

Network Meta-Analysis Comparing the Short and Long-Term Outcomes of Alternative Access for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement

Authors: Sagar Ranka, MD¹; Shubham Lahan, MD²; Adnan K. Chhatriwalla, MD³; Keith B. Allen, MD⁴; Sadhika Verma, MD⁵; Pedro Villablanca, MD⁶

Institutional Affiliations:

¹Department of Cardiovascular Medicine, University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, KS, United States. ²University College of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India. ³Division of Cardiology, Saint Luke's Mid America Heart Institute and University of Missouri-Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, United States. ⁴Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, Saint Luke's Mid America Heart Institute and University of Missouri-Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, United States. ⁵Department of Family Medicine, Henry Ford Allegiance Health, Jackson, MI, United States. ⁶Department of Medicine, Division of Cardiology, Henry Ford Health System, Detroit, MI, United States.

Abstract

Objectives: This study aimed to compare short- and long-term outcomes following various alternative access routes for transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR).

Methods: Thirty-four studies with a pooled sample size of 30,986 records were selected by searching PubMed and Cochrane library databases from inception through 11th June 2021 for patients undergoing TAVR via 1 of 6 different access sites: Transfemoral (TF), Transaortic (TAO), Transapical (TA), Transcarotid (TC), Transaxillary/Subclavian (TSA), and Transcaval (TCV). Data extracted from these studies were used to conduct a frequentist network meta-analysis with a random-effects model using TF access as a reference group.

Results: Compared with TF, both TAO [RR 1.91, 95% CI (1.46–2.50)] and TA access [RR 2.12, 95%CI (1.84–2.46)] were associated with an increased risk of 30-day mortality. No significant difference was observed for stroke, myocardial infarction, major bleeding, conversion to open surgery, and major adverse cardiovascular or cerebrovascular events in the short-term (≤ 30 days). Major vascular complications were lower in TA [RR 0.43, (95% CI, 0.28-0.67)] and TC [RR 0.51, 95% CI (0.35-0.73)] access compared to TF. The 1-year mortality was higher in the TAO [RR of 1.35, (95% CI, 1.01–1.81)] and TA [RR 1.44, (95% CI, 1.14–1.81)] groups.

Conclusion: Non-thoracic alternative access site utilization for TAVR implantation (TC, TSA and TCV) is associated with similar outcomes to conventional TF access. Thoracic TAVR access (TAO and TA) is associated with increased short and long-term mortality.

Keywords: TAVR; transfemoral; transcarotid; mortality; risk ratio; network meta-analysis.

Introduction

Transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) is increasingly performed as a favored treatment modality over surgical aortic valve replacement among patients of all risk profiles with severe aortic stenosis.¹⁻⁴ The transfemoral (TF) access has been most widely used for TAVR valve deployment and is considered as gold standard for the procedure.^{1,5-7} However, in about 10%–15% of patients, TF access is not feasible owing to unfavorable iliofemoral arterial anatomy, necessitating a need for an alternative approach.⁸

The risk profile of patients needing alternate access TAVR is typically higher compared to TF TAVR patients, however, the safety and efficacy of alternative access TAVR as compared to ‘like’ TF TAVR patients remains controversial. The selection of alternate access is often driven by the expertise and make-up of the heart team with options for percutaneous vs surgical access, need for general anesthesia, and potential impact on the cerebral, respiratory and renal systems all playing a role in the selection. Current evidence for alternative access is largely derived from observational studies comparing these alternative access strategies in a ‘pairwise’ fashion.⁹⁻¹² No randomized trial directly compares different approaches and these approaches are more or less subject to a learning curve.¹³ This limits the scope of clinical decision making, creating equipoise, especially when multiple access site options are available. There is an unmet need for a comprehensive analysis evaluating multiple alternative access options simultaneously. Therefore, we conducted this network meta-analysis to evaluate the short- and long-term

outcomes of various access approaches for TAVR.

Methods

We conducted this network meta-analysis in accordance with the preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines and the American Heart Association (AHA) scientific report on methodological standards for systematic reviews and meta-analyses.^{14,15} A PRISMA checklist has been provided in the **eTable-1, Data Supplement**.

Data Availability Statement

The authors declare that all the data are available in the article and in its Data Supplement files.

Data Sources and Searches

Given the public availability of data and the de-identified nature of patient information in respective studies included in the current network meta-analysis, this study was exempt from approval by the institutional review board. Two investigators (S.L. and S.R.) performed the literature search using the PubMed/Medline and Cochrane library databases through 11th April 2021 to identify and retrieve all the studies comparing various approaches for TAVR by using the following search terms: “transcatheter aortic valve replacement”, “transfemoral”, “transaortic”, “transaxillary”, “subclavian”, “mortality”, “transcarotid”, “clinical outcomes”, and “access site.” The same authors independently reviewed 10,098 citations by their titles, of which 5,796 articles were identified as duplicates and were thus

discarded. The remaining 4,302 articles were screened by their titles and abstracts, of which 4,157 were excluded, leaving a total of 145 full-text articles to be assessed for eligibility. A total of 111 articles were identified as systematic reviews and meta-analyses, editorial comments, case-reports, duplicate studies, or review articles, and were therefore excluded. One study, by Kirker et al, compared transcatheter TAVR with transaortic/transapical access¹⁶ but was excluded owing to combined reporting of transaortic and transapical outcomes under “transthoracic” cohort. Finally, 34 studies satisfied our inclusion criteria and were quantitatively evaluated (**Figure 1**). Any conflicts regarding the study selection were resolved by a mutual consensus.

