Meta-analysis of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients with Low Surgical Risk

Sharath C Vipparthy MD, Venkatesh Ravi MD, Sindhu Avula MD, Soumyasri Kambhatla MD, Mobasser Mahmood MD, Ameer Kabour MD, Syed Sohail Ali MD, Marco Barzallo MD, Sudhir Mungee MD

 PII:
 S0002-9149(19)31222-6

 DOI:
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjcard.2019.10.036

 Reference:
 AJC 24265

To appear in: The American Journal of Cardiology

Received date:24 July 2019Revised date:28 October 2019Accepted date:30 October 2019

Please cite this article as: Sharath C Vipparthy MD, Venkatesh Ravi MD, Sindhu Avula MD, Soumyasri Kambhatla MD, Mobasser Mahmood MD, Ameer Kabour MD, Syed Sohail Ali MD, Marco Barzallo MD, Sudhir Mungee MD, Meta-analysis of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients with Low Surgical Risk, *The American Journal of Cardiology* (2019), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjcard.2019.10.036

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2019 Published by Elsevier Inc.

American of Care	he 1 Journal diology	
Jonuary	1, 2017	
Composine of Kerly Star Conerge Retrain Jatuations and foredimethology Starts Unig-Optical Coherence foreignaphy.	Watschrolysis of the Balatise of Echoesenbagraphic Epicentrial Adjaces Teace Teachers and the Metabolic Syndrome	73
Dhein of Server e.3 to not Pulgorouthorized Forty Aridis Retros on Commung Mhercocherosis in Statischasted Patients With Commony Antery Disease 6	Development of a Method to Kisk Stratfly Patients With Heart Failure for 2000ey Readmission Using Ingliterable Device Drogramics	79
Comparison of Three-Pare Quitories After Training Percentement Commany Internetion on Fathers Wells (all Ventralia Tantas Institute wEPS Tensos 1475; (from He INCEDINGAM Trail) 12 Juliey and Efficacy of Enrollmanifolding Team Yanua	Redicting and Neuraring Heart folious foliopitulizations: In Trees o Rate for Ingitizative Device Degeneticit Comparison of Wariables in Merc Versus Women Debegring Transcollene Audit Value Ingilantics for Severa Audy, Devices Res Heart Malor Multicent CostVille	85
Sectionalities State in Woman	Registry (Red of Sand Anadratic Monoperant W.R. Conscious Section of Sand Anadratic Monoperant W.R. Conscious	**
Undulness of Testaniti and Cititasitive Puterin Concentrations for Pradiction of Concerns in Acone Concerns Synchrones, Storn the Tranch Registry of Acone 35/Streature Neuroff Devolver-Mysconful Infection 7441445. 31	Inglandon Incolecte and Ellect of Acute Kidney Injury Alber Topocoheter Acute, Value Rigibicatient Voleg the New Value Academic Research Concortium Criteria 10	04 00
Analysi Workshing and Blanding in And World Patients	tall Yantisələr Rəsəra Rənədəling in Long-Tərm (ə.12 Rəsər) Tərviyos With Magarhiz Oland Canfornyaşarhu	06
Varlahma of Fractional Flow Reserve to Improve Disprove Efficiency in Ration With Non-ST Elevation Mycourdial Influence 45	Role of Serum NoTerrand Profession Noniurals: Reptide Westwatert in Disposite of Candina: Interference in Research Profession of Candina: Interference in	
Ornal Conducts and Propriets Value of Non-Medianel Dilaton in Parlans With Non37 Segment Devotor Acute Caronary Syndrome. 31	Dertsconlegenden Spatel OEM Auge ond Insider Cardiospecke Guana in HYDeland Party Rom Re- ferences in the Management of Antonion's Party	
Gender Differences in Cells to 911 During or Acute Conversy Syndrome	pauli sug	18
Angrographic Networe and Canthoneoular Rok Factors in Runnes Innumabilitiesty Viruslinkeited Rohens WAR Rue Tone Rode Caronary Tantisme 80	for the complete fails of Easteric, has proper AE AE AR	
Analysis of the Nacolarova of Carolisesscolar Disease and Associated Risk Sectors for European-Anarisan-and Advancementarian-Regulatoric in the State of Nerroylearnin 2000 – 2000		*

1

Meta-analysis of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients with *Low* Surgical Risk

Sharath C Vipparthy <sup>a</sup> MD Venkatesh Ravi <sup>b</sup> MD, Sindhu Avula <sup>c</sup> MD, Soumyasri Kambhatla <sup>d</sup> MD, Mobasser Mahmood <sup>c</sup> MD, Ameer Kabour <sup>c</sup> MD, Syed Sohail Ali <sup>c</sup> MD, Marco Barzallo <sup>a</sup> MD, Sudhir Mungee <sup>a</sup> MD.

The contributions of authors 2 and 3 were equally significant.

No Grants were received for our study.

<sup>a</sup>OSF St. Francis Medical center, UICOMP, Peoria, Illinois

<sup>b</sup>Rush University Medical center, Chicago, Illinois

<sup>c</sup>Mercy St Vincent Medical Center, Toledo, Ohio

<sup>d</sup>John H Stroger Jr. Hospital of Cook County, Chicago, Illinois

Corresponding author:

Sharath Vipparthy, MD

OSF St. Francis Medical Center, UICOMP,

Division of Cardiovascular medicine,

530 NE Glen Oak Ave, Peoria, IL 61637

Mobile 312-340-1469/Tel 309-624-3598

Email: sharathjipmer@gmail.com

#### Abstract

Transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI) is the current standard of care for patients with severe aortic stenosis (AS) who are at high risk for surgery. However, several recent studies have demonstrated the comparable safety and efficacy of TAVI in low-risk patients as well. We sought to pool the existing data to further assert its comparability. MEDLINE, Cochrane, and Embase, databases were evaluated for relevant articles published from January 2005 to June 2019. Studies comparing outcomes of TAVI versus surgical aortic valve replacement (SAVR) in patients who are at low risk for surgery were included. Twelve studies (5 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and 7 observational studies) totaling 27,956 patients were included. Follow-up ranged from 3 months to 5 years. Short-term all-cause mortality, short-term and 1-year cardiac mortality were significantly lower in the TAVI group. 1-Year all-cause mortality, short-term and 1-year stroke and myocardial infarction (MI) were similar in both groups. Rate of acute kidney injury (AKI) and new-onset atrial fibrillation (AF) were lower in the TAVI group, while permanent pacemaker (PPM) implantation and major vascular complications were higher in the TAVI group. Subgroup analysis of RCTs showed significantly lower 1-year all-cause mortality in the TAVI group. In conclusion, among severe AS patients at low surgical risk, TAVI when compared to SAVR, demonstrated a lower rate of short-term all-cause mortality, short-term and 1-year cardiac mortality and similar in terms of 1-year all-cause mortality. TAVI is emerging as a safe and efficacious alternative for low surgical risk patients.

Keywords: TAVI, SAVR, Low risk, severe aortic stenosis, Meta-analysis

#### Introduction

Since the inception of performing TAVI for patients with prohibitive surgical risk, its scope has broadened progressively to patients at lower surgical risk. TAVI numbers have significantly grown in the United States (US), from less than 5000 in 2012 to nearly 50,000 in 2017<sup>1</sup>. Data from PARTNER 2A, Sapien 3 and meta-analyses of intermediate-risk studies <sup>2,3,4,5,6</sup> showed that TAVI was similar to SAVR in terms of mortality and stroke. SURTAVI and meta-analyses of studies comparing TAVI and SAVR in intermediate-risk patients, reinforced the available data 78.9.10. TAVI is currently a class IIa indication for intermediate-risk patients but SAVR remains the choice of treatment for low risk patients in the updated ACC/AHA valve guidelines of 2017, due to lack of significant evidence of safety for TAVI in this population <sup>11</sup>. Meta-analyses comparing TAVI to SAVR in low surgical risk patients have so far included studies consisting of both low and intermediate-risk patients, based on risk categories determined according to the Society of Thoracic Surgeons Predicted Risk of Mortality (STS PROM) score 4.12,13,14. A meta-analysis published by Witberg et al., in 2018 included only patients at low surgical risk<sup>14,15</sup> and showed similar short-term mortality, but worse intermediate-term mortality (range 1-3 years) for TAVI compared to SAVR. Two recent meta-analyses by George Siontis et.al.<sup>16</sup> and Tomo Ando et.al.<sup>14</sup> included the results of the latest PARTNER 3 and Evolut Low-risk trials but were not exclusive to low-risk patients. In this background, we sought to develop an up-to-date meta-analysis using RCTs and observational studies, which exclusively includes low surgical risk patients, defined as STS score ≤4 or EURO score ≤10.

