ESC European Society of Cardiology

European Heart Journal Open (2025) **5**, oeaf095
https://doi.org/10.1093/ehjopen/oeaf095

ORIGINAL ARTICLE
Valvular heart disease

Clinical outcomes of percutaneous coronary interventions after transcatheter aortic valve replacement

Carlo A. Pivato [1,2], Ottavia Cozzi [1,2], Nicole Fontana[3,4], Francesca Ieva[3,4], Gianluigi Condorelli [1,2], Cosmo Godino[5], Bernhard Reimers[2], Masaaki Nakase[6], Karsten Hug[7], Tobias Rheude[7], Antonio J. Munoz-Garcia[8], Victor Alfonso Jimenez Diaz[9], Alfonso Ielasi[10], Marco Barbanti [11], Luigi Biasco [12,13], Darren Mylotte[14], Massimo Leoncini[15], Jose M. de la Torre Hernandez[16], Giorgio Quadri[17], Ferdinando Varbella[18], Angelo Anzuini[19], Diego Lopez[20], Philippe Garot [21], Jorn Brouwer[22], Antonio Mangieri[2], Damiano Regazzoli[2], Luca Testa [23], Jorge Sanz Sanchez[24,25], Daijiro Tomii [6], Alaide Chieffo[26,27], Michael Joner [7], Gennaro Sardella[28], Enrico Cerrato [18], Luis Nombela-Franco[29], Thomas Pilgrim [6], and Giulio Stefanini [1,2,*]

[1]Department of Biomedical Sciences, Humanitas University, Via Rita Levi Montalcini 4, 20072 Pieve Emanuele, Milan, Italy; [2]IRCCS Humanitas Research Hospital, via Manzoni 56, 20089 Rozzano, Milan, Italy; [3]Health Data Science Centre, Human Technopole, Milan, Italy; [4]MOX, Department of Mathematics, Politecnico di Milano, Milan, Italy; [5]Cardiology Unit, Heart Valve Center, IRCCS San Raffaele Scientific Institute and Vita-Salute University, Milan, Italy; [6]Department of Cardiology, Inselspital, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland; [7]Department of Cardiovascular Diseases, German Heart Center Munich, Technical University Munich, Munich, Germany; [8]Department of Cardiology, University Hospital Virgen de la Victoria, Malaga, Spain; [9]Department of Cardiology, Hospital Álvaro Cunqueiro, University Hospital of Vigo, Vigo, Pontevedra, Spain; [10]Cardiology Division, Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico (IRCCS) Ospedale Galeazzi Sant'Ambrogio, Milan, Italy; [11]Università Degli Studi di Enna 'Kore,' Enna, Italy; [12]Azienda Sanitaria Locale Torino 4, Ciriè, Italy; [13]Department of Biomedical Sciences, University of Italian Switzerland, Lugano, Switzerland; [14]University Hospital and National University of Ireland, Galway, Ireland; [15]Cardiologia Interventistica, Ospedale di Sanremo, Via Borea 56 Sanremo 18038, Italy; [16]Hospital Universitario Marqués de Valdecilla, IDIVAL, Santander, Spain; [17]Interventional Cardiology, Mauriziano Hospital, Turin, Italy; [18]Interventional Cardiology Unit, San Luigi Gonzaga University Hospital, Orbassano, and Infermi Hospital ASL TO3, Rivoli, Turin, Italy; [19]Ospedale Humanitas Mater Domini, Castellanza, Italy; [20]Cardiology Department, Complexo Hospitalario Universitario De Pontevedra, Pontevedra, Spain; [21]Institut Cardiovasculaire Paris Sud, Hôpital Jacques Cartier, Ramsay-Santé, Massy, France; [22]Department of Cardiology, St. Antonius Hospital, Nieuwegein, the Netherlands; [23]Department of Clinical and Interventional Cardiology, IRCCS Policlinico San Donato, Milan, Italy; [24]Hospital Universitari I Politecnic La Fe, Valencia, Spain; [25]Centro de Investigación Biomedica en Red (CIBERCV), Madrid, Spain; [26]Vita Salute San Raffaele University, Milan, Italy; [27]Interventional Cardiology Unit IRCCS San Raffaele Hospital, Milan, Italy; [28]Policlinico Umberto I University, Roma, Italy; and [29]Cardiovascular Institute, Hospital Clinico San Carlos, IdISSC, Madrid, Spain