Study Selection


We aimed to include all published English language articles (randomized controlled trials, cohort, and observational studies) comparing various approaches of TAVR with at least a 30-day clinical follow-up. A total of 6 TAVR approaches were included: TF, subclavian/axillary (TSA), transcaval (TCV), transcatheter (TC), transapical (TA), and transaortic (TAO).

Data Abstraction and Quality Assessment

Data on clinical outcomes and study were extracted independently by two authors (S.L. & S.R.) using a standardized data extraction form with an intention-to-treat principle. Any disagreements pertaining to the information were resolved by mutual consensus. We used Methodological Index for Non-Randomized Studies (MINORS) criteria for performing quality

assessment.¹⁷ The criteria consist of 12 methodological parameters for evaluating study quality; with the ideal score being 24 for comparative studies. The overall scores of studies included in this network meta-analysis ranged from 16–22. The details of quality assessment are provided in **eTable-4, Data Supplement**.

Figure 1. PRISMA diagram illustrating the study selection process.



Outcomes

Our pre-defined primary outcomes were short- (30-days) and long-term (≥ 1 -year) all-cause mortality following TAVR. The secondary outcomes included short-term risk of conversion to open cardiac surgery, implantation of a new pacemaker, major vascular complication, stroke, myocardial infarction, major bleeding, and major adverse cardiovascular or cerebrovascular events (MACCE). The outcomes were defined as

they were in respective studies included in this network meta-analysis.

Statistical Analysis

We conducted this frequentist network meta-analysis using a random-effects model. The outcomes were reported as risk ratios (RR) along with their corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CI). We used the P-score metric, which is based entirely on the point estimates and standard errors of the frequentist network meta-analysis estimates for comparing the hierarchy of effectiveness and safety of various treatments. P-score quantitatively ascertains that a particular intervention is better than others averaged over all competing interventions. The values range from 0-1, i.e., the higher the value, the higher the effectiveness of a treatment.¹⁸ The consistency between the direct and indirect estimates was assessed by using the node-splitting technique (**eTable-5 & eFigure-1, Data Supplement**), and heterogeneity was quantified by tau-square (τ^2) and I^2 statistic (**eTable-6, Data Supplement**). Pairwise meta-analyses using DerSimonian and Laird random-effects model reporting direct estimates were also performed (**eTable-7, Data Supplement**). We used Wan method to convert values reported as median (interquartile range) into mean \pm standard deviation.¹⁹ We used *meta* and *netmeta* packages for conducting our network meta-analysis.^{20,21} All statistical analyses were conducted in R (v 4.0.2).

Results

Study Search and Characteristics

We identified a total of 34 studies comprising a pooled population of 32,689

patients.^{6,7,22-53} We compared outcomes across 6 different access sites used for TAVR: TF, TSA, TCV, TC, TAO, and TA. **Table 1** details the baseline characteristics of studies and patients belonging to individual studies. The mean age was similar across the groups. Only 22.1% patients who underwent transfemoral TAVR had a prior history of peripheral vascular disease (PVD) compared to ~48–67% of those who underwent TAVR via alternative access. The details pertaining to individual access groups are available in **eTable-8, Data Supplement**.

Network Structure

Figure 2 displays the network structure for the short-term and long-term risk of mortality associated with different access sites used in TAVR, with TF access being the point of reference. The overall network appears to be well-connected. There are a total 6 different access sites: TF, TSA, TAO, TA, TC, and TCV in the short-term and 5 (with the exception of TCV) in the long-term network models. Network structures for the respective secondary outcomes are shown in **eFigure-2, Data Supplement**.

All-cause mortality

All 34 studies reported incidence of all-cause mortality at 30-days following TAVR. Compared with TF access, TAO access was associated with 87% risk of mortality [RR, 1.87 (95% CI, 1.38–2.54)]. A similar risk was observed with TA access [RR 1.89 (95% CI, 1.57–2.28)]. However, we did not find any difference in mortality with TSA [RR, 1.12 (95% CI, 0.85–

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of patients and study details.