#### Methods

We performed this meta-analysis per the guidelines of the Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions <sup>17</sup> and the PRISMA statement guidelines<sup>18</sup>. We searched Medline, Embase, and

Cochrane central from January 2005 up to June 30, 2019, using a combination of keywords and MeSH terms as follows: {'Aortic stenosis' or 'severe aortic stenosis' and 'transcatheter valve replacement' or 'TAVR' and 'Surgical aortic valve replacement' or 'SAVR' with no restrictions on language or year of publication. We also checked references of all articles which were relevant to our study. Studies comparing TAVI and SAVR that met the following criteria were included: 1. Patients with severe AS and low surgical risk defined by a STS score of  $\leq$ 4% and logistic Euroscore of  $\leq$ 10%. 2.RCT or Observational study (prospective or retrospective) which adjusted the cohorts (using Propensity score matching or inverse probability weighting or weighted propensity model) to create patient groups with similar baseline characteristics. We excluded studies that did not report outcomes in low-risk populations as defined above or attempted to compare suture less SAVR with TAVI. The process of selection of studies and relevant data extraction was conducted by three reviewers (SV, SA, and MM) and a consensus was obtained upon consulting a fourth reviewer (SK). Data extracted include study design, baseline characteristics and primary outcomes of short term in-hospital or 30 day and 1-year all-cause mortality. We also extracted data for following secondary outcomes: short term(30-day or in-hospital) and 1-year stroke, cardiac mortality, new-onset or worsening AF, new PPM implantation, AKI stage II and III, MI, major/life-threatening/disabling bleeding and major vascular complications.

Two authors (SV, VR) assessed the risk of bias and used Cochrane's handbook tool <sup>19</sup> to assess the RCTs. The Newcastle-Ottawa tool was used to assess the quality of the observational studies <sup>20</sup>. The reviewers resolved conflicts through consensus. A funnel plot was used to assess publication bias. The principal summary effects measures were the odds ratio (OR) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CI) estimated by using Mantel-Haenszel random-effects model <sup>21. T</sup>wo-sided p-value  $\leq$  0.05 was considered statistically significant. We conservatively used a priori, the Mantel-Haenszel Random-effects model assuming substantial variability in the treatment effect size across studies <sup>22.</sup> The presence of statistical heterogeneity was evaluated by Cochran's Q test I2 statistic: with I<sup>2</sup> values > 50%, we planned

to explore individual study characteristics. Publication bias was assessed by using Funnel plots <sup>23.</sup> Sensitivity analysis was done with the sequential exclusion of individual trials to evaluate the robustness of the results. We also planned a priori subgroup analysis to explore potential effects on outcome measures data from RCTs only. Statistical analysis was performed using Review Manager (RevMan), Version 5.3, Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014.

### Results

We retrieved a total of 2676 studies for the title and abstract analysis of which 65 studies were screened for inclusion criteria. 13 studies met inclusion criteria of which 1 (Schymik et.al, 2015) was excluded <sup>24</sup> as it was considered a duplicate of another study (Schymik et.al, 2018). The above 2 studies <sup>24,25</sup> were derived from the TAVIK registry with overlapping periods and the former study sought to include both low and intermediate-risk patients, where-as the latter only included patients at low risk. We, therefore, chose the latter study for inclusion. 12 studies, 5 RCTs<sup>26-30</sup> and 7 observational studies <sup>25, 31-36</sup> were ultimately included in our analysis as outlined in figure 1. From these 12 studies, a total of 27,956 patients were in the SAVR group. The baseline characteristics are shown in the Table.1A, B. 8 of the 12 studies specifically included patients at low surgical risk <sup>25-27,22-36</sup>. 4 of the other studies intended to include patients at low to intermediate surgical risk <sup>28-31</sup>. Among these, 2 of the studies separately listed outcomes for low surgical risk subgroup <sup>28,31</sup> and the other 2 studies <sup>29,30</sup> had a mean STS score in the low-risk range (3.1+/-1.5 and 2.9+/-1.6 respectively). We estimate less than 0.8% of the total patients included in this study to have an STS or euro score value above the low surgical risk cut off.

The primary all study pooled analysis demonstrated that the short-term all-cause mortality was significantly lower in the TAVI group (OR 0.66, 95% CI 0.55-0.80, P<0.0001). There was no significant difference between the 2 groups in the outcomes of 1-year all-cause mortality (OR 0.96, 95% CI 0.73 –

1.28, P = 0.80). The TAVI cohort did significantly better in terms of 1-year cardiac mortality (OR 0.54, 95% CI 0.32-0.90, P=0.02). There was no significant difference between the groups for short-term stroke (OR 0.71, 95% CI 0.49-1.01, P= 0.06) and 1-year stroke (OR 0.68, 95% CI 0.44-1.07, P= 0.10), MI, short term cardiac mortality and 1-year major vascular complications (see Forest plots in figure 2, 3, 4.). The TAVI cohort demonstrated a lower rate of short and 1-year AF, AKI, major/life-threatening or disabling bleeding. The SAVR group did significantly better in terms of short and 1-year PPM implantation and short term major vascular complications. See Figures 2, 3, 4. for Forest plots of the primary pooled analysis.

Further sensitivity analysis demonstrated that the difference in the outcome of short-term allcause mortality dissipated when GARY registry data were removed from the analysis. (OR 0.73, 95%CI 0.48 - 1.11, p = 0.14). The difference in 1-year cardiovascular mortality dissipated when the results of Mack et al (PARTNER 3) were removed from the analysis (OR 0.58, 95% CI 0.33- 1.02, p = 0.06).

When subgroup analyses for all short-term and 1-year outcomes were performed using RCTs alone, the 1-year all-cause mortality was significantly lower in the TAVI group (RR 0.61, 95% CI 0.38-0.96, P=0.03). Short term all-cause mortality and major vascular complication rates were similar in both groups. The rest of the outcomes of the RCT-only cohort were similar to the overall cohort (See forest plots of RCT only studies in Supplemental figure1, 2, 3). We also performed subgroup analysis to compare the incidence of PPM by valve type, Self-Expanding(SEV) versus Balloon-Expandable (BEV) among low risk patients and the trend was similar to those in high and intermediate risk patients with SEV causing higher short-term and 1-year PPM implantation rates than BEV, when compared to SAVR (short-term : OR 9.17, 95% CI 0.93-90.76 P = 0.06 for SEV, OR 1.67, 95% CI 0.92-3.02 for BEV P= 0.09, and 1-year: OR 7.71, 95% CI 2.45-24.25 P<0.001 for SEV, OR 1.4 95% CI 0.82-2.39, P =0.21 for BEV, see forest plots of short-term and 1-year PPM by valve type in supplemental figure 5).

All the RCTs were at low risk of bias in terms of generation of randomization, concealment of allocation, selective reporting and all except STACCATO trial was at low risk for attrition bias (supplemental figure 6). All the Observational studies were ranked as good quality according to the Newcastle-Ottawa tool score range (7-8) (Supplemental figure 7). The funnel plots are shown in supplemental figure 4.

### Discussion

Our study showed a significantly lower short-term and similar 1-year all-cause mortality among the TAVI cohort when compared to SAVR cohort. Additionally, 1-year cardiac mortality was lower in the TAVI group. When we conducted an RCT-only analysis the TAVI group fared better than the SAVR group in terms of 1-year all-cause mortality. Importantly risk of short-term and 1-year stroke was similar in both groups. The overall risk of short-term and 1-year IMI, short-term cardiac mortality outcomes were similar in both groups. The outcomes of AKI, Major bleeding, AF were lower in the TAVI group, where-as the PPM requirement and short term major vascular complications (in the entire cohort) were higher in the TAVI group. Additionally, incidence of PPM implantation in BEV seemed to be similar to that of SAVR group, but more long-term data is necessary in this regard.

Although a previous meta-analysis by Witberg et.al <sup>15</sup> included 5 of the 12 studies we included, their primary outcomes were significantly different from ours. In their study, there was no significant difference between the groups in short term mortality and there was increased mortality in the TAVI group in the intermediate term which was defined as a median of 2 years follow up. In our 1-year outcomes, TAVI was non-inferior or superior (RCT-only analysis showed 39% reduction). We consider our results to be more accurate since our sample size was larger and we included more RCTs. Furthermore, the heterogeneity for their late mortality outcomes was high (I<sup>2</sup> =51%). Their results of short term CVA, MI, major bleeding, AKI, PPM implantation, vascular complications were similar to ours.

They did not separately perform analysis for outcomes of cardiac mortality and AF, and 1-year outcomes of CVA, MI, AKI, PPM, bleeding and vascular complications. There was a 41% reduction in the outcome of short-term cardiac mortality and a 46% reduction in the 1-year cardiac mortality in our study. Also, we chose Schymik et.al., 2018 observational study over Schymik et.al, 2015 (which was included in their meta-analysis) which included low-risk patients exclusively and Witberg et.al included more intermediate-risk patients both numerically and proportionately.

Two recently published meta-analyses by George Siontis et.al.<sup>16</sup> and Tomo Ando et.al.<sup>14</sup> included the results of PARTNER 3 and Evolut Low-risk trials. However, these studies were significantly different from ours. Firstly, both studies were Meta-analyses that included RCTs only, but Siontis et.al. included patients of all surgical risks and Tomo Ando et.al., included Low to intermediate-risk population. Secondly, both studies had a significantly lower sample size (8020 and 7143) compared to our sample size (27956). Thirdly, Siontis et.al., did not perform a comprehensive analysis of short-term mortality and complications. Fourthly, although Tomo Ando et.al., did perform subgroup analysis of patients with STS<4 for composite 1-year all-cause mortality or disabling stroke, they included only 2 studies and did not perform separate analysis for all-cause mortality and disabling stroke. They did not perform subgroup analysis of other short and 1-year outcomes either for STS<4 cohorts. Their overall results of lower composite outcome in the TAVI group in STS <4 is similar to lower 1-year all-cause mortality in our RCT-only analysis.