Received 5 June 2025; revised 21 June 2025; accepted 14 July 2025; online publish-ahead-of-print 16 September 2025

Handling Editor: Patrizio Lancellotti

Aims The number of patients undergoing percutaneous coronary interventions (PCI) after transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) is expected to increase, but their prognosis remains poorly understood.

Methods and results Consecutive PCI patients with prior TAVR were compared to patients without prior TAVR between 2008 and 2023. The Kaplan–Meier method was used to estimate the 1-year incidence of major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE), defined as a composite of cardiovascular death or myocardial infarction. An entropy balance approach was implemented to adjust for imbalances in patient and procedural characteristics. Adjusted hazard ratios (HRs) were estimated using weighted Cox

* Corresponding author. Tel: +390282247384, Email: giulio.stefanini@hunimed.eu

© The Author(s) 2025. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the European Society of Cardiology.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. For commercial re-use, please contact reprints@oup.com for reprints and translation rights for reprints. All other permissions can be obtained through our RightsLink service via the Permissions link on the article page on our site—for further information please contact journals.permissions@oup.com.

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ehjopen/article/5/5/oeaf095/8255918 by Hospital Universitari La Fe user on 27 May 2026

regression models. Comparing 420 PCI patients with prior TAVR (mean age 80.8 years, 37.1% women) to 1197 without (mean age 70.4 years, 24.6% women), 1-year MACE was higher in the prior TAVR group (8.7 vs. 3.7%; unadjusted HR 2.35, 95% CI 1.49–3.69; $P < 0.001$). After adjustment for clinical and procedural characteristics, prior TAVR remained associated with an increased risk of MACE (adjusted HR 2.36, 95% CI 1.08–5.16; $P = 0.032$). This was primarily driven by higher cardiovascular death (adjusted HR 3.12, 95% CI 1.10–8.79, $P = 0.032$), while the association with myocardial infarction was attenuated post-adjustment and no longer statistically significant.

Conclusion Patients undergoing PCI after TAVR experience a higher incidence of MACE compared to those undergoing PCI without prior TAVR, underscoring the importance of accurate patient selection before performing PCI in patients with chronic coronary syndrome and history of TAVR.

Graphical Abstract



Keywords Aortic stenosis • Coronary artery disease • PCI • TAVR

Introduction

Coronary artery disease (CAD) affects ~50% of patients undergoing transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) for severe aortic stenosis.[1] The coexistence of these conditions poses significant challenges in both the assessment and management of CAD, as their symptoms often overlap, making clinical management more complex. A key question revolves around the optimal timing and necessity of coronary revascularization, as balancing the treatment of both aortic stenosis and CAD requires careful consideration.

Current guidelines advocate for percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) before TAVR in patients with significant CAD, especially those involving the proximal coronary segments or the left main artery.[2] However, these recommendations are mainly based on observational studies, and recent randomized controlled trials have yielded conflicting results regarding the benefits of pre-TAVR PCI.[3,4] Additionally, some observational studies suggest that in stable CAD patients without predominant coronary symptoms, PCI may safely be deferred until after TAVR, raising questions about whether upfront revascularization is necessary for all patients.[5–9]

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ehjopen/article/5/5/oeaf095/8255918 by Hospital Universitari La Fe user on 27 May 2026

As TAVR is increasingly being used in younger and lower-risk patients with longer life expectancy, the need for post-TAVR is expected to rise.[10,11] Despite this trend, there is limited data on the long-term outcomes of PCI in patients after TAVR. Existing studies have mostly focused on acute coronary syndromes (ACS) following TAVR and have reported worse outcomes compared to patients experiencing ACS without prior TAVR. However, these studies may be confounded by older age and higher comorbidity burdens in the TAVR population, and few studies have appropriately adjusted for these factors.[12–16]

To help address these gaps, we designed the Revascularization after Aortic Valve Implantation (REVIVAL) study, a multicentre, international registry aimed at evaluating the long-term risk of adverse events in patients undergoing PCI after TAVR.