Author(s)	Year	Region	Study Design	TAVR Groups	Sample Size	Mean age (yrs)	Males (%)	Diabetes (%)	Prior MI (%)	Prior PCI (%)	PVD (%)
Bleizziffer et al	2009	Germany	Single-center Retrospective cohort	TF/TA	153/50	81.4/81.5	48/22	-	-	18/28	17/52
Petronio et al	2010	Italy	Multicenter Prospective Cohort	TF/TSA	460/54	83/83	41.3/66.7	27.4/20.4	20.7/33.3	27/46.3	15/55.6
Ewe et al	2011	Singapore	Single-center Retrospective cohort	TF/TA	45/59	82.2/79.4	46.7/52.5	29/27	22/24	-	11/67.8
Taramasso et al	2011	Italy	Single-center Prospective Cohort	TF/TA/TSA	140/16/19	79.8/78/79.7	53.1/31/73.7	18.6/25/26.3	22/37/36.8	-	18.6/62.5/63.1
Eltchaninof et al	2011	France	Multicenter Prospective Cohort	TF/TA/TSA	161/71/12	83/82/75.5	52.5/64.3/50	29.3/25.3/8.3	25.5/14/25	-	-
Moynagh et al	2011	UK, Ireland	Multicenter Retrospective Cohort	TF/TSA	253/35	81.7/80.6	-	-	16/34	24/34	21.3/74.2
Petronio et al	2012	Italy	Retrospective Cohort	TF/TSA	141/141	83/83	58/61	-	-	-	20.6/85.1
Saia et al	2012	Italy	Single-center Prospective Cohort	TF/TSA/TA	66/12/24	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gillard et al	2012	France	Multicenter Prospective Cohort	TF/TA/TSA	2361/567/184	83/81.5/82.2	47.4/58.6/71.2	-	14.5/25/18.5	15.2/30/24.2	12.5/48.1/41.6
Muensterer et al	2013	Germany	Single-center Retrospective Cohort	TF/TSA	301/40	80.2/79.5	44.9/57.5	-	-	-	14/42.5
Lardizabal et al	2013	United States	Single-center Registry	TAO/TA	44/76	85/87	43/53	23/25	18/24	20/50	73/75
Adamo et al	2014	Italy	Single-center Prospective Cohort	TF/TAO/TSA	170/44/32	83/83/82	62/61/44	28/34/28	17/16/16	24/25/41	11/70/66
Blackman et al	2014	United Kingdom	Single-center Prospective Cohort	TF/TA/TSA	1091/408/94	82/82/82	53/52/68	22/19.4/25	21.5/19.9/25.3	-	16.9/44/55.3
Schymik et al	2015	Germany	Single-center Prospective Cohort	TF/TA	587/413	82.1/81.5	39.7/49	-	58.3/64.4	-	10.9/22
Frohllich et al	2015	United Kingdom	Multicenter Prospective Registry	TF/TA/TAO/TSA	2828/761/185/188	83/84/82/83	51/56/49/65	23/22/21/23	22/22/23/28	21/20/18/24	-
Koifman et al	2016	United States	Retrospective Cohort	TF/TA	516/132	83/84	51/44	35/30	-	31/35	30/56
Kirker et al	2016	United States	Retrospective Observational Cohort	TF/TA/TC	100/12/25	83/82.5/77	51/42/52	34/50/48	-	-	39/83/80
Arai et al	2016	France, Japan	Multicenter Prospective Cohort	TF/TAO/TA	467/289/42	83.8/83.7/81.3	50/51/71	22/22/26	3/6/5	-	11/32/36
Gleason et al	2017	United States	Post-hoc analysis	TF/TSA	202/202	80.2/80.8	58.9/63.9	43/43	31.2/31.7	40/40	57.9/60.4
Paone et al	2018	United	Retrospective Cohort	TF/TC/TCV	373/32/58	80.4/79/79.6	55/50/44.8	41/34.4/44.8	-	-	23.3/78.1/75.9
Watanabe et al	2018	Japan	Retrospective Cohort	TF/TC	643/83	81.4/80	53.7/65.1	27/31.3	14.8/19.2	37.6/42.2	20.5/61.4
van Wely et al	2018	Netherlands	Retrospective Cohort	TF/TSA	29/91	82/80	-	-	-	-	-
Dalmuji et al	2018	France, United States	Prospective Observational Cohort	TA/TAO/TSA/TC	45/67/17/43	82/84/80/79.6	73/45/59/63	27/28/24/40	22/25/6/35	-	-
Chollet et al	2018	France	Prospective Cohort	TF/TAO	481/163	85/83.8	44/7/43.3	25.6/28.8	-	-	5/31.9
Folliguet et al	2019	France	Prospective Observational Study	TF/TC	10,598/435	83.2/81.1	47.3/59	25.7/31.1	37.9/46.4	28.9/38.4	17.3/50.7
Amer et al	2019	United States	Single-center Retrospective Cohort	TSA/TC	38/33	71/82	50/58	39/33	39/24	39/24	47/64
Allen et al	2019	United States	Single-center Retrospective Cohort	TAO/TC/TAP	33/84/48	78/78.9/76.8	45.5/54.8/50	36.4/54.8/35.4	-	42.4/61.9/39.6	36.4/73.8/50
Long et al	2020	United States	Single-center Retrospective Cohort	SC/TCV	41/16	83.2/80.7	36.4/41.4	43.9/31.8	12.2/27.3	9.8/13.6	29.3/36.4
Leclercq et al	2020	France	Single-center Prospective Cohort	TF/TC	51/81	81.8/81.6	33/69	42/36	-	33/52	-
Hudziack et al	2020	Poland	Single-center Retrospective Cohort	TF/TC	232/33	78.6/78	43.5/51.5	43/57	22/33	38/42.2	18/36.4
Lu et al	2020	Switzerland	Single-center Retrospective Cohort	TF/TC	255/51	83/83	49.8/60.8	24/27	-	-	14/41.2
Kirker et al	2020	United States	Observational Registry Study	TSA/TC	1576/788	78/78	52.8/52.3	41/41.9	-	-	73.2/73.2
Jones et al	2021	United States	Single-center Retrospective Cohort	TF/TC	1319/146	81/79	53/50	34/42	-	-	25/90
Marie et al	2021	France	Single-center Retrospective Cohort	TF/TC	400/100	81.3/79.9	50.5/69	26/27	-	-	14.8/86


Numerical values are represented as numbers (n) or percentages (%). TF: Transfemoral; TSA: Transaxillary/Subclavian; TA: Transapical; TAO: Transaortic; TC: Transcatheter; TCV: Transcaval; MI: Myocardial Infarction; PCI: Percutaneous Coronary Intervention; PVD: Peripheral Vascular Disease.