There was no significant heterogeneity (I<sup>2</sup> <50) for most outcomes, except for PPM implantation, major bleeding, short-term vascular complications, and short-term AF. This high heterogeneity did not improve during sensitivity analysis and possible reasons behind the high heterogeneity for outcomes of PPM implantation and vascular complications could be improving techniques, valve types(for PPM), evolving safer prostheses and improving operator experience. We noted that the removal of GARY registry data

during sensitivity analysis dissipated the difference in short-term all-cause mortality. We propose that this may be due to a large sample size that had a result in favor of TAVI in the GARY registry study.

Our study has several limitations. We have only analysed 1-year outcomes and 5-10 year outcomes are definitely desirable prior to contemplating TAVI for younger, low-risk patients. We may have included ≤0.8% of intermediate-risk patients, which could have affected the results. We included several studies that have used 1<sup>st</sup> generation devices which may have adversely affected the outcomes in the TAVI group. Subgroup analysis according to the access site or device type was not feasible as we did not have access to outcomes by device type or access site. We did not include trials with sutureless surgical aortic valves since we intended not to compare multiple newer modalities of treatment. Seven of our studies were observational with potential for bias, which may have been minimized by propensity matching, inverse probability weighting, and weighted propensity score model use. Three of the studies <sup>30,34,35</sup> included did not use VARC (Valve academic research consortium) II criteria to define their complications.

In conclusion, among severe AS patients with low surgical risk, TAVI is superior to SAVR in terms of short-term all-cause mortality and 1-year cardiac mortality, and similar in terms of 1-year all-cause mortality, short and 1-year stroke, MI and short term cardiac mortality, with a higher risk of PPM implantation and vascular complications. When only RCTs were analyzed TAVI was also superior to SAVR in terms of 1-year all-cause mortality. Additionally, TAVI derives its appeal from its less invasive nature and overall lower peri-procedural morbidity and hospitalization. We conclude that TAVI is superior to SAVR, in terms of mortality up-to 1 year and is a safe and efficacious alternative for select low-risk patients especially among the elderly. However, concerns of higher cost, long-term durability of TAVI valve, subclinical leaflet thrombosis, aortic regurgitation in low-risk cohorts, needs to be further evaluated and improved upon. The risk of PPM implantation in TAVI group could be of major impact, especially in younger patient population. This seems to be significantly lesser with BEV than SEV, but

TAVI needs to be considered for younger patients with low risk.

Conflicts of interest: Dr. Sudhir Mungee holds a consultant position with speakers-bureau of Edwards Lifesciences.

Acknowledgments: Our study was not funded by any association. I, Sharath Vipparthy, the

corresponding author that I have listed everyone who contributed significantly to the work.

1. Anon. Available at: The STS/ACC TVT Registry. www.ncdr.com/WebNCDR/tvt/publicpage. Accessed Aug. 7, 2018. Accessed July 2, 2019. Accessed July 16, 2019.

 Leon MB, Smith CR, Mack MJ, Makkar RR, Svensson LG, Kodali SK, Thourani VH, Tuzcu EM, Miller DC, Herrmann HC, Doshi D, Cohen DJ, Pichard AD, Kapadia S, Dewey T, Babaliaros V, Szeto WY, Williams MR, Kereiakes D, Zajarias A, Greason KL, Whisenant BK, Hodson RW, Moses JW, Trento A, Brown DL, Fearon WF, Pibarot P, Hahn RT, Jaber WA, Anderson WN, Alu MC, Webb JG, PARTNER 2 Investigators. Transcatheter or Surgical Aortic-Valve Replacement in Intermediate-Risk Patients. *N Engl J Med* 2016;374:1609–1620.

3. Thourani VH, Kodali S, Makkar RR, Herrmann HC, Williams M, Babaliaros V, Smalling R, Lim S, Chris Malaisrie S, Kapadia S, Szeto WY, Greason KL, Kereiakes D, Ailawadi G, Whisenant BK, Devireddy C, Leipsic J, Hahn RT, Pibarot P, Weissman NJ, Jaber WA, Cohen DJ, Suri R, Murat Tuzcu E, Svensson LG, Webb JG, Moses JW, Mack MJ, Craig Miller D, Smith CR, Alu MC, Parvataneni R, D'Agostino RB, Leon MB. Transcatheter aortic valve replacement versus surgical valve replacement in intermediate-risk patients: a propensity score analysis. *Lancet* 2016;387:2218–2225.

4. Siemieniuk RA, Agoritsas T, Manja V, Devji T, Chang Y, Bala MM, Thabane L, Guyatt GH. Transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement in patients with severe aortic stenosis at low and intermediate-risk: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2016:i5130.

5. Foroutan F, Guyatt GH, O'Brien K, Bain E, Stein M, Bhagra S, Sit D, Kamran R, Chang Y, Devji T, Mir H, Manja V, Schofield T, Siemieniuk RA, Agoritsas T, Bagur R, Otto CM, Vandvik PO. Prognosis after surgical replacement with a bioprosthetic aortic valve in patients with severe symptomatic aortic stenosis: a systematic review of observational studies. *BMJ* 2016:i5065.

6. Vandvik PO, Otto CM, Siemieniuk RA, Bagur R, Guyatt GH, Lytvyn L, Whitlock R, Vartdal T, Brieger D, Aertgeerts B, Price S, Foroutan F, Shapiro M, Mertz R, Spencer FA. Transcatheter or surgical aortic valve

replacement for patients with severe, symptomatic, aortic stenosis at low to intermediate surgical risk: a clinical practice guideline. *BMJ* 2016:i5085.

7. Reardon MJ, Van Mieghem NM, Popma JJ, Kleiman NS, Søndergaard L, Mumtaz M, Adams DH, Deeb GM, Maini B, Gada H, Chetcuti S, Gleason T, Heiser J, Lange R, Merhi W, Oh JK, Olsen PS, Piazza N, Williams M, Windecker S, Yakubov SJ, Grube E, Makkar R, Lee JS, Conte J, Vang E, Nguyen H, Chang Y, Mugglin AS, Serruys PWJC, Kappetein AP, SURTAVI Investigators. Surgical or Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement in Intermediate-Risk Patients. *N Engl J Med* 2017; 376:1321–1331.

8. Khan AR, Khan S, Riaz H, Luni FK, Simo H, Abdulhak AB, Bavishi C, Flaherty M. Efficacy and safety of transcatheter aortic valve replacement in intermediate surgical risk patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv* 2016; 88:934–944.

9. Wang Y, Zhou Y, Zhang L, Zhu J. Midterm outcome of transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement in low to intermediate-risk patients: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Cardiol* 2018; 71:534–539.

10. Sardar P, Kundu A, Chatterjee S, Feldman DN, Owan T, Kakouros N, Nairooz R, Pape LA, Feldman T, Dawn Abbott J, Elmariah S. Transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement in intermediate-risk patients: Evidence from a meta-analysis. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv* 2017;90:504–515.

11. Nishimura RA, Otto CM, Bonow RO, Carabello BA, Erwin JP, Fleisher LA, Jneid H, Mack MJ, McLeod CJ, O'Gara PT, Rigolin VH, Sundt TM, Thompson A. 2017 AHA/ACC Focused Update of the 2014 AHA/ACC Guideline for the Management of Patients With Valvular Heart Disease: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation* 2017;135.

12. Khan SU, Lone AN, Saleem MA, Kaluski E. Transcatheter vs surgical aortic-valve replacement in lowto intermediate-surgical-risk candidates: A meta-analysis and systematic review. *Clin Cardiol* 2017;40:974–981.

13. Zhou Y, Wang Y, Wu Y, Zhu J. Transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement in low to intermediate-risk patients: A meta-analysis of randomized and observational studies. *Int J Cardiol* 2017;228:723–728.

14. Ando T, Ashraf S, Villablanca P, Kuno T, Pahuja M, Shokr M, Afonso L, Grines C, Briasoulis A, Takagi H. Meta-Analysis of Effectiveness and Safety of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Low-to-Intermediate Surgical Risk Cohort. *Am J Cardiol* 2019.

15. Witberg G, Lador A, Yahav D, Kornowski R. Transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement in patients at low surgical risk: A meta-analysis of randomized trials and propensity score-matched observational studies. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv* 2018;92:408–416.

16. Siontis GCM, Overtchouk P, Cahill TJ, Modine T, Prendergast B, Praz F, Pilgrim T, Petrinic T, Nikolakopoulou A, Salanti G, Søndergaard L, Verma S, Jüni P, Windecker S. Transcatheter aortic valve implantation vs. surgical aortic valve replacement for treatment of symptomatic severe aortic stenosis: an updated meta-analysis. *Eur Heart J 2019*. Available at: https://academic.oup.com/eurheartj/advancearticle-pdf/doi/10.1093/eurheartj/ehz275/28506056/ehz275.pdf. Accessed July 16, 2019.

17. Higgins JPT. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions.; 2019.

18. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, for the PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ* 2009; 339:b2535–b2535.

19. Anon. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. 2008. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470712184.

20. Deeks J, Dinnes J, D'Amico R, Sowden A, Sakarovitch C, Song F, Petticrew M, Altman D. Evaluating non-randomised intervention studies. *Health Technology Assessment* 2003;7. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.3310/hta7270.

21. Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT, Rothstein HR. Introduction to Meta-Analysis. 2009. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470743386.

22. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, Atkins D, Kunz R, Brozek J, Montori V, Jaeschke R, Rind D, Dahm P, Meerpohl J, Vist G, Berliner E, Norris S, Falck-Ytter Y, Hassan Murad M, Schünemann HJ. GRADE guidelines: 9. Rating up the quality of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64:1311–1316.

