CEP in TAVR – From Rationale, Practical Viewpoint and Data Updates

AP Valves & Structural Heart Summit 2023 August 10-11



Simon Lam MBBS (HK) MRCP (UK) FRCP (Edin, Glas) FACC FESC Queen Mary Hospital, The University of Hong Kong

AP VALVES & ECERT STRUCTURAL HEART

Disclosure





Contemporary Studies Show Consistent Rate of Stroke



*Kaplan Meier estimates; **Bay esian estimate; PA=phy sician assistant; NP=nurse practitioner; SENTINEL: Kapadia JACC 2017 (95% of patients were evaluated pre- and post-TAVR by neurologists, and stroke neurologists were on the CEC); Ev olut Low Risk: Popma NEJM 2019 (<2% of TAVR patients receive ed an embolic protection device); PARTNER 3: Mack NEJM 2019; PORTICO CE Mark: Linke, Circ Cardiov asc Interv 2018 (Supplement); : PORTICO I: Sondergaard JACC 2017; FORWARD: Grube, JACC 2017 (an embolic protection device was used in 4.1% of patients); FORWARD PRC: Grube, PCR 2019 (an embolic protection device was used in 9.1% of patients); PARTNER 2S3i: Thourani, Lancet 2016; PARTNER 2S3HR/Inop: Kodali Eur Heart J 2016; SCOPE I: Lanz, Lancet 2019; SAVI TF: Möllmann, EuroInterv ention 2018; NOTION: Thy regod JACC 2015; Tamburino Circulation 2020

Results from different studies are not directly comparable. + Study protocol included mandated, per-protocol baseline and follow-up ev aluation by neurology PA, neurology PA, neurology fellow. Information provided for educational purpose only.

For more information on the underdiagnosis of Stroke, click here

TAVI and Stroke Rates

Consistent Stroke Occurrence Despite Newer Technologies



Huded CP, Tuzcu EM, Krishnaswamy A, et al. Association Between Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement and Early Postprocedural Stroke. JAMA. 2019;321(23):2306–2315. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.7525

TAVR Complications Have Improved Over Time With the Exception of Stroke



Carroll JD, Vemulapalli S, Dai D, Matsouaka R, Blackstone E, Edwards F, Masoudi FA, Mack M, Peterson ED, Holmes D, Rumsfeld JS, Tuzcu EM, Grover F. Procedural Experience for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement and Relation to Outcomes: The STS/ACC TVT Registry. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2017 Jul 4;70(1):29-41. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2017.04.056. PMID: 28662805.

STRUCTURAL HEAR



NEWS • Daily News

FDA Clears Sentinel Cerebral Protection Device for Use During TAVR

The filter device becomes the first of its kind cleared for use in the United States during transcatheter aortic valve procedures.

by Shelley Wood JUNE 05, 2017

SENTINEL[™] CPS – Procedural Animation

Sentinel Filters >90% of Blood Flow to Brain



AP VALVES & FORE STRUCTURAL HEART



F/70 Severe AS Valve in Valve TF Edwards SAPIEN3 #20mm in Trifecta #19 Postdilation (+ 2 ml)



AP VALVES & EDES STRUCTURAL HEART







F/80 Severe AS Predilation NUCLEUS Balloon 20mm X 4cm TAVI Evolut PRO #29mm – Cusp Overlap (single deploy) Postdilation TRUE Balloon 20mm X 4cm



F/94 High degree AV Block Severe AS Micra Implantation TF TAVI Edwards SAPIEN3 # 20mm, Postdilation

AP VALVES & EDFE STRUCTURAL HEAR









F/72 Severe AS – Rheumatic/ History of Mechanical VR Predilation, TAVI TF Evolut PRO #26mm (single deploy)



Im: 1/66 Se: 28 C

Queen Mary Hospital 0553-2020 XA Left Coronary 15 fps



AP VALVES & FOF

ČVRF

SENTINEL IDE Trial – High Rate of Debris Capture

Debris capture in 99% of TAVI patients.