Methods

Study design and population

We compared the clinical outcomes of patients undergoing PCI after TAVR to those undergoing PCI without a prior TAVR by pooling individual participant data from different PCI registries. The institutional review board of each centre approved the protocols of corresponding studies, which were conducted following the ethical principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. Participants provided written informed consent before participating in each study.

The REVIVAL registry (NCT03283501) included consecutive patients undergoing PCI after TAVR in 21 centres across Europe from 2008 to 2023 (see Supplementary material online, *Table S1*). Both TAVR and PCI procedures were performed according to standard techniques, with device choice based on operator preference. Antithrombotic therapy and duration were left to the discretion of the treating physician, based on patient risk profiles. Individual participant data on baseline characteristics, PCI and TAVR procedures, antithrombotic regimen after PCI, and clinical outcomes were collected by each participating centre in a preformatted extraction sheet. These data were anonymized and merged into a core study dataset.

Patients undergoing PCI without prior TAVR were obtained by pooling the individual participant data of two multicentre PCI registries, namely, the POEM and RUDI-FREE studies. Details on the design of these studies have been published elsewhere.[17,18] Of note, both included patients undergoing PCI with the implantation of a new-generation drug-eluting stent (DES) and had very few exclusion criteria, such as cardiogenic shock, cardiac arrest, or acute decompensated heart failure. Accordingly, patients with cardiogenic shock, cardiac arrest, or acute decompensated heart failure were also excluded from the current analysis of the prior TAVR group. Finally, we excluded patients with missing data on pivotal clinical and procedural aspects (namely, left ventricular function, indication for PCI, and antithrombotic therapy).

Endpoints

The primary endpoint was major adverse cardiovascular event (MACE), defined as the composite of cardiovascular death or myocardial infarction (MI) at 1-year follow-up. Secondary outcomes included cardiovascular death, all-cause death, MI, target vessel revascularization (TVR), stroke, and definite or probable stent thrombosis at 1 year. Outcome definitions can be found in the Supplementary material online, *Table S2*.

Statistical analysis

Continuous variables were reported as mean ± standard deviation (SD) or median ± interquartile range (IQR), while categorical variables were expressed as absolute numbers and percentages. Patients undergoing PCI with prior TAVR (REVIVAL registry) were compared with those without prior TAVR (POEM and RUDI-FREE registries). Covariate balance between the two groups was assessed using the standardized mean difference (SMD), with an SMD less than 0.1 indicating good balance.

To estimate the effect of prior TAVR on clinical outcomes of patients undergoing subsequent PCI, we first performed unadjusted Cox regression to determine the crude effect. To control for confounding variables, we employed an entropy balance, a reweighting method that ensures covariates were balanced across the two groups at the time of PCI. Unlike propensity score weighting, which relies on estimated probabilities of treatment assignment, entropy balance directly incorporates knowledge of the covariate distributions into the reweighting process, aiming to achieve near-perfect balance in pre-specified covariates.[19] We selected entropy balance because it allows for a more flexible and precise adjustment of baseline differences, particularly in the presence of small sample sizes or substantial initial imbalances. This approach creates a weighted population in which key clinical and procedural characteristics are well matched before weight truncation, enhancing the validity of comparisons. Final weights were truncated at the 1st and 99th percentiles to reduce the influence of extreme weights and improve precision.

We computed three types of weighted models: one weighted for clinical confounding variables, a second weighted for procedural confounding variables, and a third weighted for both.

