1 **Early and Midterm Outcomes of Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement with**
2 **Balloon-Expandable Versus Self-Expanding Valves**
3 **A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis**

4 Running title: Balloon-expandable versus self-expanding TAVR

5 Xin-Lin Zhang^{1†}; Xiao-Wen Zhang^{2†}; Zhong-Hai Wei^{1†}; Li-Na Kang¹; Rong-Fang Lan¹,
6 Jian-Zhou Chen¹; Jun Xie¹; Lian Wang¹; Wei Xu¹; Biao Xu¹

7 ¹Department of Cardiology, ²Department of Endocrinology, Affiliated Drum Tower Hospital,
8 Nanjing University School of Medicine, Nanjing, China.

9 [†]Drs. Xin-Lin Zhang, Xiao-Wen Zhang, and Zhong-Hai Wei contributed equally to this work.

10 **Address for Correspondence:** Dr. Biao Xu (xubiao62@nju.edu.cn) and Wei Xu

11 (13390900868@163.com), Department of Cardiology, Affiliated Drum Tower Hospital,

12 Nanjing University School of Medicine, 321 Zhongshan Road, 210008 Nanjing, China. Tel:

13 +862583105205; Fax: +862583308059.

14 Word count:

15

1 Abstract

2 **Background:** The comparative performances of transcatheter aortic-valve replacement

3 (TAVR) with balloon-expandable valves (BEV) and self-expanding valves (SEV) in severe

4 aortic stenosis remain unclear.

5 **Purpose:** To compare the early (30-day) and midterm (1-year) mortality and cardiovascular

6 outcomes of BEV with SEV.

7 **Data Sources:** PubMed, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Library from inception until February

8 13, 2020.

9 **Study Selection:** 3 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and 12 propensity-score matched

10 (PSM) studies, with 37,958 patients.

11 **Data Extraction:** 2 reviewers independently extracted study data and rated study quality.

12 **Data Synthesis:** Compared with SEV, BEV was associated with significantly lower mortality

13 at 30 days (OR 0.77, 95% CI 0.71–0.83, $P<0.00001$, $I^2=0$) and a trend toward lower mortality

14 at 1 year (OR 0.88, 95% CI 0.78–1.00, $P=0.05$, $I^2=15.8\%$), mainly driven from PSM studies,

15 but regardless of valve generations and SEV types. 30-day and 1-year cardiovascular

16 mortality, 30-day incidences of moderate to severe paravalvular leak, procedural contrast agent

17 volume and procedure time were lower, but transvalvular pressure gradient was higher in

18 BEV than SEV. 30-day incidences of permanent pacemaker implantation (PPI), acute kidney

19 injury, stroke, major bleeding, major vascular complications and rehospitalization were not

20 statistically different between BEV and SEV. Early-generation SEV was associated with a

21 higher 30-day PPI risk than corresponding BEV comparators. PPI risk was lower in

22 ACURATE neo but higher in Evolut R SEV, both compared with SAPIEN 3 BEV.

- 1 **Limitations:** Study-level but not patient-level data; residual confounders in PSM studies;
- 2 study designs and patient characteristics were heterogeneous.
- 3 **Conclusions:** Compared with SEV, BEV might be associated with lower early and midterm
- 4 mortality. Results from adequately powered RCTs with long-term follow-up are critically
- 5 needed to confirm these findings.
- 6 **Registration:** PROSPERO (CRD42020172889).
- 7 **Funding Source:** National Natural Science Foundation of China (NO. 81600312).
- 8

1 **Introduction**

2 Transcatheter aortic-valve replacement (TAVR) has emerged as a safe and effective therapy
3 for patients with severe aortic stenosis at all-range of surgical risks. A number of trials have
4 shown noninferior or superior performance of TAVR over surgical aortic-valve replacement
5 (SAVR) (1). TAVR has overtaken SAVR as the most common approach for aortic valve
6 replacement in several countries (2).

7 Among all TAVR valve systems, the balloon-expandable and self-expanding systems
8 gained the most amount of data. Current guidelines provide recommendation for TAVR
9 without emphasis on valve systems (3, 4), but it's important to compare different valve
10 systems as TAVR indications expand to younger, lower-risk patients with longer life
11 expectancy. A network meta-analysis (5) showed no significant difference in short-term
12 mortality between balloon-expandable valves (BEV) and self-expanding valves (SEV),
13 mainly driven from indirect comparisons and with considerable heterogeneity. Direct
14 comparisons of BEV with SEV have been lacking until recent publications of several
15 small-to-moderate-sized randomized controlled trials (RCTs) (6-8). All these trials were
16 underpowered to detect rare outcomes such as mortality. A number of larger-scale
17 propensity-score matched (PSM) studies (9-11) were recently published and might provide
18 complementary insights for RCTs. In this context, we performed a meta-analysis of
19 head-to-head RCTs and PSM studies to determine the early and midterm performances of
20 TAVR with BEV versus SEV.