1.48)]; TC [RR, 1.19 (95% CI, 0.88–1.60)]; or TCV access [RR, 1.68 (95% CI, 0.46–6.10)] (**Figure 3**). A total of 12 studies (N = 12,372) reported all-cause mortality at ≥ 1 -year following TAVR. The risk of all-cause mortality was significantly higher with TAO [RR, 1.35 (95% CI, 1.01–1.81)] or TA [RR, 1.44 (95% CI, 1.14–1.81)] access for TAVR, whereas the risk of mortality associated with TSA [RR, 1.16 (95% CI, 0.95–1.42)] and TC [RR, 0.92 (95% CI, 0.54–1.56)] access was comparable with TF access, as shown in **Figure 3**.

surgery. None of the alternative TAVR approaches were found to increase the predisposition to open cardiac surgery as compared to TF access — RR, 2.09 (95% CI, 0.59–7.35) for TSA; RR, 1.95 (95% CI, 0.26–14.53)] for TAO; RR, 0.89 (95% CI, 0.11–7.39) for TA; and RR, 1.17 (95% CI 0.42–3.22) for TCV (**Figure 3**).

We identified a total of 26 studies (N = 28,333) that compared insertion of new pacemaker following TAVR across various access

Figure 2. Network of primary outcomes: 30-days and ≥ 1 -year mortality



Each node (solid circle) represents an individual access site used in TAVR. The size of the node corresponds to the total number of patients included in each of the groups. The thickness of the edges (gray lines) connecting different nodes corresponds to the number of studies directly comparing a particular treatment pair.

Conversion to open cardiac surgery

Eight studies (N = 15,833) reported the incidence of conversion of TAVR to open cardiac


sites. Compared with TF access, both TAO [RR, 0.60 (95% CI, 0.40–0.89)] and TA access [RR, 0.49 (95%CI, 0.36–0.65)] significantly lowered the

risk of new pacemaker insertion at 30-days of TAVR, whereas the risk with TSA or TC access was comparable with TF access. However, we observed that TCV access was associated with a 4.5-fold risk of pacemaker insertion [RR 4.45 (95% CI, 2.48–8.00)] as shown in **Figure 4**.

Stroke at 30-days

Compared with the TF access, there were no significant differences in stroke risk with TSA [RR, 1.45 (95% CI, 0.90–2.32)]; TAO [RR, 0.72 (95% CI, 0.33–1.55)]; TA [RR, 0.86 (95% CI, 0.48–1.55)]; TC [RR, 0.85 (95% CI, 0.53–1.38)]; and TCV [RR, 0.62 (95% CI, 0.07–5.25)] access for TAVR, as shown in **Figure 5**.

Figure 3. Forest Plots showing the RR (95% CI) for Primary Outcomes: 30-days and ≥ 1 -year mortality.



Major vascular complication at 30-days

Twenty-five studies with a pooled sample size of 26,024 patients reported the incidence of major vascular complications following TAVR. We found that patients who underwent TA [RR, 0.31 (95% CI, 0.21–0.46)] or TC TAVR [RR, 0.48 (95% CI, 0.33–0.70)] had a lower risk of developing major vascular complications within 30-days, as compared to patients who underwent TF TAVR. The risk profiles of TSA, TAO, or TCV access were similar to that of TF access (**Figure 4**).


Myocardial Infarction at 30-days

Nine studies with a pooled patient population of 3,330 were identified for comparing the risk of myocardial infarction occurring within 30-days post-TAVR across 6 different access sites. When compared with the TF access, none of the other access sites were found to have a significantly different risk of myocardial infarction at 30-days (**Figure 5**).

Major bleeding at 30-days

We identified 10 studies (N = 4,546) reporting the incidence of major bleeding

Figure 4. Forest Plots for Secondary Outcomes: conversion to cardiac surgery; insertion of new pacemaker at 30-days; and major vascular complications at 30-days.



among their patient cohorts at 30-days post-TAVR. There were no significant differences in the risk of major bleeding with TSA [RR, 1.17 (95% CI, 0.85–1.62)]; TAO [RR, 0.64 (95% CI, 0.32–1.28)]; TA [RR, 0.99 (95% CI, 0.62–1.56)]; TC [RR, 0.88 (95% CI, 0.45–1.73)]; and TCV [RR, 2.49 (95% CI, 0.05–122.77)] access as compared to TF access (Figure 5).

MACCE at 30-days

Only 5 studies (N = 1,199) evaluated the risk of MACCE at 30-days across 4 different TAVR access sites. Compared to TF access, none of the other access sites had a significantly different

risk of MACCE with an RR of 0.67 (95% CI, 0.32–1.41) for TSA; RR, 0.96 (95% CI, 0.34–2.74) for TAO; and RR 1.33 (95% CI, 0.61–2.89) for TA, as illustrated in Figure 5.


