2	47/551	8.53%	77/647	11.90%	3.37%; (-0.10-6.78)%	.067
Quintile 3	33/289	11.42%	134/910	14.73%	3.31%; (-1.40-7.31)%	.158
Quintile 4	17/141	12.06%	191/1059	18.04%	5.98%; (-0.79-11.00)%	.100
Quintile 5	6/40	15.00%	236/1159	20.36%	5.36%; (-8.88-13.66)%	.379
Stratified estimate		10.89%		15.52%	4.63%; (1.75-7.52)%	.002



### **Propensity Score analysis**

All cause one-year mortality rates for SAVR and TAVI according to propensity score quintile

#### SAVR vs. TAVI (transfemoral, only)

	SAVR		TAVI (transfemoral only)		Difference; (95% CI)	p-value
	Counts (n/N)	Mortality (%)	Counts (n/N)	Mortality (%)		
Quintile 1	65/875	7.43%	25/218	11.47%	4.04% (-0.03-9.19)%	.043
Quintile 2	47/551	8.53%	56/471	11.89%	3.36% (-0.35-7.19)%	.088
Quintile 3	33/289	11.42%	86/661	13.01%	1.59% (-3.21-5.81)%	.489
Quintile 4	17/141	12.06%	130/769	16.91%	4.85% (-2.02-10.06)%	.182
Quintile 5	6/40	15.00%	177/955	18.53%	3.53% (-10.73-11.88)%	.533
Stratified estimate		10.78%		14.26%	3.48%; (0.53-6.43)%	.021



# Limitations

- ➢ Risk of unmeasured confounding ("frailty" only documented in TAVI-group in GARY)
- $\succ$  Risk stratification of a patient  $\rightarrow$  solely by using Log. EuroSCORE I
- > All available risk scores are known to be inaccurate (especially in a TAVI population)
- Not possible to adjust for the "Medical opinion" of a Heart Team (also based on subjective factors of a patient's clinical condition)
- Major differences in the number of patients treated at intermediate surgical risk between the sites
   Jocal aspects might have influenced the patient selection to TAVI or SAVR
- Clinical variables of inoperability (f.i. FEV1) of a patient not recorded in GARY (except porcelain aorta)
   Some inoperable patients might have been included in the TAVI-group with a worse clinical outcome



# Conclusion

- A relevant proportion of patients at intermediate surgical risk were treated with TAVI in Germany from 2011 until 2013.
- ➢ Patients undergoing TAVI → significantly different with regard to age, gender and risk score
   → marked selection bias in clinical reality (TAVI patients being at higher risk)
- Intermediate surgical risk patients undergoing isolated TAVI in a real-world scenario have a low in-hospital mortality rate (< 4%).</p>
- ➢ Even after propensity score analysis a significant difference in one-year mortality rate persisted between SAVR and TAVI → most probably caused by additional confounders.
- > <u>PARTNER II</u>: non-inferiority of TAVI compared to SAVR in a selected intermediate-risk population.
  - <u>GARY</u>: showed clinical reality and a reasonable selection of patients in everyday clinical practice.





# Thank you for your attention!

# Thank you to all the participating sites in GARY!





