References

S-232

- 1. Arora S, Misenheimer JA, Jones, W, Behekar A, Caughey M, et al. Transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement in intermediate risk patients: a meta-analysis. *Cardiovasc Diagn Ther*. 2016;6(3):241–249.
- 2. Barili F, Freemantle N, Folliguet T, et al. The flaws in the detail of an observational study on transcatheter aortic valve implantation versus surgical aortic valve replacement in intermediate-risks patients. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2017;51(6):1031-1035.
- 3. Baron SJ, Arnold SV, Wang K, et al. Health status benefits of transcatheter vs surgical aortic valve replacement in patients with severe aortic stenosis at intermediate surgical risk: results from the PARTNER 2 randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Cardiol.* 2017;2(8):837-845.
- 4. Lazkani M, Singh N, Howe C, et al. An updated meta-analysis of TAVR in patients at intermediate risk for SAVR. *Cardiovasc Revasc Medicine*.
- 5. Zorn GL, 3rd, Little SH, Tadros P, et al. Prosthesis-patient mismatch in highrisk patients with severe aortic stenosis: A randomized trial of a self-expanding prosthesis. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2016;151(4):1014-1022.
- 6. Deeb GM, Reardon MJ, Chetcuti S, et al. 3-year outcomes in high-risk patients who underwent surgical or transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2016;67(22):2565-2574.
- 7. Baron SJ, Arnold SV, Reynolds MR, et al. Durability of quality of life benefits of transcatheter aortic valve replacement: Long term results from the CoreValve US extreme risk trial. *Am Heart J.* 2017;194:39-48.
- 8. Villablanca PA, Mathew V, Thourani VH, et al. A meta-analysis and meta-regression of long-term outcomes of transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement for severe aortic stenosis. *Int J Cardiol*. 2016;225:234-243.
- 9. Panoulas VF, Francis DP, Ruparelia N, et al. Female-specific survival advantage from transcatheter aortic valve implantation over surgical aortic valve replacement: Meta-analysis of the gender subgroups of randomised controlled trials including 3758 patients. *Int J Cardiol.* 2018;250:66-72.

- 10. 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;380:1695-705.
- 11. Popma JJ, Deeb GM, Yakubov SJ, et al. Transcatheter aortic-valve replacement with a self-expanding valve in low-risk patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;380:1706-15.
- 12. Kapadia SR, Huded CP, Kodali SK, et al. Stroke after surgical versus transferoral transcatheter aortic valve replacement in the partner trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2018;72(20).
- 13. Baron SJ, Arnold SV, Reynolds MR, et al. Durability of quality of life benefits of transcatheter aortic valve replacement: Long-term results from the CoreValve US extreme risk trial. *Am Heart J.* 2017;194:39-48.
- 14. Panoulas VF, Francis DP, Ruparelia N, et al. Female-specific survival advantage from transcatheter aortic valve implantation over surgical aortic valve replacement: Meta-analysis of the gender subgroups of randomised controlled trials including 3758 patients. *Int J Cardiol.* 2018;250:66-72.
- 15. Villablanca PA, Mathew V, Thourani VH, et al. A meta-analysis and meta-regression of long-term outcomes of transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement for severe aortic stenosis. *Int J Cardiol*.15 2016;225:234-243.
- 16. Deeb GM, Reardon MJ, Chetcuti S, et al. 3-year outcomes in high-risk patients who underwent surgical or transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2016;67(22):2565-2574.
- 17. Zorn GL, 3rd, Little SH, Tadros P, et al. Prosthesis-patient mismatch in highrisk patients with severe aortic stenosis: A randomized trial of a self-expanding prosthesis. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2016;151(4):1014-1022,1023 e1011-1013.
- 18. Conte JV, Hermiller J, Jr., Resar JR, et al. Complications after self-expanding transcatheter or surgical aortic valve replacement. *Semin Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2017;29(3):321-330.
- 19. Gleason TG, Reardon MJ, Popma JJ, et al. 5-year outcomes of self-expanding transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement in high-risk patients. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2018;72(22).