We estimated the 95% confidence intervals (CIs) using a robust variance estimator to account for potential correlations introduced by weighting. The effect of prior TAVR was estimated using weighted Cox regression models, including covariates that remained unbalanced after weight truncation, specifically age and clinical indication for PCI in models with clinical confounders. The Kaplan–Meier method was used to estimate both crude and weighted cumulative incidences.

Clinical variables included age, gender, hypertension, diabetes, dyslipidaemia, prior coronary revascularization (percutaneous or surgical), left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), chronic kidney disease, indication for PCI, and use of oral anticoagulation. Procedural variables encompassed the number and vessel location of treated lesions per patient (left main or left anterior descending artery), use of drug-coated balloons, calcified coronary disease (defined from the angiographic appearance), American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association (ACC/AHA) lesion complexity, and complex PCI (defined as at least one of the following: ≥3 vessels treated, ≥3 lesions treated, or bifurcation).

We performed a subgroup analysis according to clinical indication to PCI [chronic coronary syndrome (CCS) vs. ACS], after accounting for baseline imbalances in clinical and procedural characteristics in the different subpopulations. A formal interaction test was performed on the association between prior TAVR and MACE by clinical indication. Moreover, to better evaluate the impact of clinical indication for PCI on MACE in patients with prior TAVR, we employed multivariable Cox regression models, adjusting for clinical and procedural confounding variables.

Lastly, we calculated the *E*-value to assess how strongly an unmeasured confounder would need to be associated with both exposure to prior TAVR and the primary outcome to nullify the observed association. In other words, a larger *E*-value indicates a lower likelihood that unmeasured confounding has biased the observed adjusted HR. All analyses were performed using R (version 4.3.1).

Results

Out of 464 patients in the REVIVAL registry and 1547 patients in the POEM and RUDI-FREE registries, 420 patients in the prior TAVR group and 1197 patients in the PCI-only group were included in the analysis, mainly due to relevant missing data (LVEF, indication for PCI, antithrombotic therapy, Supplementary material online, *Figure S1*). The median time from TAVR to PCI was 356 days (IQR 98–447). There was a clear upward trend in the number of PCIs performed post-TAVR across the participating centres throughout the study period, with the median number of cases per centre increasing from one in 2008 to four in 2022 (*Figure 1*). As shown in Supplementary material online, *Table S3*, 48.8% of patients received a balloon-expandable valve, while 46.4% were implanted with a self-expandable valve. Two patients underwent TAVR in the setting of a valve-in-valve procedure (0.5%). Successful PCI in the prior TAVR occurred in 96.9% of the patients and complete revascularization in 69.2%.

Table 1 reports clinical and procedural characteristics in the prior TAVR and no prior TAVR cohorts in the crude population (before weighting) and weighted population (after weighting for clinical and procedural confounders).

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ehjopen/article/5/5/oeaf095/8255918 by Hospital Universitari La Fe user on 27 May 2026



Figure 1 Temporal trend of PCI performed after TAVR across the participating centres from 2008 to 2022. The dots represent the median number of patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) after transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) at each centre over the years. The black line represents the regression line illustrating the association between the median PCI count post-TAVR and time. The shaded blue area depicts the 95% confidence interval (CI) for the linear model.

Before weighting, prior TAVR patients were older (mean age 80.84 ± 6.06 vs. 70.41 ± 11.11 years, SMD = 1.165) and more likely to be women (37.1 vs. 24.6%, SMD = 0.273), to have been diagnosed with hypertension (90.2 vs. 81.2%, SMD = 0.260) and chronic kidney disease (21.0 vs. 15.2%, SMD = 0.106), and have had prior PCI (41.9 vs. 28.2%, SMD = 0.291), compared to those without prior TAVR. The prevalence of diabetes (31.4 vs. 32.3%, SMD = 0.019) and number of complex PCI (27.6 vs. 29.3%, SMD = 0.038) were similar in the two cohorts. Patients with a prior TAVR underwent PCI more frequently for CCS (66.2 vs. 61.7%, SMD = 0.234). Moreover, prior TAVR patients had higher rates of increased procedural complexity, with more severe coronary calcifications (24.3 vs. 16.8%, SMD = 0.186), left main PCIs (16.2 vs. 4.7%, SMD = 0.383), and ACC/AHA B2 to C lesions (70.0 vs. 64.6%, SMD = 0.116). Drug-coated balloon was used more frequently in the prior TAVR group (8.1 vs. 0.7%, SMD = 0.369).