22 **Methods**

1 We reported the meta-analysis following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
2 Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guideline (12).

3 **Data Sources and Searches**

4 PubMed, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, and EMBASE were
5 systematically searched through February 13, 2020 (X.L.Z. and X.W.Z.). The computer-based
6 searches, reviewed by a medical librarian, combined terms and combinations of keywords
7 which included self-expanding, balloon-expandable, and transcatheter aortic-valve. Two
8 investigators (X.L.Z. and X.W.Z.) also independently reviewed the reference lists of
9 identified studies and relevant reviews to search for other relevant studies.

10 **Study Selection**

11 Two reviewers (X.L.Z. and X.W.Z.) independently screened the titles and abstracts for
12 eligibility, and retrieved full-text for those with potential relevance. Conflicts were handled by
13 consensus, or resolved by a third investigator (L.K.) if necessary. Eligible studies (1)
14 evaluated patients with severe aortic stenosis who received a TAVR therapy, (2) compared
15 BEV with SEV, (3) reported at least one outcome of interest, (4) were RCTs or PSM studies.
16 We excluded adjusted observational studies without PSM, observational studies without
17 adjustment, single-arm studies, studies performed in patients with degenerated aortic surgical
18 bioprostheses, and studies comparing devices other than SEV and BEV.

19 **Outcome Measures**

20 The primary outcomes were early (30-day) and midterm (1-year) all-cause mortality.
21 Secondary outcomes included 30-day and 1-year cardiovascular mortality, 30-day stroke,
22 permanent pacemaker implantation (PPI), major bleeding, major vascular complications

(MVC), acute kidney injury (AKI), rehospitalization, and moderate to severe paravalvular leak (PVL). We also included procedure outcomes such as transvalvular pressure gradient, contrast agent volume, procedure time, and fluoroscopy time.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Two investigators (X.L.Z. and X.W.Z.) independently extracted study data using a prespecified form, evaluated the risk of bias of RCTs using the Cochrane Collaboration's risk of bias tool (13) and the quality of PSM studies using the Newcastle–Ottawa Scale (14). We also evaluated the quality and appropriateness of PSM methods used in the observational studies (15).

Data Synthesis and Statistical Analysis

Summary measures are presented as odds ratios (ORs) for binary outcomes and mean differences for continuous outcomes, and pooled using random-effect models (DerSimonian–Laird method) with Hartung–Knapp–Sidik–Jonkman variance correction (16). Heterogeneity was assessed using the Q and I^2 statistics. Stratified analyses were performed according to study designs (RCTs and PSM studies), valve generations (early-generation and new-generation) and SEV types (Boston Scientific ACURATE neo, Medtronic Evolut R, Medtronic CoreValve, and Abbott Portico). Between-subgroup differences were evaluated with the Q -test for heterogeneity. We performed random-effects meta-regression analysis to outline the association between early all-cause mortality and other potentially relevant outcomes, including moderate to severe PVL, PPI, and stroke. Potential publication bias was examined by visual inspection of the asymmetry in funnel plots. Both the studies of Deharo (11) and Van Belle (9) originated from national registries of French; we extracted data before

1 last quarter 2014 in the study of Van Belle to avoid overlap with the study of Deharo. All
2 meta-analyses were conducted with the R statistical programming environment, version 4.0.0
3 and the Review Manager, version 5.3, and a 2-tailed P value<0.05 was considered statistically
4 significant.

5 **Role of the Funding Source**

6 This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NO.
7 81600312). The funders had no role in the study design, data collection and analysis, writing
8 of the report, and decision to submit the article for publication.

10 **Results**

11 **Study selection and characteristics**

12 We included 15 studies—3 RCTs (6-8) and 12 PSM studies (9-11, 17-25)—with 37,958
13 patients (19,053 with BEV and 18,905 with SEV) (Figure 1). The mean age was 82.6 years
14 and 42.4% were male. When reported, the mean Logistic EuroSCORE ranged from 14 to 22.8,
15 the mean STS risk score ranged from 3.7 to 9.3. Most procedures were performed through
16 transfemoral approach. Baseline characteristics were presented in Appendix Table 1 to 4. All
17 trials were deemed as having low risk of bias (Appendix Table 5). The nature of the
18 intervention made trials blinded for clinicians impossible. All PSM studies achieved high
19 scores on the Newcastle–Ottawa Scale, ranging from 8 to 9 stars (Appendix Table 6). The
20 quality of reporting on PSM varied (Appendix Table 7), detailed in the discussion section.