Ranking Strategies for TAVR Access Site

Transfemoral approach was ranked the best strategy (P-score, 0.89), followed by TSA (P-score, 0.71) and TC (P-score, 0.64) for reducing all-cause mortality at 30-days, whereas both the TAO (P-score, 0.19) and TA (P-score, 0.18) approaches were relatively least effective in reducing the risk of mortality at 30-days post-TAVR (Figure 6). At 1-year follow-up, TF access

was ranked the most effective (P-score, 0.82), followed by TC (P-score, 0.81) for limiting all-cause mortality risk at ≥ 1 -year (**Figure 6**). Rankograms for the secondary outcomes are shown in **eFigure-3, Data Supplement**.

access, both TAO and TA access were associated with a nearly two-fold increase in all-cause mortality at 30-days and ≥ 1 -year following TAVR; 2) Major adverse cardiovascular and cerebrovascular events were comparable across

Figure 5. Forest plot for secondary outcomes: stroke at 30-days; myocardial infarction at 30-days; major bleeding at 30-days; and MACCE at 30-days.



Discussion


This network meta-analysis including 34 studies with 30,986 patients provides a cross-comparison of various available access sites and attempts to generate a pooled estimate using the currently available evidence. Multiple observations of this study are noteworthy and deserve emphasis — 1) As compared to TF

various TAVR access sites; 3) Non-thoracic alternative access sites (TC, TSA, and TCV) were associated with comparable mortality and similar risk of stroke as compared to TF access; 4) TA and TC access for TAVR were associated with lower risk of vascular complications as compared to TF access; 5) TCV access for TAVR was associated with an increased risk of

permanent pacemaker implant as compared to TF access.

non-negligible group of patients comprising 10-15% of cases are still not suitable for TF access

Figure 6. Rankograms for Primary Outcomes.



The TF route is currently considered the gold standard for TAVR because TAVR devices were primarily designed for TF approach. Among the few initially available approaches for TAVR (including TF, TA, and TAO), the TF route was considered the least invasive one, not requiring a surgical incision. Since then, centers are using TF as their default approach.^{5,54} Thanks to ongoing development of transcatheter heart valve technologies, including progressive evolution and downsizing of delivery systems and introducer sheaths, TF TAVR is now feasible in the majority of patients. However, despite the technical advancements in valve delivery systems and reduced sheath sizes, a small but

due to tortuous, calcified, or small caliber iliofemoral arteries warranting alternative access TAVR approaches.^{31,34} In early TAVR experience, TAO and TA accesses were the only alternative access routes for valve implantation, followed by TSA, TC, and TCV. These approaches are limited by relative contraindications, such as respiratory failure in case of TA, and porcelain aorta and previous heart surgery, in cases of TAO. As a result, and with the downsizing of delivery systems for newer generation devices, interest in TA and TAO approaches waned and non-thoracic alternative access routes gained popularity.^{30,36} Prior studies have found both TAO and TA approaches similar to TF in terms of

mortality-related outcomes.^{32,47,55} Our findings, on the contrary, indicate otherwise — underscoring nearly a two-fold risk of mortality with TAO and TA approaches compared with TF access both in short as well as long-term. The increased mortality with TA and TAO approaches has been ascribed to high “risk profiles” of patients and a steeper learning curve for the procedure.^{7,30,31,56} This is in line with findings from a prior study of high-risk patients from the FRANCE-2 TAVI Registry demonstrating a higher 1-year adjusted mortality (HR 1.45; 95% CI, 1.09–1.92) with TA as compared to TF TAVR.⁷

Stroke has been well-recognized as a dreaded complication of TAVR, associated with a five-fold increase in 30-day risk of mortality.⁵⁷ In this network meta-analysis, we observed that 30-day risk of stroke was comparable across different approaches, with no particular approach having a higher or lower predisposition to stroke. While some early studies of TC TAVR suggested a higher than ideal stroke rate, our analysis corroborates contemporary findings from the French registry where the stroke rate was similar to that of TF TAVR^{36,58} and lower than what has been reported for TSA TAVR.⁵⁶

Though TCV and the other peripheral alternative access had comparable outcomes compared to TF access, there was a significant increased risk of permanent pacemaker with TCV compared to TF access. No information on non-modifiable causes (pre-existing conduction disorders, distribution and amount of calcification, left ventricular outflow geometry) and mechanical factors of the procedure

(implantation depth, transcatheter valve oversizing, and radial force of the valve at outflow level) are available to look for association of this findings. More data analysis comparing TCV and TF access including the above-mentioned factors are needed to explore this finding.