23. Sterne JAC, Harbord RM. Funnel Plots in Meta-analysis. *The Stata Journal: Promoting communications on statistics and Stata* 2004;4:127–141.

Schymik G, Heimeshoff M, Bramlage P, Herbinger T, Würth A, Pilz L, Schymik JS, Wondraschek R,
 Süselbeck T, Gerhardus J, Luik A, Gonska B-D, Tzamalis P, Posival H, Schmitt C, Schröfel H. A comparison of transcatheter aortic valve implantation and surgical aortic valve replacement in 1,141 patients with severe symptomatic aortic stenosis and less than high risk. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv* 2015;86:738–744.
 Schymik G, Varsami C, Bramlage P, Conzelmann LO, Würth A, Luik A, Schröfel H, Tzamalis P. Two-Year Outcomes of Transcatheter Compared With Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in "Minimal-Risk" Patients Lacking EuroSCORE Co-morbidities (from the TAVIK Registry). *Am J Cardiol* 2018;122:149–155.
 Mack MJ, Leon MB, Thourani VH, Makkar R, Kodali SK, Russo M, Kapadia SR, Chris Malaisrie S, Cohen DJ, Pibarot P, Leipsic J, Hahn RT, Blanke P, Williams MR, McCabe JM, Brown DL, Babaliaros V, Goldman S, Szeto WY, Genereux P, Pershad A, Pocock SJ, Alu MC, Webb JG, Smith CR. Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement with a Balloon-Expandable Valve in Low-Risk Patients. *N Engl J Med* 2019;380:1695–1705.

27. Popma JJ, Deeb GM, Yakubov SJ, Mumtaz M, Gada H, O'Hair D, Bajwa T, Heiser JC, Merhi W, Kleiman NS, Askew J, Sorajja P, Rovin J, Chetcuti SJ, Adams DH, Teirstein PS, Zorn GL 3rd, Forrest JK, Tchétché D, Resar J, Walton A, Piazza N, Ramlawi B, Robinson N, Petrossian G, Gleason TG, Oh JK, Boulware MJ, Qiao H, Mugglin AS, Reardon MJ, Evolut Low Risk Trial Investigators. Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement with a Self-Expanding Valve in Low-Risk Patients. *N Engl J Med* 2019;380:1706–1715.

28. Serruys PW, Modolo R, Reardon M, Miyazaki Y, Windecker S, Popma J, Chang Y, Kleiman NS, Lilly S, Amrane H, Boonstra PW, Kappetein AP, Onuma Y, Søndergaard L, Mieghem N van. One-year outcomes of patients with severe aortic stenosis and an STS PROM of less than three percent in the SURTAVI trial. *EuroIntervention* 2018; 14:877–883.

29. Thyregod HGH, Steinbrüchel DA, Ihlemann N, Nissen H, Kjeldsen BJ, Petursson P, Chang Y, Franzen OW, Engstrøm T, Clemmensen P, Hansen PB, Andersen LW, Olsen PS, Søndergaard L. Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients With Severe Aortic Valve Stenosis: 1-year Results From the All-Comers NOTION Randomized Clinical Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2015; 65:2184–2194.

30. Nielsen HHM, Klaaborg KE, Nissen H, Terp K, Mortensen PE, Kjeldsen BJ, Jakobsen C-J, Andersen HR, Egeblad H, Krusell LR, Thuesen L, Hjortdal VE. A prospective, randomized trial of transapical transcatheter aortic valve implantation vs. surgical aortic valve replacement in operable elderly patients with aortic stenosis: the STACCATO trial. *EuroIntervention* 2012; 8:383–389.

31. Piazza N, Kalesan B, Mieghem N van, Head S, Wenaweser P, Carrel TP, Bleiziffer S, Jaegere PP de, Gahl B, Anderson RH, Kappetein A-P, Lange R, Serruys PW, Windecker S, Jüni P. A 3-Center Comparison of 1-year Mortality Outcomes Between Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation and Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement on the Basis of Propensity Score Matching Among Intermediate-Risk Surgical Patients. *JACC: Cardiovasc Interv* 2013; 6:443–451.

32. Anon. Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement in Low-Risk Patients With Symptomatic Severe Aortic Stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;72:2095–2105.

33. Rosato S, Santini F, Barbanti M, Biancari F, D'Errigo P, Onorati F, Tamburino C, Ranucci M, Covello RD, Santoro G, Grossi C, Ventura M, Fusco D, Seccareccia F, OBSERVANT Research Group. Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation Compared With Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Low-Risk Patients. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 2016;9:e003326.

34. Bekeredjian R, Szabo G, Balaban Ü, Bleiziffer S, Bauer T, Ensminger S, Frerker C, Herrmann E, Beyersdorf F, Hamm C, Beckmann A, Möllmann H, Karck M, Katus HA, Walther T. Patients at low surgical risk as defined by the Society of Thoracic Surgeons Score undergoing isolated interventional or surgical aortic valve implantation: in-hospital data and 1-year results from the German Aortic Valve Registry (GARY). *Eur Heart J* 2019;40:1323–1330.

35. Frerker C, Bestehorn K, Schlüter M, Bestehorn M, Hamm CW, Möllmann H, Katus HA, Kuck K-H. Inhospital mortality in propensity-score matched low-risk patients undergoing routine isolated surgical or transfemoral transcatheter aortic valve replacement in 2014 in Germany. *Clinical Research in Cardiology* 2017;106:610–617. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00392-017-1097-y.

36. Virtanen MPO, Eskola M, Jalava MP, Husso A, Laakso T, Niemelä M, Ahvenvaara T, Tauriainen T, Maaranen P, Kinnunen E-M, Dahlbacka S, Jaakkola J, Vasankari T, Airaksinen J, Anttila V, Rosato S, D'Errigo P, Savontaus M, Juvonen T, Laine M, Mäkikallio T, Valtola A, Raivio P, Biancari F. Comparison of Outcomes After Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement vs Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement Among Patients With Aortic Stenosis at Low Operative Risk. *JAMA Netw Open* 2019;2:e195742.