21 **Early and midterm all-cause mortality**

22 Overall, BEV was associated with a significantly lower 30-day all-cause mortality

1 compared with SEV (OR 0.77, 95% CI 0.71–0.83, $P<0.00001$, $I^2=0$) (Figure 2A). No
2 publication bias was observed (Appendix Figure 1). Stratified analysis showed a
3 nonstatistically difference in RCTs (OR 0.60, 95% CI 0.19–1.90, $P=0.19$, $I^2=0$) and a
4 statistically significant risk reduction in PSM studies (OR, 0.76, 95% CI, 0.67–0.85, $P<0.001$,
5 $I^2=0$), without significant difference between subgroups (P value for interaction=0.39) (Table
6 1). 30-day all-cause mortality was significantly lower in BEV regardless of valve generations
7 (early-generation: OR 0.74, 95% CI 0.65–0.85, $P=0.002$, $I^2=0$; new-generation: OR, 0.77, 95%
8 CI, 0.68–0.87, $P=0.001$, $I^2=0$) (Figure 2B, Table 2). Because all BEV were all of the Edwards
9 SAPIEN family, but SEV were from 3 different companies, we performed subgroup analysis
10 based on SEV types, and found consistently lower 30-day all-cause mortality in BEV
11 (SAPIEN 3 vs. Evolut R: OR 0.78, 95% CI 0.75–0.82, $P=0.002$, $I^2=0$; SAPIEN/SAPIEN XT
12 vs. CoreValve: OR 0.74, 95% CI 0.65–0.85, $P=0.002$, $I^2=0$) (Appendix Figure 2).
13 Comparison between ACURATE neo, Portico and SAPIEN 3 valves seemed underpowered
14 (SAPIEN 3 vs. ACURATE neo: OR 0.56, 95% CI 0.28–1.12, $P=0.08$, $I^2=0$).
15 BEV was associated with a trend toward lower 1-year mortality compared with SEV (OR,
16 0.88, 95% CI, 0.78–1.00, $P=0.05$, $I^2=15.8\%$) (Appendix Figure 3). Only one underpowered
17 RCT reported 1-year mortality (OR, 1.47, 95% CI, 0.72–3.01, $P=0.29$). PSM studies showed
18 a significantly lower 1-year mortality in BEV (OR, 0.87, 95% CI, 0.77–0.99, $P=0.04$,
19 $I^2=20.4\%$). No significant difference was detected between subgroups (P value for
20 interaction=0.16).

21 **Early and midterm cardiovascular mortality**

22 The overall incidences of 30-day (OR, 0.77, 95% CI, 0.64–0.93, $P=0.01$, $I^2=0$) and 1-year

(OR, 0.86, 95% CI, 0.77–0.95, $P=0.02$, $I^2=0$) cardiovascular mortality were significantly lower in BEV than SEV (Appendix Figure 4 and 5). Stratified analysis showed a statistically significant risk reduction with BEV in PSM studies, but not in RCTs. No significant difference was detected between subgroups.

Early PPI, moderate to severe PVL

30-day incidence of PPI was not statistically different between BEV and SEV (OR, 0.74, 95% CI, 0.50–1.09, $P=0.12$, $I^2=95.1\%$) (Appendix Figure 6). BEV was associated with a significantly lower PPI incidence in early-generation (OR, 0.31, 95% CI, 0.22–0.44, $P=0.002$, $I^2=63.0\%$) but not new-generation valves (OR, 0.97, 95% CI, 0.69–1.35, $P=0.82$, $I^2=84.2\%$) (Appendix Figure 7). Compared with SAPIEN 3 BEV, PPI incidence was lower in ACURATE neo SEV (OR, 1.45, 95% CI, 1.05–2.01, $P=0.03$, $I^2=18.4\%$), but higher in Evolut R SEV (OR, 0.62, 95% CI, 0.39–1.00, $P=0.05$, $I^2=76.2\%$), showing significant difference between subgroups (Appendix Figure 8).

30-day incidence of moderate to severe PVL was significantly lower in BEV (OR, 0.40, 95% CI, 0.29–0.55, $P<0.00001$, $I^2=47.5\%$), both in RCTs and PSM studies (Appendix Figure 9), early and new-generation valves (Appendix Figure 10 and 11), without significant difference between subgroups.

Early stroke, AKI, MVC, major bleeding, and rehospitalization

30-day incidence of stroke was not different between BEV and SEV. Stroke incidence was lower in BEV in PSM studies but not RCTs, with significant difference between subgroups (Appendix Figure 12). Analyses based on valve generations and SEV types showed no significant differences (Appendix Figure 13 and 14). There was no significant difference in

30-day AKI, MVC, major bleeding and rehospitalization between BEV and SEV, and all stratified analyses showed similar findings (Appendix Figure 15 to 23).