Virmani R, et al. CVPath. SENTINEL IDE Trial. Data presented at Sentinel FDA Advisory Panel, February 23, 2017

Percent of Patients with at Least One Particle of Given Size



SENTINEL CPS Reduced Cerebral Lesion Volume

Protection Can Reduce New Lesion Volumes

52% reduction in new lesion volume in whole brain (MISTRAL- C^{1})

 3T MRI assessment at baseline & 2-5 days post-procedure

41% reduction in new lesion volume in whole brain(CLEAN-TAVI²)

• 3T MRI assessment at baseline,

2 days, 7 days post-procedure

42% reduction* in new lesion volume in whole brain(SENTINELIDE³)

• 3T MRI assessment at baseline, 2-7 days post-procedure

The CLEAN-TAVI Randomized Trial Showed Significant Reductions in New Cerebral Lesion Accumulation with SENTINEL CPS Use²



Representative slices from each of the orthogonal planes showing new lesions at 2d from each arm of CLEAN-TAVI randomized trial of cerebral embolic protection in TAVI using SENTINEL CPS

Combining SENTINEL IDE Trial with CLEAN-TAVI and MISTRAL-C

Shows significant statistical superiority for SENTINEL CPS reducing new lesion volume.



without cerebral embolic protection (CEP) filters. The weighted mean difference (WMD) among groups equals to -114.4 mm³ (95% confidence interval [CI], -218.2 mm³ to -10.5 mm³), confirming a significant reduction in the analyzed endpoint (p-value 0.031).

Latib A, Pagnesi M, Cerebral embolic protection during transcatheter aortic valve replacement: A disconnect between logic and data?, *JACC* (2016), doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2016.10.036

UCTURAL HEART

Multiple Studies Suggest SENTINEL CPS Provides 60-80% Stroke Risk Reduction



1SENTINEL IDE Trial. Data presented at SENTINEL FDA Adv isory Panel, Feb 23, 201; ²Chakrav arty T, TCT 2018; ³Seeger J, et al. JACC Cardiov asc Interv . 2017 ⁴Van Mieghem N, TVT 2018 (includes TIA); ⁵ Rinaldi Outcomes with a Sy stematic Application of SENTINEL Cerebral Embolic Protection For TAVR. Data presented at ACC 2021, May 15, 2021.; ⁶Stripe, B. PCR LV 2019; ⁷Megaly M. et al Ischemic stroke with cerebral protection sy stem during transcatheter aortic v alv e replacement J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2020; 13:2149-55 ⁸Cohen DJ. Cerebral embolic protection and TAVR outcomes: results from the TVT Registry. Paper presented at: Transcatheter Cardiov ascular Therapeutics Annual Conference; October 16, 2020; online. Results from different studies are not directly comparable. Information provided for educational purposes only.

CVRF

Use of sentinel in low-intermediate risk patients The SENTINEL-LIR Study

Debris captured in 100% of the TAVI patients



Larger size particles (\geq 1000 µm), which can cause significant vessel obstruction, were present in 67% of cases



Characterization of Cerebral Embolic Capture Using the SENTINEL Device During Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation in Low to Intermediate-Risk Patients: The SENTINEL-LIR Study Kawakami et al. - Circulation: Cardiovascular Interventions - 2022

Wolfrum et al. BMC Cardiovascular Disorders (2023) 23:306 https://doi.org/10.1186/s12872-023-03338-0

BMC Cardiovascular Disorders

RESEARCH

Open Access

Cerebral embolic protection during transcatheter aortic valve replacement: a systematic review and meta-analysis of propensity score matched and randomized controlled trials using the Sentinel cerebral embolic protection device

Mathias Wolfrum^{1,2*†}, Immanuel Justus Handerer^{2†}, Federico Moccetti¹, Alexander Schmeisser², Ruediger C. Braun-Dullaeus² and Stefan Toggweiler¹

Abstract

Background The Sentinel cerebral embolic protection device (CEP) aims to reduce the risk of stroke during transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR). We performed a systematic review and meta-analysis of propensity score matched (PSM) and randomized controlled trials (RCT) investigating the effect of the Sentinel CEP to prevent strokes during TAVR.

Methods Eligible trials were searched through PubMed, ISI Web of science databases, Cochrane database, and proceedings of major congresses. Primary outcome was stroke. Secondary outcomes included all-cause mortality, major or life-threatening bleeding, major vascular complications and acute kidney injury at discharge. Fixed and random effect models were used to calculate the pooled risk ratio (RR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI) and absolute risk difference (ARD).