17

### Figure Legends

#### Table 1.A Baseline characteristics

Intervention	DM, n (%)	CVA, n (%)	CAD, n (%)	CKD, n (%)	PAD, n (%)	Pulmonary Disease, n (%)	EF %	AVA Cm <sup>2</sup>	NYHA III-
TAVI	155 (31.2 %)	17(3.4 %)	137 (27.7 %)	1 (0.2 %)	34 (6.9 %)	25 (5.1 %)	65.7+/-9.0	0.8+/-0.2	155 (3
SAVR	137 (30.2 %)	23(5.1 %)	127 (28.0 %)	1 (0.2 %)	33 (7.3 %)	28 (6.2 %)	66.2+/-8.6	0.8+/-0.2	108 (2
TAVI	228 (31.4 %)	74(10.2 %)	121 (16.6 %)	3 (0.4 %)	54 (7.5 %)	104 (15.0 %)	61.7+/-7.9	0.8+/-0.2	182 (2
SAVR	207 (30.5 %)	80(11.8 %)	101(14.8 %)	1 (0.1 %)	56 (8.3 %)	117 (18.0 %)	61.9+/-7.7	0.8+/-0.2	193 (2
TAVI	30 (22.9 %)	21(16.1 %)	63 (48.1 %)	0 (0.0)	25 (19.1 %)	9 (6.9 %)	NA	NA	53 (40
SAVR	21 (17.1 %)	14(11.4 %)	63 (51.2 %)	1 (0.8 %)	18 (14.6 %)	4 (3.3 %)	NA	NA	60 (48
TAVI	26 (17.9 %)	24(16.6 %)	8 (5.5 %)	2 (1.4 %)	6 (4.1 %)	17(11.7 %)	NA	NA	61 (4
SAVR	28 (20.7 %)	22(16.3 %)	6 (4.4 %)	1 (0.7 %)	9 (6.7 %)	16 (11.9 %)	NA	NA	57 (4
TAVI	1(2.9 %)	1(2.9 %)	NA	1 (2.9 %)	2 (5.9 %)	1 (2.9 %)	56.5 +/-9.7	0.66+/-0.17	N
SAVR	3 (8.3 %)	1(2.8 %)	NA	0 (0.0)	3 (8.3 %)	1 (2.8 %)	56.3+/-10	0.71+/-0.17	N
TAVI	68 (22.4 %)	46 (15.2 %)	57 (18.8 %)	NA	39 (12.8 %)	54 (17.8 %)	NA	NA	5 (1.
SAVR	68 (22.4 %)	43 (14.2 %)	57 (18.8 %)	NA	42 (13.8 %)	59 (19.4 %)	NA	NA	8 (2.
TAVI	61 (30.5 %)	19 (9.5%)	42 (21.0 %)	12 (6 %)	4 (2 %)	16 (8 %)	63.5+/-7.5	NA	35 (17
SAVR	186 (25.9 %)	51(7.1 %)	67 (9.3%)	52 (7.3 %)	46 (6.4 %)	125 (17.4 %)	58.7+/-8.7	NA	145 (2
TAVI	1296 (21.4 %)	817 (13.5 %)	1648 (27.2 %)	NA	NA	531 (8.8 %)	54.59 (0.155)	0.74 + (0.007)	4720 (
SAVR	3152.5 (21.8 %)	1014.9 (7%)	3469 (23.9 %)	NA	NA	1268 (8.8 %)	55.916 (0.128)	0.803 (0.005)	112791
	Intervention TAVI SAVR TAVI SAVR TAVI SAVR TAVI SAVR TAVI SAVR TAVI SAVR TAVI SAVR	DM, n (%)           TAVI         155 (31.2 %)           SAVR         137 (30.2 %)           TAVI         228 (31.4 %)           SAVR         207 (30.5 %)           TAVI         228 (31.4 %)           SAVR         207 (30.5 %)           TAVI         30 (22.9 %)           SAVR         21 (17.1 %)           TAVI         26 (17.9 %)           SAVR         28 (20.7 %)           TAVI         26 (12.9 %)           SAVR         3 (8.3 %)           TAVI         68 (22.4 %)           SAVR         68 (22.4 %)           TAVI         61 (30.5 %)           SAVR         186 (25.9 %)           TAVI         1296 (21.4 %)           SAVR         3152.5 (21.8 %)	Intervention         DM, n (%)         CVA, n (%)           TAVI         155 (31.2 %)         17(3.4 %)           SAVR         137 (30.2 %)         23(5.1 %)           TAVI         228 (31.4 %)         74(10.2 %)           SAVR         207 (30.5 %)         80(11.8 %)           TAVI         202 (30.5 %)         80(11.8 %)           TAVI         30 (22.9 %)         21(16.1 %)           SAVR         21 (17.1 %)         14(11.4 %)           TAVI         26 (17.9 %)         24(16.6 %)           SAVR         28 (20.7 %)         22(16.3 %)           TAVI         26 (17.9 %)         1(2.9 %)           SAVR         3 (8.3 %)         1(2.9 %)           TAVI         1(2.9 %)         1(2.9 %)           SAVR         3 (8.3 %)         1(2.8 %)           TAVI         68 (22.4 %)         43 (14.2 %)           TAVI         68 (22.4 %)         43 (14.2 %)           TAVI         61 (30.5 %)         19 (9.5 %)           SAVR         186 (25.9 %)         51(7.1 %)           TAVI         1296 (21.4 %)         817 (13.5 %)           SAVR         3152.5 (21.8 %)         1014.9 (7%)	Intervention         DM, n (%)         CVA, n (%)         CAD, n (%)           TAVI         155 (31.2 %)         17(3.4 %)         137 (27.7 %)           SAVR         137 (30.2 %)         23(5.1 %)         127 (28.0 %)           TAVI         228 (31.4 %)         74(10.2 %)         121 (16.6 %)           SAVR         207 (30.5 %)         80(11.8 %)         101(14.8 %)           TAVI         228 (29.9 %)         21(16.1 %)         63 (48.1 %)           SAVR         21 (17.1 %)         14(11.4 %)         63 (51.2 %)           TAVI         26 (17.9 %)         24(16.6 %)         8 (5.5 %)           SAVR         28 (20.7 %)         22(16.3 %)         6 (4.4 %)           TAVI         1(2.9 %)         1(2.9 %)         NA           SAVR         3 (8.3 %)         1(2.9 %)         NA           TAVI         68 (22.4 %)         46 (15.2 %)         57 (18.8 %)           TAVI         68 (22.4 %)         43 (14.2 %)         57 (18.8 %)           TAVI         61 (30.5 %)         19 (9.5 %)         42 (21.0 %)           SAVR         186 (25.9 %)         51(7.1 %)         67 (9.3 %)           TAVI         1296 (21.4 %)         817 (13.5 %)         1648 (27.2 %)           SAVR	Intervention         DM, n (%)         CVA, n (%)         CAD, n (%)         CKD, n (%)           TAVI         155 (31.2 %)         17(3.4 %)         137 (27.7 %)         1 (0.2 %)           SAVR         137 (30.2 %)         23(5.1 %)         127 (28.0 %)         1 (0.2 %)           TAVI         228 (31.4 %)         74(10.2 %)         121 (16.6 %)         3 (0.4 %)           SAVR         207 (30.5 %)         80(11.8 %)         101(14.8 %)         10.1 %)           TAVI         30 (22.9 %)         21(16.1 %)         63 (48.1 %)         0 (0.0)           SAVR         21 (17.1 %)         14(11.4 %)         63 (51.2 %)         1 (0.8 %)           TAVI         26 (17.9 %)         24(16.6 %)         8 (55.5 %)         2 (1.4 %)           SAVR         28 (20.7 %)         22(16.3 %)         6 (4.4 %)         1 (0.7 %)           TAVI         1(2.9 %)         1(2.9 %)         NA         1 (2.9 %)           TAVI         1(2.9 %)         1(2.8 %)         NA         0 (0.0)           TAVI         68 (22.4 %)         46 (15.2 %)         57 (18.8 %)         NA           SAVR         68 (22.4 %)         43 (14.2 %)         57 (18.8 %)         NA           TAVI         61 (30.5 %)         19 (9.5	Intervention         DM, n (%)         CVA, n (%)         CAD, n (%)         CKD, n (%)         PAD, n (%)           TAVI         155 (31.2 %)         17(3.4 %)         137 (27.7 %)         1 (0.2 %)         34 (6.9 %)           SAVR         137 (30.2 %)         23(5.1 %)         127 (28.0 %)         1 (0.2 %)         33 (7.3 %)           TAVI         228 (31.4 %)         74(10.2 %)         121 (16.6 %)         3 (0.4 %)         54 (7.5 %)           SAVR         207 (30.5 %)         80(11.8 %)         101(14.8 %)         1 (0.1 %)         56 (8.3 %)           TAVI         30 (22.9 %)         21(16.1 %)         63 (48.1 %)         0 (0.0)         25 (19.1 %)           SAVR         21 (17.1 %)         14(11.4 %)         63 (51.2 %)         1 (0.8 %)         18 (14.6 %)           TAVI         26 (17.9 %)         24(16.6 %)         8 (5.5 %)         2 (1.4 %)         6 (4.1 %)           SAVR         28 (20.7 %)         22(16.3 %)         6 (4.4 %)         1 (0.7 %)         9 (6.7 %)           TAVI         1(2.9 %)         1(2.9 %)         NA         1 (2.9 %)         2 (5.9 %)           SAVR         3 (8.3 %)         1/2.8 %)         NA         39 (12.8 %)           TAVI         68 (22.4 %)         46 (15.2 %)	InterventionDM, n (%)CVA, n (%)CAD, n (%)CKD, n (%)PAD, n (%)Pulmonary Disease, n (%)TAVI155 (31.2 %)17(3.4 %)137 (27.7 %)1 (0.2 %)34 (6.9 %)25 (5.1 %)SAVR137 (30.2 %)23(5.1 %)127 (28.0 %)1 (0.2 %)33 (7.3 %)28 (6.2 %)TAVI228 (31.4 %)74 (10.2 %)121 (16.6 %)3 (0.4 %)54 (7.5 %)104 (15.0 %)SAVR207 (30.5 %)80 (11.8 %)101 (14.8 %)1 (0.1 %)56 (8.3 %)117 (18.0 %)TAVI30 (22.9 %)21 (15.1 %)63 (48.1 %)0 (0.0)25 (19.1 %)9 (6.9 %)SAVR21 (17.1 %)14 (11.4 %)63 (51.2 %)1 (0.8 %)18 (14.6 %)4 (3.3 %)TAVI26 (17.9 %)24 (16.6 %)8 (55 %)2 (14.4 %)6 (4.1 %)17 (11.7 %)SAVR28 (20.7 %)22 (16.3 %)6 (4.4 %)1 (0.7 %)9 (6.7 %)16 (11.9 %)TAVI1(2.9 %)1 (2.9 %)NA1 (2.9 %)2 (5.9 %)1 (2.9 %)SAVR3 (8.3 %)1 (2.8 %)NA0 (0.0)3 (8.3 %)1 (2.8 %)TAVI68 (22.4 %)43 (14.2 %)57 (18.8 %)NA42 (13.8 %)59 (19.4 %)SAVR68 (22.4 %)43 (14.2 %)57 (18.8 %)NA42 (13.8 %)59 (19.4 %)TAVI61 (30.5 %)19 (9.5 %)42 (21.0 %)12 (6 %)4 (2 %)16 (8 %)SAVR186 (25.9 %)51 (7.1 %)67 (9.3 %)52 (7.3 %)46 (6.4 %)125 (17.4	Intervention         DM, n (%)         CVA, n (%)         CAD, n (%)         CKD, n (%)         PAD, n (%)         Pulmonary Disease, n (%)         EF %           TAVI         155 (31.2 %)         17(3.4 %)         137 (27.7 %)         1 (0.2 %)         34 (6.9 %)         25 (5.1 %)         65.7+/-9.0           SAVR         137 (30.2 %)         23 (5.1 %)         127 (28.0 %)         1 (0.2 %)         33 (7.3 %)         28 (6.2 %)         66.2+/-8.6           TAVI         228 (31.4 %)         74(10.2 %)         121 (16.6 %)         50 (0.4 %)         54 (7.5 %)         104 (15.0 %)         61.7+/-7.9           SAVR         207 (30.5 %)         80(11.8 %)         101.14.8 %)         10.1 %)         56 (8.3 %)         117 (18.0 %)         61.9+/-7.7           TAVI         30 (22.9 %)         21 (16.1 %)         63 (48.1 %)         0 (0.0)         25 (19.1 %)         9 (6.9 %)         NA           SAVR         21 (17.1 %)         14(11.4 %)         63 (45.1 %)         10 (0.8 %)         18 (14.6 %)         4 (3.3 %)         NA           TAVI         26 (17.9 %)         24 (16.6 %)         8 (5.5 %)         2 (14.4 %)         6 (4.1 %)         17 (11.7 %)         NA           TAVI         1 (2.9 %)         1 (2.9 %)         NA         1 (2.9 %)         <	Intervention         DM, n (%)         CVA, n (%)         CAD, n (%)         CKD, n (%)         PAD, n (%)         Pulmonary Disease, n (%)         EF %         AVA Cm <sup>2</sup> TAVI         155 (31.2 %)         17(3.4 %)         137 (27.7 %)         1 (0.2 %)         34 (6.9 %)         25 (5.1 %)         65 7/-9.0         0.8+/-0.2           SAVR         137 (30.2 %)         23(5.1 %)         127 (28.0 %)         1 (0.2 %)         33 (7.3 %)         28 (6.2 %)         66 2+/-8.6         0.8+/-0.2           TAVI         228 (31.4 %)         74(10.2 %)         121 (16.6 %)         50 (4.8 %)         104 (15.0 %)         61.7+/-7.9         0.8+/-0.2           SAVR         207 (30.5 %)         80(11.8 %)         101(14.8 %)         10.1 %)         56 (8.3 %)         117 (18.0 %)         61.9+/-7.7         0.8+/-0.2           TAVI         30 (22.9 %)         21 (16.1 %)         63 (48.1 %)         0 (0.0)         25 (19.1 %)         9 (6.9 %)         NA         NA           SAVR         21 (17.1 %)         14 (11.4 %)         63 (61.2 %)         11 (0.8 %)         18 (14.6 %)         4 (3.3 %)         NA         NA           SAVR         28 (20.7 %)         22 (16.5 %)         8 (5.5 %)         2 (1.4 %)         6 (6.1 %)         17 (11.7 %)         NA