Transvalvular pressure gradient, procedural contrast agent volume, procedure time and fluoroscopy time

BEV was associated with a significantly higher transvalvular pressure gradient (Appendix Figure 24), lower contrast agent volume (Appendix Figure 25) and procedure time (Appendix Figure 26) compared with SEV, but fluoroscopy time was similar (Appendix Figure 27).

Meta-regression analysis

Meta-regression analysis showed a trend toward higher 30-day all-cause mortality with higher incidence of moderate to severe PVL ($P=0.054$) (Appendix Figure 28) and lower incidence of PPI ($P=0.064$) (Appendix Figure 29). No association was observed between 30-day all-cause mortality and risk for stroke ($P=0.29$) (Appendix Figure 30).

Discussion

In our meta-analysis, BEV might be associated with lower incidences of early and midterm all-cause mortality, though these differences did not reach statistical significance in RCTs. These differences seemed to be independent of valve generations and SEV types, and might be associated with moderate to severe PVL risk differences. 30-day and 1-year cardiovascular mortality, 30-day moderate to severe PVL, procedure contrast agent volume and procedure time were lower, while transvalvular pressure gradient was higher in BEV. 30-day incidence of stroke, PPI, AKI, major bleeding, MVC and rehospitalization were not statistically different between BEV and SEV. Our study was strengthened by lack of significant

1 heterogeneity across studies and lack of significant difference between RCTs and
2 observational studies for most outcomes.

3 The higher mortality in SEV than BEV was also robust in currently using new-generation
4 valves, which highlights the importance of our findings. The lack of statistical significance in
5 RCTs may possibly be due to power insufficiency, thus raising the need for an adequately
6 powered RCT comparing different TAVR devices. Consistent with mortality outcome, we also
7 observed a higher incidence of moderate to severe PVL in SEV. Our meta-regression analysis
8 revealed that higher risk for moderate to severe PVL in SEV might partially contribute to its
9 higher mortality, but it needs to be confirmed in future studies due to the exploratory nature of
10 our meta-regression analysis. In agreement with this observation, multiple studies provided
11 relatively convincing evidence that residual moderate to severe PVL was associated with
12 increased short and long-term mortality, similar in BEV and SEV (9, 26). New-generation
13 valves feature sealing skirts or incorporates outer pericardial wrap to minimize PVL (27). Our
14 study and others' reports confirmed a significant reduction in PVL rates in new-generation
15 valves (28), but the risk difference between BEV and SEV remains substantial and significant.
16 It's remarkable that <1% of patients developed moderate to severe PVL in patients receiving
17 SAPIEN 3 valves (29).

18 Conduction abnormalities, including high-grade atrioventricular block leading to PPI,
19 remain the most frequent complication of TAVR (30). The clinical impact of PPI after TAVR
20 remains controversial. Although some studies suggested that periprocedural PPI might be
21 associated with a higher risk of all-cause mortality (31), it's unlikely to explain the mortality
22 difference observed in our study. The overall incidence of PPI was not statistically different

1 between SEV and BEV. Evolut R and ACURATE neo SEV showed opposite performance
 2 regarding PPI risk in our analysis, but both were associated with a higher mortality compared
 3 with SAPIEN 3 BEV. In addition, our exploratory meta-regression analysis demonstrated a
 4 possible trend toward higher mortality with lower incidence of PPI, which requires further
 5 investigation. The adoption of new-generation valves seem to have no evident reduction on
 6 PPI incidence (30). On the contrary, SAPIEN 3 valves might even increase PPI risk than its
 7 prior-generation valves (29). The low PPI incidence associated with ACURATE neo valve
 8 system might be attributed to the relatively low radial force that the inflow portion of this
 9 frame exerts on the surrounding conduction system (32).

10 It is important to note that the potential mortality superiority of BEV to SEV in our analysis
 11 was mainly driven from PSM studies but not RCTs. Even by sophisticated matching, these
 12 PSM studies were limited by lack of independent adjudication of outcomes and residual
 13 confounders that could not be fully accounted for. The choice of TAVR prosthesis strongly
 14 depends on the operators' experience with the devices and patients' anatomical suitability,
 15 both of which were not adequately adjusted in nonrandomized studies (33). Exclusion of
 16 certain patients based on anatomic criteria make it impossible to match for such patients'
 17 characteristics in an observational study. In fact, it's likely that there are considerably more
 18 patients with extensive outflow tract calcifications, low implanted coronary arteries, or
 19 complex and small femoral access receiving SEV devices. Other confounders not adjusted in
 20 PSM studies may include patient risk profiles and TAVR access, etc. Such residual
 21 confounders might explain part of the mortality difference between SEV and BEV.