Results A total of 4066 patients from 4 RCTs (3'506 patients) and 1 PSM study (560 patients) were included. Use of Sentinel CEP was successful in 92% of patients and was associated with a significantly lower risk of stroke (RR: 0.67, 95% CI: 0.48–0.95, p = 0.02. ARD: -1.3%, 95% CI: -2.3 – -0.2, p = 0.02, number needed to treat (NNT) = 77), and a reduced risk of disabling stroke (RR: 0.33, 95% CI: 0.17–0.65. ARD: -0.9%, 95% CI: -1.5 – -0.3, p = 0.004, NNT = 111). Use of Sentinel CEP was associated with a lower risk of major or life-threatening bleeding (RR: 0.37, 95% CI: 0.16–0.87, p = 0.02). Risk for nondisabling stroke (RR: 0.93, 95% CI: 0.62–1.40, p = 0.73), all-cause mortality (RR: 0.70, 95% CI: 0.35–1.40, p = 0.31), major vascular complications (RR: 0.74, 95% CI: 0.33–1.67, p = 0.47) and acute kidney injury (RR: 0.74, 95% CI: 0.37–1.50, p = 0.40) were similar.

A					S	troke	1	
		CEP		Control		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
	CLEAN-TAVI 2016	5	50	5	50	6.5%	1.00 [0.31, 3.24]	
	MISTRAL-C 2016	0	32	2	33	3.2%	0.21 [0.01, 4.13]	
	PROTECTED-TAVR 2022	34	1501	43	1499	55.9%	0.79 [0.51, 1.23]	
	Seeger 2017	4	280	13	280	16.9%	0.31 [0.10, 0.93]	
	SENTINEL 2017	13	231	10	110	17.6%	0.62 [0.28, 1.37]	
	Total (95% CI)		2094		1972	100.0%	0.67 [0.48, 0.95]	•
	Total events	56		73				
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.49), df = 4	(P = 0.					
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.26 (P = 0.02)								CEP better Control better