After weighting, clinical and procedural characteristics were balanced between groups. However, truncation at the 1st and 99th percentiles resulted in an imbalance for age (SMD 0.250) and type of indication for PCI (SMD 0.175) (see Supplementary material online, *Figure S2*).

Outcomes before weighting

The median follow-up was 360 (IQR 353–360) days. The 1-year crude cumulative incidence of MACE was 8.7% in the prior TAVR group vs. 3.7% in the no prior TAVR group (HR 2.35, 95% CI 1.49–3.69, $P < 0.001$; *Table 2* and *Figure 2*). Similarly, prior TAVR patients had a higher risk of cardiovascular death (5.6% vs. 2.2%, HR 2.58, 95% CI 1.44–4.60, $P < 0.001$), MI (4.2% vs. 1.8%, HR 2.30, 95% CI 1.20–4.41, $P = 0.012$), all-cause death (9.5% vs. 6.6%, HR 1.56, 95% CI 1.04–2.32, $P = 0.030$), stroke (2.9% vs. 0.4%, HR 6.74, 95% CI 2.34–19.40, $P < 0.001$), and TVR (6.8% vs. 1.9%, HR 3.57, 95% CI 2.01–6.33, $P < 0.001$) as compared with no prior TAVR patients (*Table 2* and *Figure 2*).

Outcomes after weighting

Following weighting for clinical and procedural covariates, the primary endpoint remained significantly higher in the prior TAVR population with a 1-year MACE rate of 8.3% vs. 3.7% in the no prior TAVR population (HR 2.36, 95% CI 1.08–5.16, $P = 0.03$) (*Table 2* and *Figure 3*). The *E*-value analysis for the primary analysis suggested that an unobserved confounder would need to be associated with prior TAVR and MACE risk with a relative risk of 4.14 above and beyond the adjusted confounders, to explain the observed HR of 2.36.

Prior TAVR patients still had a higher risk of cardiovascular death (6.0 vs. 2.0%, HR 3.12, 95% CI 1.10–8.79, $P = 0.032$) as compared to no prior TAVR patients (*Table 2* and *Figure 3*). Conversely, MI, all-cause death, stroke, and TVR rates did not differ significantly between the two populations (MI, 3.15 vs. 2.0%, HR 1.55, 95% CI 0.64–3.76, $P = 0.331$; all-cause death, 10.4 vs. 6.1%, HR 1.75, 95% CI 0.85–3.58, $P = 0.129$; stroke, 1.8 vs. 0.6%, HR 2.90, 95% CI 0.55–15.28, $P = 0.209$; TVR, 4.6 vs. 2.7%, HR 1.73, 95% CI 0.76–3.94, $P = 0.192$) (*Table 2*). Supplementary material online, *Figure S3* visualizes the association between prior TAVR and 1-year clinical outcomes across all models: the first unadjusted, the second adjusted for clinical confounders, the third adjusted for procedural confounders, and the fourth adjusted for both.