22 We chose to include PSM studies but not studies with regression analysis and other

1 adjusting methods to pooled with RCTs because the former shares some particular
2 characteristics of RCTs. PSM allows researchers to separate the design from the analysis, and
3 to estimate treatment effects in metrics similar to RCTs (34). While in regression analysis,
4 temptation to model toward a desired result might be present because the outcome is always
5 in sight. It's simpler and more transparent to assess whether observed confounding has been
6 adequately eliminated in PSM than regression analysis (34, 35). PSM might produce less
7 biased, more robust, and more precise estimates than conventional regression analysis (35,
8 36), especially when there were few events per confounding variables (37). However, in spite
9 of its advantages, no complete consensus on the comparison of PSM with regression methods
10 has been achieved. With the most appealing transparent advantage of PSM, we were able to
11 evaluate the scientific quality and reporting of PSM studies. In our analysis, all PSM studies
12 described the variables to generate the propensity scores, 9 of 12 studies reported methods of
13 matching algorithm, and 5 described that the matching process was conducted without
14 replacement (Appendix Table 7). Eight studies used the encouraged standardized difference
15 method, which is independent of sample size, as the balance diagnostics to compare the
16 distribution of covariates between matched cohorts. It's important to note that the 3 PSM
17 studies (9-11) which altogether accounted for more than 80% of the weight in the analysis of
18 the primary outcome, provided appropriate, transparent and detailed descriptions of their
19 statistical methods (Appendix Table 7).

20 We acknowledged several other limitations in our study. First, the meta-analysis was based
21 on study-level but not patient-level data, and thus we were unable to perform in-depth
22 subgroup analyses or meta-regressions. Second, whether our findings could be generalized to

1 low-risk patients remains unknown. Third, our study included in the SEV group several
 2 different TAVR valve systems, however, subgroup analysis showed largely similar results.
 3 Fourth, our meta-regression analysis could only be considered as exploratory due to limited
 4 number of studies. Fifth, number of trials and events are very small for particular valve types,
 5 such as the Portico valve. Sixth, there may be differences in baseline characteristics between
 6 subgroups and this might influence the observed outcomes between subgroups, but our
 7 analyses revealed no obvious heterogeneity between these subgroups. Seventh, the longest
 8 duration of follow-up was limited to 1 year, data on durability and long-term outcomes are
 9 needed.

10

11 **Conclusions**

12 TAVR with BEV might be associated with a lower early and midterm all-cause and
 13 cardiovascular mortality compared with TAVR with SEV. An adequately powered RCT
 14 comparing different TAVR devices with longer-term follow-up data are warranted to confirm
 15 these findings, and determine their late performance and the effects of underlying risks of
 16 patients.

17

18 **Acknowledgements**

19 None.

20

21 **Conflict of interest**

22 None declared.

References:

1. **Mack MJ, Leon MB, Thourani VH, et al.** Transcatheter aortic-valve replacement with a balloon-expandable valve in low-risk patients. *N Engl J Med.* 2019;380(18):1695-1705.
2. **Boskovski MT, Nguyen TC, McCabe JM, Kaneko T.** Outcomes of transcatheter aortic valve replacement in patients with severe aortic stenosis: a review of a disruptive technology in aortic valve surgery. *JAMA Surg.* 2019. doi: 10.1001/jamasurg.2019.4449.
3. **Bonow RO, Brown AS, Gillam LD, et al.** ACC/AATS/AHA/ASE/EACTS/HVS/SCA/SCAI/SCCT/SCMR/STS 2017 Appropriate use criteria for the treatment of patients with severe aortic stenosis: a report of the American College of Cardiology Appropriate Use Criteria Task Force, American Association for Thoracic Surgery, American Heart Association, American Society of Echocardiography, European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery, Heart Valve Society, Society of Cardiovascular Anesthesiologists, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, Society of Cardiovascular Computed Tomography, Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance, and Society of Thoracic Surgeons. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2017;70(20):2566-2598.
4. **Baumgartner H, Falk V, Bax JJ, et al.** 2017 ESC/EACTS Guidelines for the management of valvular heart disease. *Eur Heart J.* 2017;38(36):2739-2791.
5. **Osman M, Ghaffar YA, Saleem M, et al.** Meta-analysis comparing transcatheter aortic valve implantation with balloon versus self-expandable valves. *Am J Cardiol.* 2019;124(8):1252-1256.
6. **Abdel-Wahab M, Mehili J, Frerker C, et al.** Comparison of balloon-expandable vs self-expandable valves in patients undergoing transcatheter aortic valve replacement: the