- 20. Reardon MJ, Feldman TE, Meduri CU, et al. Two-year outcomes after transcatheter aortic valve replacement with mechanical vs self-expanding valves: The reprise iii randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Cardiol*. 2019;4(3).
- 21. Garg A, Rao SV, Visveswaran G, et al. Transcatheter aortic valve replacement versus surgical valve replacement in low-intermediate surgical risk patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Invasive Cardiol*. 2017;29(6):209-216.
- 22. Singh K, Carson K, Rashid MK, et al. Transcatheter aortic valve implantation in intermediate surgical risk patients with severe aortic stenosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Heart Lung Circ*. 2018;27(2):227-234.
- 23. Ando T, Takagi H, Grines CL. Transfemoral, transapical and transcatheter aortic valve implantation and surgical aortic valve replacement: a meta-analysis of direct and adjusted indirect comparisons of early and mid-term deaths. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg.* 2017;25(3):484-492.
- 24. Gozdek M, Raffa GM, Suwalski P, et al. Comparative performance of transcatheter aortic valve-in-valve implantation versus conventional surgical redo aortic valve replacement in patients with degenerated aortic valve bioprostheses: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2018;53(3):495-504.
- 25. Khan SU, Lone AN, Saleem MA, et al. Transcatheter vs surgical aortic-valve replacement in low- to intermediate- surgical-risk candidates: A meta-analysis and systematic review. *Clin Cardiol.* 2017;40(11):974-981.
- 26. Tam DY, Vo TX, Wijeysundera HC, et al. Transcatheter vs surgical aortic valve replacement for aortic stenosis in low-intermediate risk patients: a meta-analysis. *Can J Cardiol*. 2017;33(9):1171-1179.
- 27. Witberg G, Lador A, Yahav D, et al. 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*.
- 28. Ueshima D, Fovino LN, D'Amico G et al. Transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement in low- and intermediate-risk patients: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis.. *Cardiovasc Interv Ther*. 2018;34(3).

- 29. Zhou Y, Wang Y, Wu Y, et al. Transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement in low to intermediate-risk patients: A meta-analysis of randomized and observational studies. *Int J Cardiol.* 2016;228:723-728.
- 30. Kondur A, Briasoulis A, Palla M, et al. Meta-Analysis of transcatheter aortic valve replacement versus surgical aortic valve replacement in patients with severe aortic valve stenosis. *Am J Cardiol*. 2016;117(2):252-257.
- 31. Siemieniuk RA, Agoritsas T, Manja V, et al. Transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement in patients with severe aortic stenosis at low and intermediate-risk: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2016;354:i5130.
- 32. Sondergaard L, Steinbruchel DA, Ihlemann N, et al. Two-year outcomes in patients with severe aortic valve stenosis randomized to transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement: the all-comers nordic aortic valve intervention randomized clinical trial. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv.* 2016;9(6).
- 33. Sondergaard L, Ihlemann N, Capodanno D, Jrgensen TH, Nissen H, Kjeldsen BJ, Chang Y, Steinbrchel DA, Olsen PS, Petronio AS, Thyregod HGH. Durability of transcatheter and surgical bioprosthetic aortic valves in patients at lower Surgical Risk. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2019;73(5):546-553.
- 34. Reardon MJ, Kleiman NS, Adams DH, et al. Outcomes in the randomized corevalve us pivotal high-risk trial in patients with a Society of Thoracic Surgeons Risk Score of 7% or less. *JAMA Cardiol*. 2016;1(8):945-949.
- 35. Phan K, Zhao DF, Wang N, et al. Transcatheter valve-in-valve implantation versus reoperative conventional aortic valve replacement: a systematic review. *J Thorac Dis.* 2016(1):E83-93.
- 36.Chen HL, Liu K. Clinical outcomes for transcatheter valve-in-valve in treating surgical bioprosthetic dysfunction: A meta-analysis. *Int J Cardiol.* 2016;212:138-41.
- 37. Tam DY, Vo TX, Wijeysundera HC et al. Transcatheter valve-in-valve versus redo surgical aortic valve replacement for the treatment of degenerated bioprosthetic aortic valve: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* 2018 92(7):1404-1411.
- 38. Nishimura RA, O'Gara PT, Bonow RO. Guidelines update on indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *JAMA Cardiol.* 2017;2(9):1036-1037.

- 39. Hayes, Inc. Hayes Health Technology Assessment. *Comparative effectiveness review of transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI) and surgical aortic valve replacement (SAVR) for aortic stenosis in lower risk patients*. Lansdale, PA. Hayes, Inc.; 9/27/2018.
- 40. InterQual® Level of Care Criteria 2019. Acute Care Adult. Change Healthcare, LLC.