Subgroup analysis by clinical presentation

In the subgroup analysis by indication for PCI, the crude analysis indicated that patients with prior TAVR were at a higher risk of MACE

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ehjopen/article/5/5/oeaf095/8255918 by Hospital Universitari La Fe user on 27 May 2026

Table 1 Clinical and procedural characteristics in patients with and without prior TAVR before/after weighting

	Crude population			Weighted population[a]		
	Prior TAVR (*n* = 420)	No prior TAVR (*n* = 1197)	SMD	Prior TAVR (*n* = 343)	No prior TAVR (*n* = 1197)	SMD
Age, years	80.84 ± 6.06	70.41 ± 11.11	1.165	75.32 ± 6.95	73.12 ± 10.36	0.250
Women sex	156 (37.1)	297 (24.6)	0.273	100 (29.1)	334 (27.9)	0.024
Medical history						
Hypertension	379 (90.2)	972 (81.2)	0.260	292.2 (85.3)	999.9 (83.5)	0.047
Diabetes mellitus	132 (31.4)	387 (32.3)	0.019	119.6 (34.9)	384.0 (32.1)	0.060
Dyslipidaemia	308 (73.3)	766 (64.0)	0.202	217.1 (63.4)	795.0 (66.4)	0.064
Prior PCI	176 (41.9)	337 (28.2)	0.291	94.9 (27.7)	379.6 (31.7)	0.088
Prior CABG	63 (15.0)	95 (7.9)	0.223	36.6 (10.7)	116.8 (9.8)	0.030
LVEF, %	54.69 ± 11.80	50.03 ± 9.83	0.429	51.40 ± 12.74	51.24 ± 9.44)	0.014
Indication for PCI			0.234			0.175
CCS	278 (66.2)	738 (61.7)		234.2 (68.3)	751.9 (62.8)	
Unstable angina	84 (20.0)	195 (16.3)		39.7 (11.6)	206.5 (17.3)	
STEMI	22 (5.2)	124 (10.4)		26.8 (7.8)	108.1 (9.0)	
Non-STEMI	36 (8.6)	140 (11.7)		42.0 (12.3)	130.3 (10.9)	
eGFR < 45 mL/min/1.73m^2	88 (21.0)	201 (16.8)	0.106	59.0 (17.2)	213.9 (17.9)	0.017
Oral anticoagulation	106 (25.2)	182 (15.2)	0.252	64.2 (18.7)	213.0 (17.8)	0.024
Procedural characteristics						
Complex PCI[b]	116 (27.6)	351 (29.3)	0.038	102.3 (29.9)	345.7 (28.9)	0.021
Left main PCI	68 (16.2)	56 (4.7)	0.383	30.5 (8.9)	91.6 (7.7)	0.045
LAD PCI	184 (43.8)	654 (54.6)	0.218	186.8 (54.5)	620.3 (51.8)	0.054
No. of lesions per patient	1.38 ± 0.75	1.53 ± 0.89	0.183	1.53 ± 0.92	1.50 ± 0.85	0.041
Drug-coated balloon	34 (8.1)	8 (0.7)	0.369	8.4 (2.5)	30.9 (2.6)	0.008
Calcified lesion	102 (24.3)	201 (16.8)	0.186	65.9 (19.2)	224.3 (18.7)	0.012
ACC/AHA B2/C lesion	294 (70.0)	773 (64.6)	0.116	218.0 (63.6)	789.7 (66.0)	0.049

Values are mean ± SD or *n* (%).
ACC/AHA, American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association; CABG, coronary artery bypass grafting; CCS, chronic coronary syndrome; LAD, left anterior descending artery; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; SD, standard deviation; SMD, standardized mean difference; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; TAVR, transcatheter aortic valve replacement.
[a]The weighted model is presented which includes both clinical and procedural characteristics. Weights are truncated at the 1st and 99th percentiles.
[b]Complex PCI was defined as at least one among ≥3 vessels treated, ≥3 lesions treated, or bifurcation.

compared to those without prior TAVR, regardless of whether they presented with CCS (HR 1.77, 95% CI 0.90–3.47, $P = 0.094$) or ACS (HR 3.27, 95% CI 1.76–6.09, $P < 0.001$; P for interaction = 0.184). However, after adjusting for clinical and procedural confounders, we observed a trend towards interaction with clinical presentation (P for interaction = 0.072), where the association between prior TAVR and MACE was stronger in the ACS subgroup (HR 2.84, 95% CI 1.16–6.99, $P = 0.022$) compared to the CCS subgroup (HR 1.15, 95% CI 0.44–2.96, $P = 0.777$).