- 1 CHOICE randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2014;311(15):1503-14.
- 2 7. **Thiele H, Kurz T, Feistritz HJ, et al.** Comparison of newer generation
- 3 self-expandable vs. balloon-expandable valves in transcatheter aortic valve implantation: the
- 4 randomized SOLVE-TAVI trial. *Eur Heart J*. 2020; doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehaa036..
- 5 8. **Lanz J, Kim WK, Walther T, et al.** Safety and efficacy of a self-expanding versus a
- 6 balloon-expandable bioprosthesis for transcatheter aortic valve replacement in patients with
- 7 symptomatic severe aortic stenosis: a randomised non-inferiority trial. *Lancet*.
- 8 2019;394(10209):1619-1628.
- 9 9. **Van Belle E, Vincent F, Labreuche J, et al.** Balloon-expandable versus self-expanding
- 10 transcatheter aortic valve replacement: a propensity-matched comparison from the
- 11 FRANCE-TAVI registry. *Circulation*. 2020;141(4):243-259.
- 12 10. **Vlastra W, Chandrasekhar J, Munoz-Garcia AJ, et al.** Comparison of
- 13 balloon-expandable vs. self-expandable valves in patients undergoing transfemoral
- 14 transcatheter aortic valve implantation: from the CENTER-collaboration. *Eur Heart J*.
- 15 2019;40(5):456-465.
- 16 11. **Deharo P, Bisson A, Herbert J, et al.** Impact of Sapien 3 balloon-expandable versus
- 17 Evolut R self-expandable transcatheter aortic valve implantation in patients with aortic
- 18 stenosis: data from a nationwide analysis. *Circulation*. 2020;141(4):260-268.
- 19 12. **Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG.** Preferred reporting items for systematic
- 20 reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Ann Intern Med*. 2009;151:264-9, W64.
- 21 13. **Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Sterne JAC.** Assessing risk of bias in included studies. In:
- 22 Higgins JPT, Green S, eds. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*.

- 1 Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration; 2011. Available at:
- 2 www.cochrane.org/resources/handbook. Accessed December 15, 2015
- 3 14. **Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, et al.** The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for
- 4 assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. 2014. Accessed at
- 5 www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp on 15 December 2015.
- 6 15. **Austin PC.** A critical appraisal of propensity-score matching in the medical literature
- 7 between 1996 and 2003. *Stat Med*. 2008;27(12):2037-49.
- 8 16. **IntHout J, Ioannidis JP, Borm GF.** The Hartung-Knapp-Sidik-Jonkman method for
- 9 random effects meta-analysis is straightforward and considerably outperforms the standard
- 10 DerSimonian-Laird method. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2014;14:25.
- 11 17. **Mas-Peiro S, Seppelt PC, Weiler H, et al.** A Direct comparison of self-expandable
- 12 Portico versus balloon-expandable Sapien 3 devices for transcatheter aortic valve replacement:
- 13 a case-matched cohort study. *J Invasive Cardiol*. 2019;31(7):E199-E204.
- 14 18. **Wijeysundera HC, Qiu F, Koh M, et al.** Comparison of outcomes of
- 15 balloon-expandable versus self-expandable transcatheter heart valves for severe aortic
- 16 stenosis. *Am J Cardiol*. 2017;119(7):1094-1099.
- 17 19. **Husser O, Kim WK, Pellegrini C, et al.** Multicenter comparison of novel
- 18 self-expanding versus balloon-expandable transcatheter heart valves. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*.
- 19 2017;10(20):2078-2087.
- 20 20. **Barth S, Reents W, Zacher M, et al.** Multicentre propensity-matched comparison of
- 21 transcatheter aortic valve implantation using the ACURATE TA/neo self-expanding versus
- 22 the SAPIEN 3 balloon-expandable prosthesis. *EuroIntervention*. 2019;15(10):884-891.

- 1 21. **Zhang Y, Pyxaras SA, Wolf A, Schmitz T, Naber CK.** Propensity-matched
2 comparison between Direct Flow Medical, Medtronic Corevalve, and Edwards Sapien XT
3 prostheses: device success, thirty-day safety, and mortality. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.*
4 2015;85(7):1217-25.
- 5 22. **Mauri V, Kim WK, Abumayyaleh M, et al.** Short-term outcome and hemodynamic
6 performance of next-generation self-expanding versus balloon-expandable transcatheter aortic
7 valves in patients with small aortic annulus: a multicenter propensity-matched comparison.
8 *Circ Cardiovasc Interv.* 2017;10(10); doi:10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.117.005013.
- 9 23. **Chieffo A, Buchanan GL, Van Mieghem NM, et al.** Transcatheter aortic valve
10 implantation with the Edwards SAPIEN versus the Medtronic CoreValve Revalving system
11 devices: a multicenter collaborative study: the PRAGMATIC Plus Initiative
12 (Pooled-Rotterdam-Milano-Toulouse In Collaboration). *J Am Coll Cardiol.*
13 2013;61(8):830-6.
- 14 24. **Schaefer A, Linder M, Seiffert M, et al.** Comparison of latest generation transfemoral
15 self-expandable and balloon-expandable transcatheter heart valves. *Interact Cardiovasc*
16 *Thorac Surg.* 2017;25(6):905-911.
- 17 25. **Costa G, Buccheri S, Barbanti M, et al.** Outcomes of three different new generation
18 transcatheter aortic valve prostheses. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* 2020;95(3):398-407.
- 19 26. **Athappan G, Patvardhan E, Tuzcu EM, et al.** Incidence, predictors, and outcomes of
20 aortic regurgitation after transcatheter aortic valve replacement: meta-analysis and systematic
21 review of literature. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2013;61(15):1585-95.
- 22 27. **Bourantas CV, Modolo R, Baumbach A, et al.** The evolution of device technology in