Our findings highlight that alternative access options that avoid the thoracic cavity, including TC, TSA and TCV access, best mimic the safety profile of TF TAVR. Of these, TC demonstrated the most favorable outcomes, with a lower number of vascular complications as compared to TCV, TSA, and TF access, and similar reduction in risk of 1-year mortality as compared to TF access. Probable reasons for this could be the superficial location of the carotid arteries and the comfort level of cardiovascular surgeons with carotid artery manipulation, facilitating access and closure under direct visualization, potentially reducing major or life-threatening bleeding and vascular complications.⁵⁹ However, there are currently no randomized data to support any alternative access strategy over another so the strategy should be chosen by the heart team based on patient anatomy, risk factors, and the center’s expertise. While further studies comparing TC, to TCV or TSA are needed to inform which access site should preferred when alternative access is needed, several recent publications suggest reduced stroke and improved 30-day outcomes with TC compared to TSA and TAO/TA.^{16,34,38}

Despite our network meta-analysis results and outcomes from single or larger multicenter experiences,⁶⁰ the selection of the

optimal access route — including TF — should always be individualized to the patient, operator and center experience. Additionally, to preserve the benefit of TF access, some centers have adopted intravascular lithotripsy, in the femoral and iliac vasculature prior to TAVR in patients with inadequate femoral access to decrease the need for alternative access.⁶¹ There are currently no data to support the use of peripheral vascular interventions to obtain femoral access versus pursuing an alternative access strategy in a carotid or axillary artery with minimal atherosclerosis. TAVR computed tomography should be routinely performed with imaging of the complete peripheral vascular anatomy. This should be reviewed by the multidisciplinary heart team including cardiology, cardiothoracic surgery, and radiology to determine the preferred access strategy prior to the case.

Limitations

The present study has several limitations. First, the inclusion of all study designs instead of just randomized studies could result in the introduction of bias at the individual study level. Second, the baseline characteristics, unequal sample sizes, definitions of clinical outcomes, and differences in the follow-up durations may add to imprecision. The overall incidence of events was low, which could have influenced our inability to reach statistically significant results for some of the outcome measures. We also lacked ability to adjust for peri-procedural characteristics (prosthetic valve size/type, depth of implantation, valve-in-valve, native valve morphology), which may significantly influence the outcomes.

Furthermore, the antithrombotic regimen and role of embolic protection devices used may have contributed as possible confounders. Finally, indirect comparisons in network meta-analysis are built on the assumption of transitivity, implying that studies making different direct comparisons must be sufficiently similar in all respects. Although this approach respects randomization, it does not represent randomized evidence.

Conclusion

Non-thoracic alternative access routes (TC, TSA and TCV) are associated with a similar safety profile as compared to TF access with regarding the major complications of periprocedural mortality, stroke, and major bleeding following TAVR, while TA and TAO access are associated with increased short- and long-term mortality.

Acknowledgements

None.

Sources of financial support

None.

Conflicts of interest

Adnan K. Chhatrwalla: Speakers Bureau: Abbott Vascular, Edwards Lifesciences, Medtronic Inc.; Proctor: Edwards Lifesciences, Medtronic Inc.; Consultant: Boston Scientific, Silk Road Medical; Research Grant: Boston Scientific

Keith B. Allen: Institutional Research/Grant support: Edwards, Abbott, Medtronic, Boston Scientific; Speakers Bureau: Edwards Lifesciences, Medtronic Inc.; Proctor: Edwards

Lifesciences, Medtronic Inc.; Consultant: Abbott, Edwards, Medtronic, Boston Scientific; (all payments are to the institution and none to me personally).

CRediT statement for author contribution

SR: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing, Validation; **SL:** Conceptualization, Software, Formal analysis, Data curation, Methodology, Writing – Original Draft, Visualization; **KA:** Validation, Writing – Review & Editing, Methodology; **AKC:** Validation, Writing – Review & Editing, **SV:** Data curation, Resources, Writing - Writing – Review & Editing; **PV:** Validation, Writing – Review & Editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition.

ORCID iD

Sagar Ranka:

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2167-6961>

Shubham Lahan:

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8192-3629>

Adnan K Chhatrwalla:

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5309-3058>

Address for correspondence

Pedro Villablanca, MD

Department of Medicine, Division of Cardiology

Henry Ford Health System

2799 Grand Blvd, K14, Detroit, MI, United

States

Email: pvillab1@hfhs.org

Ph: (+1) 800-436-7936

References

1. Ludman PF, Moat N, de Belder MA, et al. Transcatheter aortic valve implantation
2. Mack MJ, Leon MB, Smith CR, et al. 5-year outcomes of transcatheter aortic valve replacement or surgical aortic valve replacement for high surgical risk patients with aortic stenosis (PARTNER 1): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2015;385(9986):2477-2484.
3. Thourani VH, Kodali S, Makkar RR, et al. Transcatheter aortic valve replacement versus surgical valve replacement in intermediate-risk patients: a propensity score analysis. *Lancet*. 2016;387(10034):2218-2225.
4. Rodes-Cabau J, Webb JG, Cheung A, et al. Transcatheter aortic valve implantation for the treatment of severe symptomatic aortic stenosis in patients at very high or prohibitive surgical risk: acute and late outcomes of the multicenter Canadian experience. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2010;55(11):1080-1090.
5. Beurtheret S, Karam N, Resseguier N, et al. Femoral Versus Nonfemoral Peripheral Access for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2019;74(22):2728-2739.
6. Watanabe M, Takahashi S, Yamaoka H, et al. Comparison of Transcatheter vs. Transfemoral Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation. *Circ J*. 2018;82(10):2518-2522.
7. Gilard M, Eltchaninoff H, Jung B, et al. Registry of transcatheter aortic-valve implantation in high-risk patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2012;366(18):1705-1715.
8. Patel JS, Krishnaswamy A, Svensson LG, Tuzcu EM, Mick S, Kapadia SR. Access Options for Transcatheter Aortic Valve

in the United Kingdom: temporal trends, predictors of outcome, and 6-year follow-up: a report from the UK Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation (TAVI) Registry, 2007 to 2012. *Circulation*. 2015;131(13):1181-1190.