18

Gerhard schymik (obs)-2018	TAVI	NA	9 (6.8%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	64.8 +/- <sub>N</sub> 6.6	0.66 +/-0.15	N
	SAVR	NA	3 (3.2%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	64.5+/-6.6	0.64 +/-0.20	N
Frerker (obs)-2017	TAVI	190 (23.6 %)	33 (4.1%)	164 (20.4 %)	85 (10.6%)	5 (0.6 %)	14 (1.7%)	NA	NA	614 (7
	SAVR	190 (23.6 %)	33 (4.1%)	164 (20.4 %)	85 (10.6%)	5 (0.6%)	14 (1.7%)	NA	NA	614 (7
Rosato (obs)-2016	TAVI	53 (14.9 %)	15 (4.2%)	56 (15.8 %)	NA	36 (10.1 %)	65 (18.3 %)	NA	0.67 +/- 0.26	180 (5
	SAVR	57(16.1 %)	15 (4.2%)	45 (12.7 %)	NA	31 (8.7%)	70 (19.7 %)	NA	0.71 +/- 0.25	182 (5
Piazza (obs) - 2013	TAVI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	N
	SAVR	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	N

EVOLUT = Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement With the Medtronic Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement System In Patients at Low Risk for Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement. LRT: Transcatheter Aortic valve replacement in Low-Risk Patients with Symptomatic Severe Aortic stenosis. NA, Not available;NOTION = Nordic Aortic Valve Intervention; PARTNER = Placement of Aortic Transcatheter Valve trial; RCT, Randomized controlled trial; STACCATO = Transpical Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Operable Elderly Patients with Aortic Stenosis; SURTAVI = Surgical Replacement and Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation.

OUN

19

#### Table1.B Baseline characteristics

Study	Publication year	Design	Follow up	Sample size	STS score (mean)	Logistic Euro score (mean)	Age in years (mean)	Male (per
PARTNER3	2019	RCT	1 year	TAVI 496	1.9+/-0.7	NA	73.3+/-5.8	335
				SAVR 494	1.9+/-0.6	NA	73.6+/-6.1	323
EVOLUT	2019	RCT	2 years	TAVI 725	1.9+/-0.7	NA	74.1+/-5.8	46
				SAVR 678	1.9+/-0.7	NA	73.6+/-5.9	44
SURTAVI-STS<3	2018	RCT	1 year	TAVI 131	2.3+/-0.5	NA	75.1+/-6.5	89
				SAVR 123	2.3+/-0.5	NA	75.4+/-5.5	84
NOTION	2015	RCT	5 Years	TAVI 145	2.9+/-1.6	II -1.9+/-1.2 (I- 8.4+/-4.0)	79.2+/-4.9	78
				SAVR 135	3.1+/-1.7	II - 2.0 +/-1.3 (I-8.9+/-5.5)	79.0+/-4.7	71
STACCATO	2012	RCT	3 months	TAVI 34	3.1+/-1.5	9.4+/-3.9	80+/-3.6	9(
				SAVR 36	3.4+/-1.2	10.3+/-5.8	82+/-4.4	12
Virtanen	2019	Observational Study	3 years	TAVI 304	2.1 (0.9)	II - 2.6 (1.4)	77.9	14
				SAVR 304	2.1 (0.5)	II - 2.5 (1.3)	78.1	151
LRT-Waksman	2018	Observational Study	30 days	TAVI 200	1.8+/-0.5	NA	73.6+/-6.1	123
				SAVR 719	1.6+/-0.6	NA	70+/-8.3	438
Bekeredjian	2018	Observational study	1 year	TAVI 6062	2.862 (0.010)	I- 112.879 (0.077)	78.869 (0.123)	368
				SAVR 14487	2.743 (0.007)	l - 11.410 (0.079)	78.372 (0.058)	8866

20

Schymick	2018	Observational Study	2 years	TAVI 132	2.16 +/- 0.65	I - 8.16 +/-2.15	80.7 +/- 3.1	36
				SAVR 93	1.72 +/- 0.56	I - 6.43 +/- 2.15	77.4 +/- 2.5	40
Frerker	2017	Observational Study	Index hospitalization only	TAVI 805	NA	I - 6.8+/-1.7	77.5 +/- 4.4	319
				SAVR 805	NA	I- 4.2 +/- 1.4	77.5 +/- 4.4	319
Rosato	2016	Observational study	3 years	TAVI 355	NA	II -2.6+/-0.8 (I -6.3+/-2.7)	80.1+/-6.4	20
				SAVR 355	NA	II- 2.5+/-0.8 (I - 6.3+/- 3.0)	80.0+/-5.1	209
Piazza	2012	Observational Study	1 year	TAVI 15	All < 4	NA	NA	
				SAVR 17	All < 4	NA	NA	

AVA, Aortic valve area; CVA, cerebrovascular accident; CAD, coronary artery disease; CKD, chronic kidney disease; DM, diabetes mellitus; EF,

Ejection fraction; ICD, Implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; NA, Not available; NYHA, New York heart association; PAD, Peripheral arterial

disease.

Jonuly

21

Figure 1. PRISMA flow chart



Figure:2

Forest plots of all-study analysis A)Short term all-cause mortality B)1-year all-cause mortality C)short term stroke D)1-year stroke E)Short term cardiac mortality F)1-year cardiac mortality. Data are events in each group and weighted odds ratios. The horizontal line is 95% CI. The diamond shape is the pooled

### mean difference of all studies.



Figure:3

<u>Forest plots of all-study analysis G)Short term new onset or worsening AF H) 1-year AF I)Short term new</u> <u>PPM implantation J) 1-year PPM implantation K)Short term AKI stage II and III L) 1-year AKI stage II and</u> <u>III. Data are events in each group and weighted odds ratios. The horizontal line is 95% Cl. The diamond</u>

shape is the pooled mean difference of all studies.



## Forest plots of all-study analysis M) Short term MI N) 1-year MI O)Short term major/life-

### threatening/disabling bleeding P) 1-year major/life-threatening/disabling bleeding Q)Short term major

## vascular complications R) 1-year major vascular complications. Data are events in each group and

weighted odds ratios. The horizontal line is 95% CI. The diamond shape is the pooled mean difference of