- 1 transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *EuroIntervention*. 2019;14(18):e1826-e1833.
- 2 28. **Barbanti M, Buccheri S, Rodes-Cabau J, et al.** Transcatheter aortic valve replacement
- 3 with new-generation devices: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Cardiol*.
- 4 2017;245:83-89.
- 5 29. **Mack MJ, Leon MB, Thourani VH, et al.** Transcatheter aortic-valve replacement with
- 6 a balloon-expandable valve in low-risk patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;380(18):1695-1705.
- 7 30. **Auffret V, Puri R, Urena M, et al.** Conduction disturbances after transcatheter aortic
- 8 valve replacement: current status and future perspectives. *Circulation*.
- 9 2017;136(11):1049-1069.
- 10 31. **Faroux L, Chen S, Muntane-Carol G, et al.** Clinical impact of conduction disturbances
- 11 in transcatheter aortic valve replacement recipients: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
- 12 *Eur Heart J*. 2020; doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehz924.
- 13 32. **van Rosendaal PJ, Delgado V, Bax JJ.** Pacemaker implantation rate after transcatheter
- 14 aortic valve implantation with early and new-generation devices: a systematic review. *Eur*
- 15 *Heart J*. 2018;39(21):2003-2013.
- 16 33. **Abdel-Wahab M, Thiele H.** Transcatheter heart valve design and mortality: truth or
- 17 dare? *Circulation*. 2020;141(4):269-272.
- 18 34. **Austin PC.** An introduction to propensity score methods for reducing the effects of
- 19 confounding in observational studies. *Multivariate Behav Res*. 2011;46(3):399-424.
- 20 35. **Rubin DB.** Estimating causal effects from large data sets using propensity scores. *Ann*
- 21 *Intern Med*. 1997;127(8 Pt 2):757-63.
- 22 36. **Martens EP, Pestman WR, de Boer A, Belitser SV, Klungel OH.** Systematic

1 differences in treatment effect estimates between propensity score methods and logistic
2 regression. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2008;37(5):1142-7.
3 37. **Cepeda MS, Boston R, Farrar JT, Strom BL.** Comparison of logistic regression versus
4 propensity score when the number of events is low and there are multiple confounders. *Am J*
5 *Epidemiol.* 2003;158(3):280-7.
6
7

1 **Figure legends**

2 **Figure 1.** PRISMA flow diagram.

3 **Figure 2.** Risk estimates of 30-day all-cause mortality for TAVR with balloon-expandable

4 versus self-expanding valves according to study designs (A) and generations of valves (B).

5

6

1 **Table 1.** Risk estimates of 30-day and 1-year outcomes for TAVR with balloon-expandable versus self-expanding valves according to study designs.

Outcomes	Randomized controlled trials				Propensity-score matched studies					Overall			
	No of	OR (95% CI)	I^2	P value	No of	OR (95% CI)	I^2	P value	P value for	No of	OR (95% CI)	I^2	P value
	studies		(%)		studies		(%)		interaction*	studies		(%)	
	(patients)				(patients)					(patients)			
30-day follow-up													
All-cause mortality	3 (1418)	0.60 (0.19–1.90)	0	0.19	11 (36540)	0.76 (0.67–0.85)	0	<0.001	0.39	14 (37958)	0.77 (0.71–0.83)	0	<0.00001
Cardiovascular mortality	2 (980)	0.62 (0.24–1.62)	6.8	0.33	5 (22336)	0.77 (0.60–1.00)	0	0.05	0.67	7 (23316)	0.77 (0.64–0.93)	0	0.01
PPI	3 (1418)	0.69 (0.24–1.99)	57.4	0.27	10 (36052)	0.77 (0.46–1.27)	96.7	0.27	0.75	13 (37470)	0.74 (0.50–1.09)	95.1	0.12
Moderate to severe PVL	3 (1418)	0.28 (0.12–0.65)	0	0.02	9 (7286)	0.44 (0.30–0.64)	55.4	< 0.0001	0.08	12 (8704)	0.40 (0.29, 0.55)	47.5	<0.00001
AKI	3 (1418)	0.56 (0.11–2.75)	45.6	0.26	5 (1773)	0.85 (0.45–1.60)	0	0.51	0.33	8 (3191)	0.75 (0.48–1.16)	0	0.16
Stroke	3 (1418)	2.30 (0.36–14.7)	2.1	0.19	10 (15622)	0.73 (0.59–0.90)	0	0.01	0.01	13 (17040)	0.89 (0.62–1.27)	21.9	0.48
MVC	3 (1418)	0.86 (0.39–1.93)	0	0.51	8 (6058)	1.10 (0.87–1.38)	0	0.38	0.26	11 (7476)	1.04 (0.84–1.28)	5.3	0.71