В					D	isabli	ing stroke	
1		CEP	,	Contr	ol		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Ι.	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
17	CLEAN-TAVI 2016	0	50	0	50		Not estimable	
	MISTRAL-C 2016	0	32	2	33	7.5%	0.21 [0.01, 4.13]	
	PROTECTED-TAVR 2022	8	1501	20	1499	61.0%	0.40 [0.18, 0.90]	
	Seeger 2017	1	280	9	280	27.4%	0.11 [0.01, 0.87]	
	SENTINEL 2017	2	231	1	109	4.1%	0.94 [0.09, 10.30]	
	Total (95% CI)		2094		1971	100.0%	0.33 [0.17, 0.65]	•
	Total events	11		32				
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2.13	3, df = 3	(P = 0.	55); I ² =	0%			
	Test for overall effect: Z =	3.19 (P +	= 0.001	1)				CEP better Control better
L								
F					N	ondis	sabling strok	20
c	N	CER		Cart	N	londis	sabling strok	ie Bisk Basis
c	faulti ar Subaraun	CEP	Total	Contr	N	londis	Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
C	Study or Subgroup	CEP Events	Total	Contr Events	N Total	londis Weight	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	Ce Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
с -	Study or Subgroup CLEAN-TAVI 2016	CEP Events	Total	Contr Events	ol Total	londis Weight 11.3%	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.00 [0.31, 3.24]	Ce Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
с -	Study or Subgroup CLEAN-TAVI 2016 MISTRAL-C 2016	CEP Events 5 0	Total 50 32	Contr Events 5 0	rol Total 50 33	Veight	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.00 [0.31, 3.24] Not estimable	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
- -	Study or Subgroup CLEAN-TAVI 2016 MISTRAL-C 2016 PROTECTED-TAVR 2022	CEP Events 5 26	Total 50 32 1501	Contr Events 5 0 23	rol Total 50 33 1499	Undis Weight 11.3% 52.1%	Cabling strok Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.00 [0.31, 3.24] Not estimable 1.13 [0.65, 1.97]	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
- -	Study or Subgroup CLEAN-TAVI 2016 MISTRAL-C 2016 PROTECTED-TAVR 2022 Seeger 2017	CEP Events 5 26 3	Total 50 32 1501 280	Contr Events 5 0 23 4	rol Total 50 33 1499 280	Veight 11.3% 52.1% 9.0%	Cabling strok Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.00 [0.31, 3.24] Not estimable 1.13 [0.65, 1.97] 0.75 [0.17, 3.32]	Ce Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
- -	Study or Subgroup CLEAN-TAVI 2016 MISTRAL-C 2016 PROTECTED-TAVR 2022 Seeger 2017 SENTINEL 2017	CEP Events 5 0 26 3 11	Total 50 32 1501 280 231	Contr Events 5 0 23 4 9	N Total 50 33 1499 280 110	Veight 11.3% 52.1% 9.0% 27.6%	Cabling strok Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.00 [0.31, 3.24] Not estimable 1.13 [0.65, 1.97] 0.75 [0.17, 3.32] 0.58 [0.25, 1.36]	Ce Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
	Study or Subgroup CLEAN-TAVI 2016 MISTRAL-C 2016 PROTECTED-TAVR 2022 Seeger 2017 SENTINEL 2017 Total (95% CI)	CEP Events 5 0 26 3 11	Total 50 32 1501 280 231 2094	Contr Events 5 0 23 4 9	rol Total 50 33 1499 280 110 1972	Veight 11.3% 52.1% 9.0% 27.6% 100.0%	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.00 [0.31, 3.24] Not estimable 1.13 [0.65, 1.97] 0.75 [0.17, 3.32] 0.58 [0.25, 1.36] 0.93 [0.62, 1.40]	Ce Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
	Study or Subgroup CLEAN-TAVI 2016 MISTRAL-C 2016 PROTECTED-TAVR 2022 Seeger 2017 SENTINEL 2017 Total (95% CI) Total events	CEF Events 5 0 26 3 11 45	Total 50 32 1501 280 231 2094	Contr Events 5 0 23 4 9 41	rol Total 50 33 1499 280 110 1972	Veight 11.3% 52.1% 9.0% 27.6% 100.0%	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.00 [0.31, 3.24] Not estimable 1.13 [0.65, 1.97] 0.75 [0.17, 3.32] 0.58 [0.25, 1.36] 0.93 [0.62, 1.40]	Ce Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
- -	Study or Subgroup CLEAN-TAVI 2016 MISTRAL-C 2016 PROTECTED-TAVR 2022 Seeger 2017 SENTINEL 2017 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.73	CEF Events 5 0 26 3 11 45 3, df = 3	Total 50 32 1501 280 231 2094 (P = 0.	Contr Events 5 0 23 4 9 41 63); l ² =	N Total 50 33 1499 280 110 1972	Weight 11.3% 52.1% 9.0% 27.6% 100.0%	Cabling strok Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.00 [0.31, 3.24] Not estimable 1.13 [0.65, 1.97] 0.75 [0.17, 3.32] 0.58 [0.25, 1.36] 0.93 [0.62, 1.40]	Ke Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI

Fig. 2 Stroke in patients undergoing TAVR with versus without Sentinel CEP. Forest plots of individual and summarized risk ratios of all-cause stroke (A), disabling stoke (B), nondisabling stroke (C) according to the use of the Sentinel CEP device versus not during TAVR. CI, confidence interval. CLEAN-TAVI, Claret Embolic Protection and TAVI. CEP, cerebral embolic protection. M-H, Mantel–Haenszel. MISTRAL-C, MRI Investigation With Claret. TAVR, transcatheter aortic valve replacement

PROTECTED TAVR Study



Randomized Controlled Trial

The PROTECTED TAVR Trial is an **all-comers study** to prospectively determine if SENTINEL CPS significantly reduces risk of periprocedural stroke (\leq 72 h) after TAVR. All commercially available TAVR devices.



The NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL of MEDICINE

ESTABLISHED IN 1812

OCTOBER 6, 2022

VOL. 387 NO. 14

Cerebral Embolic Protection during Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement

Samir R. Kapadia, M.D., Raj Makkar, M.D., Martin Leon, M.D., Mohamed Abdel-Wahab, M.D.,
Thomas Waggoner, D.O., Steffen Massberg, M.D., Wolfgang Rottbauer, M.D., Ph.D., Samuel Horr, M.D.,
Lars Sondergaard, M.D., Juhana Karha, M.D., Robert Gooley, M.B., B.S., Ph.D., Lowell Satler, M.D.,
Robert C. Stoler, M.D., Steven R. Messé, M.D., Suzanne J. Baron, M.D., Julia Seeger, M.D., Susheel Kodali, M.D.,
Amar Krishnaswamy, M.D., Vinod H. Thourani, M.D., Katherine Harrington, M.D., Stuart Pocock, Ph.D.,
Rodrigo Modolo, M.D., Ph.D., Dominic J. Allocco, M.D., Ian T. Meredith, M.D., Ph.D., and Axel Linke, M.D.,
for the PROTECTED TAVR Investigators*



Subgroup	CEP no. of patients with event	Control /total no. of patients	Difference (95% CI) (%)
All patients	34/1501 (2.3)	43/1499 (2.9)	
Age	54/1501 (2.5)	45/2455 (2.5)	
>80 vr	23/760 (3.0)	25/771 (3.2)	
<80 yr	11/741 (1.5)	18/728 (2.5)	
Sex	11/11 (1.3)	10//20 (2.5)	
Male	15/870 (1 7)	19/933 (2.0)	
Female	19/631 (3.0)	24/566 (4.2)	
STS surgical risk score	15/051 (5.0)	24/300 (4.2)	
5394	17/658 (2.6)	22/620 (3.5)	
<3%	16/823 (1.9)	21/862 (2.4)	
Operative risk (according to heart	10/025 (1.5)	21/002 (2.4)	
Low	15/545 (2.8)	15/351 /2 81	
Intermediate or higher	19/956 (2.0)	28/968 (2.0)	i al i
Value morphology	19/900 (2.0)	20/900 (2.9)	•
Valve morphology	27/1212 (2.1)	20/12/1 (2.0)	
Piecesid	2//1313 (2.1)	39/1341 (2.9)	
Bicuspid	//131 (5.3)	3/121 (2.5)	
Aortic-valve calcification			
None or mild	3/241 (1.2)	9/223 (4.0)	
Moderate or greater	30/1192 (2.5)	32/1218 (2.6)	
History of coronary artery disease	1		
Yes	15/850 (1.8)	26/880 (3.0)	
No	19/643 (3.0)	17/613 (2.8)	
History of peripheral vascular dise	case		
Yes	3/165 (1.8)	7/162 (4.3)	
No	31/1319 (2.4)	35/1319 (2.7)	⊢ ● →
Previous cerebrovascular event			
Yes	5/114 (4.4)	5/122 (4.1)	• • •
No	29/1382 (2.1)	37/1369 (2.7)	⊢● <u></u> -1
Use of valve-in-valve procedure			
Yes	0/56	1/37 (3.0)	
No	34/1445 (2.4)	42/1462 (2.9)	⊢ ●
Use of balloon-expandable valve			
Yes	11/913 (1.2)	20/914 (2.2)	⊢ ●
No	23/588 (3.9)	23/585 (3.9)	⊢
Balloon dilation before valve impl	ant		
Yes	18/573 (3.1)	21/624 (3.4)	
No	16/916 (1.7)	21/866 (2.4)	⊢ ●
Balloon dilation after valve implar	nt		
Yes	11/390 (2.8)	6/383 (1.6)	⊢ - ●
No	23/1099 (2.1)	36/1107 (3.3)	⊢ − ●−− <u></u> +
Geographic region			
United States	12/914 (1.3)	24/929 (2.6)	⊢ ● <u>−</u>
Other	22/587 (3.7)	19/580 (3.3)	⊢
		-	4.0 -2.0 0.0 2.0 4.0
			CEP Better Control Better

Protected TAVR Trial

Disabling Stroke CEP – 8/1501 (0.5%)

Control - 20/1499 (1.3%)

Significant reduction NNT 125

12th AP VALVES & ECCEN STRUCTURAL HEART

BACKGROUND

Transcatheter aortic-valve replacement (TAVR) for the treatment of aortic stenosis can lead to embolization of debris. Capture of debris by devices that provide cerebral embolic protection (CEP) may reduce the risk of stroke.