- Replacement in Patients with Unfavorable Aortoiliacofemoral Anatomy. *Curr Cardiol Rep*. 2016;18(11):110.
9. Faroux L, Junquera L, Mohammadi S, et al. Femoral Versus Nonfemoral Subclavian/Carotid Arterial Access Route for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2020;9(19):e017460.
10. Sharma SP, Chaudhary R, Ghuneim A, et al. Carotid access for transcatheter aortic valve replacement: A meta-analysis. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. 2021;97(4):723-733.
11. Zhan Y, Saadat S, Soin A, Kawabori M, Chen FY. A meta-analysis comparing transaxillary and transfemoral transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *J Thorac Dis*. 2019;11(12):5140-5151.
12. Amat-Santos IJ, Rojas P, Gutierrez H, et al. Transsubclavian approach: A competitive access for transcatheter aortic valve implantation as compared to transfemoral. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. 2018;92(5):935-944.
13. Henn MC, Percival T, Zajarias A, et al. Learning Alternative Access Approaches for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement: Implications for New Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement Centers. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2017;103(5):1399-1405.
14. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med*. 2009;6(7):e1000097.
15. Rao G, Lopez-Jimenez F, Boyd J, et al. Methodological Standards for Meta-Analyses and Qualitative Systematic Reviews of Cardiac Prevention and Treatment Studies: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2017;136(10):e172-e194.
16. Allen KB, Chhatrwalla AK, Saxon J, et al. Transcarotid versus transthoracic access for transcatheter aortic valve replacement: A propensity-matched analysis. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2020.
17. Slim K, Nini E, Forestier D, Kwiatkowski F, Panis Y, Chipponi J. Methodological index for non-randomized studies (minors): development and validation of a new instrument. *ANZ J Surg*. 2003;73(9):712-716.
18. Rucker G, Schwarzer G. Ranking treatments in frequentist network meta-analysis works without resampling methods. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2015;15:58.
19. Wan X, Wang W, Liu J, Tong T. Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from the sample size, median, range and/or interquartile range. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2014;14:135.
20. Balduzzi S, Rucker G, Schwarzer G. How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a practical tutorial. *Evid Based Ment Health*. 2019;22(4):153-160.
21. Rücker G, Schwarzer G, Krahn U, König J. Network Meta-Analysis using Frequentist Methods. 2018.
22. Petronio AS, De Carlo M, Bedogni F, et al. Safety and efficacy of the subclavian approach for transcatheter aortic valve implantation with the CoreValve revalving system. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv*. 2010;3(4):359-366.
23. Eltchaninoff H, Prat A, Gilard M, et al. Transcatheter aortic valve implantation: early results of the FRANCE (FRench Aortic National CoreValve and Edwards) registry. *Eur Heart J*. 2011;32(2):191-197.
24. Moynagh AM, Scott DJ, Baumbach A, et al. CoreValve transcatheter aortic valve

- implantation via the subclavian artery: comparison with the transfemoral approach. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2011;57(5):634-635.
25. Taramasso M, Maisano F, Cioni M, et al. Trans-apical and trans-axillary percutaneous aortic valve implantation as alternatives to the femoral route: short- and middle-term results. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg*. 2011;40(1):49-55.
26. Petronio AS, De Carlo M, Bedogni F, et al. 2-year results of CoreValve implantation through the subclavian access: a propensity-matched comparison with the femoral access. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2012;60(6):502-507.
27. Muensterer A, Mazzitelli D, Ruge H, et al. Safety and efficacy of the subclavian access route for TAVI in cases of missing transfemoral access. *Clin Res Cardiol*. 2013;102(9):627-636.
28. Lardizabal JA, O'Neill BP, Desai HV, et al. The transaortic approach for transcatheter aortic valve replacement: initial clinical experience in the United States. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2013;61(23):2341-2345.
29. Saia F, Ciuca C, Taglieri N, et al. Acute kidney injury following transcatheter aortic valve implantation: incidence, predictors and clinical outcome. *Int J Cardiol*. 2013;168(2):1034-1040.
30. Blackman DJ, Baxter PD, Gale CP, et al. Do outcomes from transcatheter aortic valve implantation vary according to access route and valve type? The UK TAVI Registry. *J Interv Cardiol*. 2014;27(1):86-95.
31. Frohlich GM, Baxter PD, Malkin CJ, et al. Comparative survival after transapical, direct aortic, and subclavian transcatheter aortic valve implantation (data from the UK TAVI registry). *Am J Cardiol*. 2015;116(10):1555-1559.
32. Adamo M, Fiorina C, Currello S, et al. Role of different vascular approaches on transcatheter aortic valve implantation outcome: a single-center study. *J Cardiovasc Med (Hagerstown)*. 2015;16(4):279-285.
33. Koifman E, Magalhaes M, Kiramijyan S, et al. Impact of transfemoral versus transapical access on mortality among patients with severe aortic stenosis undergoing transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *Cardiovasc Revasc Med*. 2016;17(5):318-321.
34. Kirker EB, Hodson RW, Spinelli KJ, Korngold EC. The Carotid Artery as a Preferred Alternative Access Route for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2017;104(2):621-629.
35. Paone G, Eng M, Kabbani LS, et al. Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement: Comparing Transfemoral, Transcarotid, and Transcaval Access. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2018;106(4):1105-1112.
36. Allen KB, Chhatrwalla AK, Cohen D, et al. Transcarotid Versus Transapical and Transaortic Access for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2019;108(3):715-722.
37. van Wely MH, van der Wulp K, Verkroost MWA, et al. Procedural Success and Clinical Outcome of the Portico Transcatheter Aortic Valve Using the Left Subclavian Artery as Primary Access. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. 2018;11(13):1311-1312.
38. Folliguet TA, Teiger E, Beurtheret S, et al. Carotid versus femoral access for transcatheter aortic valve implantation: a propensity score inverse probability weighting study. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg*. 2019;56(6):1140-1146.
39. Gleason TG, Schindler JT, Hagberg RC, et al. Subclavian/Axillary Access for Self-Expanding Transcatheter Aortic Valve