The multivariable Cox regression analysis assessing the association between PCI indication and MACE in patients with prior TAVR confirmed a higher risk of MACE in those with ACS (adjusted HR 2.20, 95% CI 1.26–3.81, $P = 0.005$) compared to CCS. Among all the clinical and procedural variables included in the model, only PCI failure was strongly associated with MACE (adjusted HR 4.34, 95% CI 1.41–14.29, $P = 0.01$).

Discussion

This study represents the largest and most comprehensive analysis to date on long-term clinical outcomes of PCI after TAVR. Our findings reveal an increasing number of patients with prior TAVR undergoing PCI across Europe. These patients are at a significantly higher risk of MACE at 1-year follow-up. After comprehensive adjustment for clinical and procedural confounders, this heightened risk was primarily driven by an increase in cardiovascular death, while the association with myocardial infarction was attenuated. We find these findings of particular clinical relevance since they underscore the need for careful patient selection prior to performing PCI in patients with CCS and a history of TAVR.

The poorer outcome of patients undergoing PCI with prior TAVR is likely multifactorial. One key factor is patient complexity; the prior TAVR group was older, with a higher burden of comorbidities such as chronic kidney disease and prior revascularization, all associated with worse cardiovascular outcomes. However, after adjusting for these variables, the risk for MACE of prior TAVR compared to no prior TAVR remained relatively constant, suggesting that other factors are contributing to the increased risk.

The clinical characteristics of prior TAVR patients—including advanced age, higher comorbidity burden, and myocardial remodelling due to severe aortic stenosis—may account for a higher proportion of patients presenting in unstable clinical conditions and with higher Killip classes compared to those without prior TAVR, as reported in

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ehjopen/article/5/5/oeaf095/8255918 by Hospital Universitari La Fe user on 27 May 2026

Table 2 One-year clinical outcomes in patients with and without prior TAVR before/after weighting

	Before weighting				After weighting			
	Prior TAVR ($n = 420$)	No prior TAVR ($n = 1197$)	HR (95% CI)	*P*-value	Prior TAVR ($n = 343$)	No prior TAVR ($n = 1197$)	HR (95% CI)	*P*-value
MACE	8.7%	3.7%	2.35 (1.49–3.69)	< 0.001	8.3%	3.7%	2.36 (1.08–5.16)	0.032
All-cause death	9.5%	6.6%	1.56 (1.04–2.32)	0.030	10.4%	6.1%	1.75 (0.85–3.58)	0.129
CV death	5.6%	2.2%	2.58 (1.44–4.60)	< 0.001	6.0%	2.0%	3.12 (1.10–8.79)	0.032
MI	4.2%	1.8%	2.30 (1.20–4.41)	0.012	3.1%	2.0%	1.55 (0.64–3.76)	0.331
Stroke	2.9%	0.4%	6.74 (2.34–19.40)	< 0.001	1.8%	0.6%	2.90 (0.55–15.28)	0.209
Stent thrombosis	1.6%	1.3%	1.20 (0.46–3.09)	0.708	1.0%	1.5%	0.88 (0.32–2.42)	0.807
TVR	6.8%	1.9%	3.57 (2.01–6.33)	< 0.001	4.6%	2.7%	1.73 (0.76–3.94)	0.192

Results from the weighted model adjusting for both clinical and procedural characteristics are presented. Weights are truncated at the 1st and 99th percentiles.
CI, confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio; CV, cardiovascular; MACE, major adverse cardiovascular events; MI, myocardial infarction; TAVR, transcatheter aortic valve replacement; TVR, target vessel revascularization.
Incidence rates are Kaplan–Meier estimates in the crude and weighted population at 1-year follow-up.