METHODS

We randomly assigned patients with aortic stenosis in a 1:1 ratio to undergo transfemoral TAVR with CEP (CEP group) or without CEP (control group). The primary end point was stroke within 72 hours after TAVR or before discharge (whichever came first) in the intention-to-treat population. Disabling stroke, death, transient ischemic attack, delirium, major or minor vascular complications at the CEP access site, and acute kidney injury were also assessed. A neurology professional examined all the patients at baseline and after TAVR.

RESULTS

A total of 3000 patients across North America, Europe, and Australia underwent randomization; 1501 were assigned to the CEP group and 1499 to the control group. A CEP device was successfully deployed in 1406 of the 1489 patients (94.4%) in whom an attempt was made. The incidence of stroke within 72 hours after TAVR or before discharge did not differ significantly between the CEP group and the control group (2.3% vs. 2.9%, difference, -0.6 percentage points, 95% confidence interval, -1.7 to 0.5; P=0.30). Disabling stroke occurred in 0.5% of the patients in the CEP group and in 1.3% of those in the control group. There were no substantial differences between the CEP group and the control group in the percentage of patients who died (0.5% vs. 0.3%); had a stroke, a transient ischemic attack, or delirium (3.1% vs. 3.7%); or had acute kidney injury (0.5% vs. 0.5%). One patient (0.1%) had a vascular complication at the CEP access site.

CONCLUSIONS

Among patients with aortic stenosis undergoing transfemoral TAVR, the use of CEP did not have a significant effect on the incidence of periprocedural stroke, but on the basis of the 95% confidence interval around this outcome, the results may not rule out a benefit of CEP during TAVR. (Funded by Boston Scientific; PROTECTED TAVR ClinicalTrials.gov number, NCT04149535.)

The authors' affiliations are listed in the Appendix. Dr. Kapadia can be contacted at kapadis@ccf.org or at the Department of Cardiovascular Medicine, Cleveland Clinic, 9500 Euclid Ave., J2-3, Cleveland, OH 44195.

*A full list of the PROTECTED TAVR investigators is provided in the Supplementary Appendix, available at NEJM.org.

This article was published on September 17, 2022, at NEJM.org.

N Engl J Med 2022;387:1253-63. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2204961 Copyright © 2022 Massachusetts Medical Society.

BHF PROTECT-TAVI Chief Investigator: Professor Rajesh Kharbanda

British Heart Foundation Randomised Clinical Trial of Cerebral Embolic Protection in Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation (BHF PROTECT-TAVI)





* Powered for control event rate of 3% and effect size of 33%

UNIVERSITY OF

SENTINEL PROTECTION: A Global Prospective Meta-Analysis of the PROTECTED TAVR and BHF PROTECT-TAVI Studies

Principal Investigators: Samir Kapadia, Raj Kharbanda

- Context: P-TAVR and BHF-P-TAVI are the only randomized and powered studies to date designed to detect reduction in clinical stroke using CEP
- Main outcome: Clinical stroke at 72 hours post-TAVI or hospital discharge (whichever first).
- Participants/population: Patients from PROTECTED TAVR and BHF PROTECT-TAVI
- Additional outcomes
 - All-cause mortality (cardiovascular and non-cardiovascular)
 - 30-Day Stroke Mortality
 - Stroke severity (disabling and non-disabling)
 - Stroke disability composite of all-cause mortality and all stroke
 - Neurocognitive outcome
 - Length of stay
 - Discharge destination

• Timing: Analysis to be conducted following completion BHF PROTECT-TAVI (~July 2026)







AP VALVES & ETFE STRUCTURAL HEAR

CVR





CVRF





CVRF









AP VALVES & EDEB STRUCTURAL HEAR





AP VALVES & ECER STRUCTURAL HEAR







AP VALVES & ECET STRUCTURAL HEAR









AP VALVES & EDEE STRUCTURAL HEART

Other considerations

- Preserve right radial access prior to planned TAVI procedures
 - Pre TAVI PCI via L radial
 - Remind anesthetists avoid setting right arterial line
- Secure right arm position during TAVI under LA/MAC
- Potential limitations of Existing Device
 - explained to patient during consent
- PROTECTED TAVR, BHF PROTECT-TAVI and Combined Analysis
- Minimizing thromboembolic risk in the first place#