- Replacement Renders Equivalent Outcomes as Transfemoral. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2018;105(2):477-483.
40. Kirker E, Korngold E, Hodson RW, et al. Transcarotid Versus Subclavian/Axillary Access for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement With SAPIEN 3. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2020;110(6):1892-1897.
41. Amer MR, Mosleh W, Joshi S, et al. Comparative Outcomes of Transcarotid and Transsubclavian Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2020;109(1):49-56.
42. Long A, Mahoney P. Comparative Intermediate-Term Outcomes of Subclavian and Transcaval Access for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *J Invasive Cardiol*. 2020;32(12):463-469.
43. Jones BM, Kumar V, Chiu ST, et al. Comparable Outcomes for Transcarotid and Transfemoral Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement at a High Volume US Center. *Semin Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2021.
44. Lu H, Monney P, Fournier S, et al. Transcervical approach versus transfemoral approach for transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *Int J Cardiol*. 2021;327:58-62.
45. Marie B, David CH, Guimbretiere G, et al. Carotid versus femoral access for transcatheter aortic valve replacement: comparable results in the current era. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg*. 2021.
46. Arai T, Romano M, Lefevre T, et al. Direct Comparison of Feasibility and Safety of Transfemoral Versus Transaortic Versus Transapical Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. 2016;9(22):2320-2325.
47. Chollet T, Marcheix B, Boudou N, et al. Propensity-matched comparison of clinical outcomes after transaortic versus transfemoral aortic valve replacement. *EuroIntervention*. 2018;14(7):750-757.
48. Damluji AA, Murman M, Byun S, et al. Alternative access for transcatheter aortic valve replacement in older adults: A collaborative study from France and United States. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. 2018;92(6):1182-1193.
49. Bleiziffer S, Ruge H, Mazzitelli D, et al. Survival after transapical and transfemoral aortic valve implantation: talking about two different patient populations. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2009;138(5):1073-1080.
50. Ewe SH, Delgado V, Ng AC, et al. Outcomes after transcatheter aortic valve implantation: transfemoral versus transapical approach. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2011;92(4):1244-1251.
51. Hudziak D, Wojakowski W, Malinowski M, et al. Comparison of the short-term safety and efficacy of transcarotid and transfemoral access routes for transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Kardiol Pol*. 2021;79(1):31-38.
52. Leclercq F, Choteau R, Cayla G, et al. Transcarotid versus transfemoral access in patients undergoing transcatheter aortic valve replacement with complex aortofemoral anatomy. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. 2021;97(7):1452-1459.
53. Schymik G, Wurth A, Bramlage P, et al. Long-term results of transapical versus transfemoral TAVI in a real world population of 1000 patients with severe symptomatic aortic stenosis. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv*. 2015;8(1).
54. Nishimura RA, Otto CM, Bonow RO, et al. 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(25):e1159-e1195.
55. McCarthy FH, Spragan DD, Savino D, et al. Outcomes, readmissions, and costs in transfemoral and alternative access transcatheter aortic valve replacement in the US Medicare population. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2017;154(4):1224-1232 e1221.
56. Dahle TG, Kaneko T, McCabe JM. Outcomes Following Subclavian and Axillary Artery Access for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement: Society of the Thoracic Surgeons/American College of Cardiology TVT Registry Report. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. 2019;12(7):662-669.
57. Werner N, Zeymer U, Schneider S, et al. Incidence and Clinical Impact of Stroke Complicating Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation: Results From the German TAVI Registry. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. 2016;88(4):644-653.
58. Overtchouk P, Folliguet T, Pinaud F, et al. Transcarotid Approach for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement With the Sapien 3 Prosthesis: A Multicenter French Registry. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. 2019;12(5):413-419.
59. Chamandi C, Abi-Akar R, Rodes-Cabau J, et al. Transcarotid Compared With Other Alternative Access Routes for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv*. 2018;11(11):e006388.
60. Junquera L, Kalavrouziotis D, Cote M, et al. Results of transcarotid compared with transfemoral transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2020.
61. Di Mario C, Goodwin M, Ristalli F, et al. A Prospective Registry of Intravascular Lithotripsy-Enabled Vascular Access for Transfemoral Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. 2019;12(5):502-504.