## all studies.

M. 30 day MI								N. One year MI	
	TAVR		SAVR			Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio	TAVR SAVR Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Study or Subgroup Events Total Events Total Weight M-H, Rand Winnarthy Sharath	H, Random, 95% Cl
Virtanen et al	2	304	2	304	8.3%	1.00 [0.14, 7.15] 2019		Mack et al (PARTNER 3) 6 496 10 454 201% 0.54	
Mack et al (PARTNER 3)	5	495	6	454	22.6%	0.76 [0.23, 2.51] 2019		Person of al (EV/0111T) 12 725 11 679 44 500 1021045 2 331 2010	
Popma et al (EVOLUT)	7	725	9	678	32.6%	0.72 [0.27, 1.96] 2019			The second secon
Schymik et al	0	132	0	93		Not estimable 2018		Rearbon et al (SURTAVI) 2 131 0 123 3.3% 4.77 [0.23, 100.32] 2018	
Frerker et al	2	805	5	805	11.9%	0.40 [0.08, 2.06] 2017		Thyregod et al (NOTION) 5 142 8 134 23.2% 0.57 [0.18, 1.80] 2015	
Thyregod et al (NOTION)	4	142	8	134	21.5%	0.46 [0.13, 1.55] 2015		and the second	
Nielsen et al (STACCATO)	1	34	0	36	3.1%	3.27 [0.13, 83.03] 2012		Total (95% CI) 1494 1389 100.0% 0.78 [0.45, 1.36]	-
								Total events 25 29	2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Total (95% CI)		2638		2504	100.0%	0.66 [0.38, 1.17]	•	Heleroneneity: Tau2 = 0.00: Chi2 = 2.53; (ff = 3.(P = 0.47); (2 = 0.%	
Total events	21		30					The fore even if $e^{i\theta}(x) = 0.07 (P = 0.10)$ 0.01	0.1 1 10 100
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00; (	chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.91.	. df = 5	(P = 0.86	2 P = C	1%	10		Test to Overall energy 2 = 0.07 (r = 0.00)	Favours [TAVR] Favours [SAVR]
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.4	11 (P = 0.1)	6)					Encourse (TAMP) Encourse (PAMP)		
O. 30 day major/li	fe three	ateni	ng/dis	abli	ng blee	ding		P. One year major/life threatening/disabling bleeding Tave save Orde Patio	Odds Ratio
O. 30 day major/li	fe threa	ateni R	ng/dis savi	sablii R	ng blee	odds Ratio	Odds Ratio	P. One year major/life threatening/disabling bleeding TAVR SAVR Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
O. 30 day major/li	fe threa TAVF Events	ateni R Total	ng/dis SAVI Events	ablin R Total	ng blee	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Year	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	P. One year major/life threatening/disabling bleeding TAVR SAVR Odds Ratio Study of Subgroup E-vints Total Events Total Weight M-H. Random, 95% CI Year	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl
O. 30 day major/li Study or Subgroup Thyregod et al (NOTION)	fe three TAVF Events 16	ateni R <u>Total</u> 142	ng/dis SAVI Events 28	sablin R Total 134	Weight 17.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Yea 0.48 [0.25, 0.94] 2015	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	P. One year major/life threatening/disabling bleeding TAVR SAVR Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup Evints Total Evints Total Weight M-H, Random, 95% CI Year Mack et al (PARTINE N) 38 496 117 454 36.3% O.24 [0.16, 0.35] 2019	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl
O. 30 day major/li Study or Subgroup Thyregod et al (NOTION) Rosato et al	fe threa TAVF Events 16 14	ateni R Total 142 355	ng/dis SAVI Events 28 48	R Total 134 355	Weight 17.0% 18.1%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Yeau 0.48 [0.25, 0.94] 2010 0.26 [0.14, 0.49] 2010	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	P. One year major/life threatening/disabling bleeding TAVR SAVR Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup Evints Total Events Total Weight M-H. Random, 55%. CI Year Mack et al (PARTNER) 38 496 117 454 363% 0.24 [016, 0.35] 2019 Pormer et al (EOUUT) 23 725 60 67 8 34.5% 0.24 [01.6, 0.35] 2019	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl
O. 30 day major/li <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Thyregod et al (NOTION) Rosato et al Waksman et al (LRT)	TAVE TAVE Events 16 14 5	ateni R Total 142 355 200	SAVI Events 28 48 74	R Total 134 355 719	Weight 17.0% 18.1% 12.6%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Yea 0.48 [0.25, 0.94] 2016 0.26 [0.14, 0.49] 2016 0.22 [0.09, 0.54] 2018	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	P. One year major/life threatening/disabling bleeding TAVE SAVE Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup Evints Total Weight M-H Randon 85% Cl Year Mack at el PANTRE 31 28 496 1117 443 432.% Deck at el PANTRE 31 28 496 1417 413 432.% Pegna et al (EOLUT) 28 725 60 678 345% 0.34 [021 0.59] 2019 Pegna et al (EOLUT) 21 725 60 678 345% 0.34 [021 0.59] 2019	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl
O. 30 day major/li Study or Subgroup Thyregod et al (NOTION) Rosato et al Waksman et al (LRT) Schymik et al	fe three TAVF Events 16 14 5 8	ateni R Total 142 355 200 132	SAVI Events 28 48 74 15	R Total 134 355 719 93	Weight 17.0% 18.1% 12.6% 12.8%	Codis Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Year 0.48 (0.25, 0.94) 2010 0.26 (0.14, 0.49) 2010 0.22 (0.09, 0.56) 2010 0.34 (0.14, 0.83) 2015	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	P. One year major/life threatening/disabling bleeding TAVR SAVR Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup E-mins Total Events Total Weight M-H, Random, 85%, CI Year Mack et al (PARTNER-3) 38 496 117 454 38.3% 0.24 [016 0.35] 2019 Pormer et al (SURTAVI) 17 131 14 123 29.2% 1.16 [0.55, 247] 2018	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl
O. 30 day major/li Study or Subgroup Thyregod et al (NOTION) Rosato et al Waksman et al (LRT) Schymik et al (EVOLUT)	fe three TAVF Events 16 14 5 8 17	ateni R <u>Total</u> 142 355 200 132 725	SAVI Events 28 48 74 15 51	R Total 134 355 719 93 678	Weight 17.0% 18.1% 12.6% 12.8% 19.3%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Year 0.48 [0.25, 0.94] 2010 0.28 [0.14, 0.49] 2011 0.22 [0.09, 0.56] 2011 0.34 [0.14, 0.83] 2010 0.30 [0.17, 0.52] 2011	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	P. One year major/life threatening/disabling bleeding TAVR SAVR Odds Ratio Study of Subgroup Evints Total Events Total Weight M-H. Random, 95% CI Year Mack et al (PARTNE R3) 38 496 1177 454 363% 0.24 [016, 0.35] 2019 Popmer et al (CFOUT) 2725 60 678 34.5% 0.24 [016, 0.35] 2019 Readom et al (GURTAVI) 17 131 14 123 292% 1.16 [055, 247] 2018	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl
O. 30 day major/li <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Thyregod et al (NOTION) Rosato et al Waksman et al (LRT) Schymk et al Popma et al (EVOLUT) Mack et al (PARTNER 3)	fe three TAVF Events 16 14 5 8 17 18	ateni R 142 355 200 132 725 496	ng/dis SAVI Events 28 48 74 15 51 111	R Total 134 355 719 93 678 454	Weight 17.0% 18.1% 12.6% 19.3% 20.2%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Yeas 0.48 (0.25, 0.94) 2010 0.26 (0.14, 0.40) 2014 0.22 (0.09, 0.56) 2011 0.34 (0.14, 0.83) 2017 0.34 (0.14, 0.83) 2011 0.34 (0.17, 0.52) 2011 0.12 (0.07, 0.02) 2019	Odds Ratio M-H, Randon, 955, CI	P. One year major/life threatening/disabling bleeding TAVE SAVE Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup Evints Total Weight M-H, Randon 85% CI Year Mack et al (#NATRIB-3) 36 406 117 443 43.0% Dack et al (#NATRIB-3) 23 725 60 678 345% 0.34 [021, 0.36] 2019 Pepme et al (EVOLUT) 23 725 60 678 345% 0.34 [021, 0.36] 2019 Reardon et al (SURTAVI) 17 131 14 123 20.2% 1.16 [0.55, 2.47] 2018	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% Cl
O. 30 day major/li <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Thyregod et al (NOTION) Rosato et al (NATION) Schymik et al Popma et al (EVOLUT) Mack et al (PARTNER 3)	TAVF Events 16 14 5 8 17 18	ateni R <u>Total</u> 142 355 200 132 725 496	ng/dis SAVI Events 28 48 74 15 51 111	R Total 134 355 719 93 678 454	Weight 17.0% 18.1% 12.6% 19.3% 20.2%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Yeas 0.48 (0.25, 0.34) 2010 0.26 (0.14, 0.49) 2010 0.22 (0.06, 0.56) 2011 0.34 (0.14, 0.83) 2010 0.30 (0.17, 0.52) 2011 0.12 (0.07, 0.20) 2015	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	P. One year major/life threatening/disabling bleeding TAVR SAVR Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup Evrints Total Evrents Total Weight M-H, Random, 85%, CI Year Mack et al (PARTNER 3) 38 496 117 454 36375, 0.24 [01.6, 0.35] 2019 Popmer et al (CPUUT) 27 725 60 678 34.5%, 0.24 [01.6, 0.35] 2019 Reardon et al (SURTAVI) 17 131 14 123 29.2%, 1.16 [0.55, 2.47] 2018 Total Iversi 78 1901	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
O. 30 day major/li Study or Subgroup Thyregod et al (NOTION) Rosato et al Waksman et al (RT) Schmikt et al (PARTNE3) Total (1995; CE)	TAVF Events 16 14 5 8 17 18	ateni R Total 142 355 200 132 725 495 2050	SAVI Events 28 48 74 15 51 111	R Total 134 355 719 93 678 454 2433	Weight 17.0% 18.1% 12.6% 19.3% 20.2% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95%, CI Yee 0.48 (0.25, 0.04) 201 0.28 (0.14, 0.04) 201 0.22 (0.06, 0.64) 201 0.23 (0.14, 0.04) 201 0.23 (0.14, 0.03) 201 0.24 (0.14, 0.03) 201 0.20 (0.17, 0.20) 2011 0.26 (0.16, 0.04)	Codes Ballio MH, Randon, BPS CI	P. One year major/life threatening/disabling bleeding TAVR SAVR Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup Fronts Total Weight MH4, Random, 55%, CI Year Mack et al (PARTNER) 3) 38 4/86 First Stat Weight MH4, Random, 55%, CI Year Pagene et al (CULT) 27 25 60 67 34.5% 0.24 [016, 0.35] 2019 Readon et al (URITAVI) 17 131 14 122 202%, 1.16 [0.55, 2.47] 2018 Total (2015 C) 1352 1255 100.0%, 0.43 [0.19, 0.33] Total (2015 C) 1352 1255 100.0%, 0.43 [0.19, 0.33] Total (2015 C) 1352 1255 100.0%, 0.43 [0.19, 0.33]	Otde Ratio
O. 30 day major/li Study or Subgroup Thyregod et al (NOTION) Rosato et al Waksman et al (LRT) Schymk et al Popma et al (EVOLUT) Mack et al (PARTNER 3) Total (99% CI) Total events	fe threa TAVF Events 16 14 5 8 17 18	ateni Total 142 355 200 132 725 496 2050	ng/dis SAVI 28 48 74 15 51 111	R Total 134 355 719 93 678 454 2433	Weight 17.0% 18.1% 12.6% 19.3% 20.2% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 955, C1 Yeau 0.48 [0:25, 0:44] 201 0.28 [0:14, 0:49] 201 0.29 [0:06, 0:56] 201 0.34 [0:14, 0:49] 201 0.30 [0:17, 0:52] 201 0.30 [0:17, 0:52] 201 0.12 [0:07, 0:20] 2015	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 195; Cl	P. One year major/life threatening/disabling bleeding TAVK SAVR Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup Evints Total Vergint M-H, Random, 85% CI Year Mack et al (PANTRIE) 31 26 406 117 443 43.03% Popme et al (EVOLUT) 23 725 60 678 345% 0.34 [021.035] 2019 Reardon et al (GUTLVV) 17 131 144 123 28.2% 0.34 [021.035] 2019 Reardon et al (GUTLVV) 17 131 144 123 28.2% 0.34 [021.035] 2019 Total 15% CI) 1352 1255 100.0% 0.43 [0.19, 0.33] Total 15% CI) 735 124 20 20 0.0011; J* 85%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
O. 30 day major/li Study or Subgroup Thyregod et al (NOTION) Roato et al Waksman et al (RT) Solymik et al Popma et al (EVOLUT) Mack et al (PARTNET) Total events Heteroonenik- Tas <sup>2</sup> = 0.18	TAVF Events 16 14 5 8 17 18 78 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 12	ateni R <u>Total</u> 142 355 200 132 725 495 2050 98. df	savi Events 28 48 74 15 51 111 327 5 (P = 0	ablii R Total 134 355 719 93 678 454 2433	Weight 17.0% 18.1% 12.8% 19.3% 20.2% 100.0% = 61%	Ading Odds Rutio M.H. Random, 55%, C1 Yea 0.46 (0.25, 0.94) 2011 0.45 (0.25, 0.94) 2011 0.45 (0.25, 0.94) 2011 0.45 (0.25, 0.94) 2011 0.45 (0.15, 0.94) 2011 0.45 (0.17, 0.25) 2011 0.45 (0.17, 0.25) 2011 0.42 (0.17, 0.26) 2011 0.46 (0.16, 0.40)	Odds Ratio MAI, Randon, 90%, Cl	P. One year major/life threatening/disabling bleeding TAVR SAVR Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup Crimits Total Events Total Weight MH-R Random, 85% CI Year Mack et al (PARTNER 3) 38 496 1177 454 363% 0.24 (10.6, 0.35) 2019 Popmer et al (CFOUNT) 27 725 60 678 34.5% 0.24 (10.6, 0.35) 2019 Random et al (GURTAVI) 17 131 14 123 292% 1.16 (10.5, 0.24) 2010 0.52 (2019 Random et al (GURTAVI) 17 131 14 123 292% 0.43 (0.19, 0.93) Total (35% CI) 1352 1255 100.9% 0.43 (0.19, 0.93) Total (35% 0.40 (2013) 23.6d = 2 (0.2000) 1.1° 85%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
O. 30 day major/li Study or Subgroup Thyregod et al (NOTION) Roato et al Waksman et al (LRT) Schymk et al Popma et al (EVOLUT) Mack et al (PARTNER 3) Total (99% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tasi <sup>2</sup> = 0.18 Heterogeneity: Tasi <sup>2</sup> = 0.18	TAVF Events 16 14 5 8 17 18 78 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 12 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 12	ateni R Total 142 355 200 132 725 496 2050 .98, df -	savi Events 28 48 74 15 51 111 327 5 (P = (	R Total 134 355 719 93 678 454 2433 0.02); P	Weight 17.0% 18.1% 12.8% 19.3% 20.2% 100.0% = 61%	Odds Ratio           M44 Random, 85%. CI Yea           0.46 [0.25, 0.44]           0.46 [0.25, 0.44]           0.28 [0.14, 0.49]           0.28 [0.14, 0.49]           0.29 [0.14, 0.33]           0.39 [0.17, 0.32]           0.39 [0.17, 0.32]           0.26 [0.16, 0.40]	Odds Ratio M44 Random, 1955 Cl	P. One year major/life threatening/disabling bleeding TAVE SAVE Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup Evints Total Weight M-H, Randon, 85% Cl Year Mack at al (PANTRIB-3) 28 406 117 44 38.3% Depender at al (SOLUT) 23 725 60 678 345% 0.34 [021, 0.58] 2019 Reardon et al (SOLUT) 23 725 60 678 345% 0.34 [021, 0.58] 2019 Total versiti, 71 131 14 123 29.2% 1.16 [055, 247] 2018 Total versiti, 78 191 Hulliomponenti, Tau <sup>2</sup> e 0.40 Ch <sup>2</sup> = 13.8, df = 2 (P = 0.001), P = 85% Total versiti, Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.40 Ch <sup>2</sup> = 0.031	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI

#### Q. 30 day major vascular complications

	TAV	R	SAV	R		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	1 Year	M-H, Random, 95% CI
Virtanen et al	27	304	7	304	23.4%	4.14 [1.77, 9.65]	2019	
Popma et al (EVOLUT)	28	725	22	678	27.0%	1.20 [0.68, 2.11]	2019	+
Mack et al (PARTNER 3)	11	496	7	454	21.9%	1.45 [0.56, 3.77]	2019	
Schymik et al	2	132	0	93	6.0%	3.58 [0.17, 75.49]	2018	
Rosato et al	25	355	0	355	6.9%	54.86 [3.33, 904.70]	2016	
Thyregod et al (NOTION)	8	142	2	134	14.8%	3.94 [0.82, 18.90]	2015	
Total (95% CI)		2154		2018	100.0%	2.77 [1.20, 6.37]		•
Total events	101		38					
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.59	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 14	1.36, df	= 5 (P = 1	0.01); P	<sup>4</sup> = 65%			the state of the second
				<b>.</b>				
			. 1					

### R. One year major vascular complications

	TAV	к	SAV	R		Odds Ratio		Odds	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI Ye	ear	M-H, Rand	lom, 95% Cl	
Mack et al (PARTNER 3)	14	496	7	454	33.4%	1.85 [0.74, 4.64] 20	019	-	-	
Popma et al (EVOLUT)	28	725	24	678	62.2%	1.09 [0.63, 1.91] 20	019	-		
Reardon et al (SURTAVI)	4	131	0	123	4.3%	8.72 [0.46, 163.62] 20	018	_		
Total (95% CI)		1352		1255	100.0%	1.43 [0.77, 2.65]			•	
Total events	46		31							
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.08	Chi2 = 2.	59, df =	2(P = 0.	27); 12	= 23%		10.04		1	400
Test for overall effect: Z = 1	1.13 (P = 0	.26)					0.01	Eavours ITAVR	Favours ISAVRI	100

Supplemental Figure 1:

Forest plots of RCT only analyses A)Short term all-cause mortality, B) 1-year all-cause mortality, C)short term stroke, D) 1-year stroke, E)Short term cardiac mortality, F) 1-year cardiac mortality. Data are events in each group and weighted odds ratios. The horizontal line is 95% CI. The diamond shape is the pooled mean difference of all studies.

Supplemental Figure 2:

Forest plots of RCT-only analyses G) Short term new onset or worsening AF, H) 1-year AF, I)Short term new PPM implantation, J) 1-year PPM implantation, K)Short term AKI stage II and III, L) 1-year AKI stage II and III. Data are events in each group and weighted odds ratios. The horizontal line is 95% CI. The diamond shape is the pooled mean difference of all studies.

Supplemental Figure 3:

Forest plots of RCT only analyses M)Short term MI, N) 1-year MI, O)Short term major/lifethreatening/disabling bleeding, P) 1-year major/life-threatening/disabling bleeding, Q)Short term major vascular complications, R) 1-year major vascular complications. Data are events in each group and weighted odds ratios. The horizontal line is 95% CI. The diamond shape is the pooled mean difference of all studies.

Supplemental Figure 4:

<u>Funnel plots:A) Short term all-cause mortality, B) 1-year all-cause mortality, C) Short term stroke, D)</u> <u>Short term cardiac mortality, E) Short term new PPM implantation, F) Short term MI, G) Short term</u> <u>major/life-threatening/disabling bleeding.</u>

Supplemental Figure 5:

Forest plots of PPM by valve type, A) short-term PPM by valve type B) 1-year PPM by valve type.

Supplemental Figure 6: Quality assessment of RCT: Risk of Bias summary

EVOLUT = Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement With the Medtronic Transcatheter Aortic Valve

Replacement System In Patients at Low Risk for Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement;NOTION = Nordic

Aortic Valve Intervention; PARTNER = Placement of Aortic Transcatheter Valve trial;

STACCATO = Transapical Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation versus Surgical Aortic Valve

Replacement in Operable Elderly Patients with Aortic Stenosis; SURTAVI = Surgical Replacement and

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation.

Supplemental Figure 7: Quality assessment of observational studies

JURO