Major bleeding	3 (1418)	1.09 (0.35–3.39)	18.7	0.78	11 (15622)	1.08 (0.94–1.24)	3.4	0.24	0.98	14 (17040)	1.08 (0.95–1.22)	2.3	0.20
Rehospitalization	2 (980)	0.39 (0.05, 3.05)	46.9	0.37	3 (22040)	1.01 (0.59, 1.74)	53.8	0.95	0.37	5 (23020)	0.98 (0.67, 1.43)	33.4	0.87
1-year follow-up													
All-cause mortality	1 (241)	1.47 (0.72–3.01)	NA	0.29	7 (26950)	0.87 (0.77–0.99)	20.4	0.04	0.16	8 (27191)	0.88 (0.78–1.00)	15.8	0.05
Cardiovascular mortality	1 (241)	1.40 (0.62–3.19)	NA	0.42	3 (25250)	0.87 (0.79–0.97)	0	0.01	0.24	4 (25491)	0.86 (0.77–0.95)	0	0.02

1 AKI, acute kidney injury; MVC, major vascular complication; OR, odds ratio; PPI, permanent pacemaker implantation; PVL, paravavular leak; TAVR, transcatheter

2 aortic-valve replacement.

3

4

5

1 **Table 2.** Risk estimates of 30-day outcomes for TAVR with balloon-expandable versus self-expanding valves according to valve generations.

Outcomes	Early-generation valves				New-generation valves				
	No of studies	OR (95% CI)	<i>I</i> ²	<i>P</i> value	No of studies	OR (95% CI)	<i>I</i> ²	<i>P</i> value	<i>P</i> value for
	(patients)		(%)		(patients)		(%)		interaction
All-cause mortality	6 (10855)	0.74 (0.65–0.85)	0	0.002	10 (26612)	0.77 (0.68–0.87)	0	0.001	0.67
PPI	4 (10367)	0.31 (0.22–0.44)	63.0	0.002	10 (26612)	0.97 (0.69–1.35)	84.2	0.82	<0.0001
Moderate to severe PVL	5 (5067)	0.47 (0.21–1.05)	70.3	0.06	7 (3337)	0.32 (0.23–0.44)	0	0.0001	0.21
AKI	3 (729)	0.53 (0.13–2.24)	0	0.2	5 (2462)	0.85 (0.46–1.56)	0	0.49	0.24
Stroke	6 (10855)	0.76 (0.54–1.07)	0	0.1	8 (4694)	1.00 (0.45–2.22)	53.9	1.0	0.45
MVC	4 (4653)	1.14 (0.91–1.43)	0	0.17	7 (2823)	0.89 (0.60–1.32)	0	0.48	0.15
Major bleeding	6 (10855)	0.99 (0.83–1.17)	0	0.86	9 (5694)	1.13 (0.72–1.80)	37.5	0.55	0.51

2 Early-generation valves included Edwards Sapien/Sapien XT and Medtronic CoreValve, new-generation valves included Edwards SAPIEN3, Medtronic Evolut R, Boston

3 Scientifics Accurate Neo, and Abbott Portico. AKI, acute kidney injury; MVC, major vascular complication; OR, odds ratio; PPI, permanent pacemaker implantation; PVL,

1 paravavular leak; TAVR, transcatheter aortic-valve replacement.

2

Identification

Records identified through
database searching
(n = 2203)

Additional records identified
through other sources
(n = 8)

Records after duplicates removed
(n = 1625)

Screening

Records screened
(n = 1625)

Records excluded after
screening at title and
abstract level
(n = 1577)

Eligibility

Full-text articles assessed
for eligibility
(n = 48)

Full-text articles excluded,
with reasons (n = 33):
Not propensity-score
matched studies (n = 21)
Comparing other devices
(n = 2)
Meta-analysis (n = 9)
Study in degenerated
aortic surgical
bioprostheses (n = 1)

Included

Studies included in
quantitative synthesis
(meta-analysis)
(n = 15)