Figure 2 Kaplan–Meier estimates of 1-year clinical outcomes in the crude population. CI, confidence interval; CV, cardiovascular; HR, hazard ratio; MACE, major adverse cardiovascular events; MI, myocardial infarction; TAVR, transcatheter aortic valve replacement.

the literature.[13,20] Procedural challenges also play a significant role. Accessing coronary arteries post-TAVR is complicated by the presence of the transcatheter valve, which can obscure the coronary ostia and hinder catheter engagement.[21–23] Consequently, higher PCI failure rates, longer door-to-balloon times, increased use of fluoroscopy time, more contrast, higher femoral access rates, the need for multiple guide catheters during PCI, and increased haemodynamic instability have been reported in post-TAVR patients compared to those without prior TAVR.[13] These issues are particularly critical in the context of STEMI, potentially explaining why prior studies found that PCI after TAVR was associated with worse outcomes in this setting.[13,15] Conversely, non-STEMI patients with prior TAVR have been associated with better outcomes than those without prior TAVR.[15] It is noteworthy that in these studies, about half of the patients did not undergo PCI, follow-up was limited to in-hospital events or a median of seven months, and data on patients undergoing PCI for CCS were lacking.

Our subgroup analysis showed that the risk of MACE was particularly pronounced in patients with ACS who had undergone prior TAVR. After adjusting for clinical and procedural variables, the association between prior TAVR and MACE remained significant in the ACS group (HR 2.84, 95% CI 1.16–6.99, $P = 0.022$), while it was attenuated in patients presenting with CCS (HR 1.15, 95% CI 0.44–2.96, $P = 0.777$; P for interaction = 0.072). This suggests that the TAVR population is more vulnerable to adverse outcomes in the acute setting, possibly due to the greater haemodynamic instability and anatomical challenges in accessing coronary arteries post-TAVR.[13]

Future iterations of prosthetic valve profiles, alongside new techniques such as commissural and coronary alignment, intentional leaflet laceration,

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ehjopen/article/5/5/oeaf095/8255918 by Hospital Universitari La Fe user on 27 May 2026



Figure 3 Kaplan–Meier estimates of 1-year clinical outcomes after adjusting for clinical and procedural characteristics. CI, confidence interval; CV, cardiovascular; HR, hazard ratio; MACE, major adverse cardiovascular events; MI, myocardial infarction; TAVR, transcatheter aortic valve replacement.

and advanced pre-procedural planning—including CT-guided PCI—may alter this landscape and improve outcomes for these patients.[21–31]

Limitations

The primary limitation of our study is its observational design, which inherently prevents the elimination of bias from residual confounding. Furthermore, as with all observational studies relying on registry data and re-weighting methodologies like entropy balancing, the accuracy of our results is contingent upon the quality and completeness of the data collected by participating centres and the assumption that recorded covariates accurately reflect the patient characteristics. To address potential unmeasured confounding, we calculated an E-value, which indicates that any unmeasured confounder would need a risk ratio of at least 4.14 associated with both prior TAVR exposure and the primary endpoint to nullify our observed adjusted HR of 2.36. However, it is important to acknowledge that while the E-value provides a useful measure of sensitivity to unmeasured confounding, it does not account for other potential sources of bias, such as selection bias or measurement error, nor does it address the theoretical possibility of bias amplification, where statistical adjustment could, under certain conditions, interact with unmeasured confounders.

A second key limitation is the potential for selection bias. REVIVAL investigators at each centre voluntarily reported cases of PCI after TAVR without external monitoring to verify data accuracy. This could explain the high PCI success rate of 96.9% observed in the TAVR group, although this rate aligns with other studies less susceptible to such bias, which reported success rates ranging from 93 to 99%.[32,33] If this potential selection bias led to an overestimation of PCI success rates, our study might underestimate the true risk of MACE in a more generalizable post-TAVR PCI population, suggesting our primary finding is conservative.

Third, while this is the largest study to date on this topic, the sample size remains relatively modest. This increases the risk of type II error, particularly for some secondary outcomes and subgroup analyses, leading to wider confidence intervals. The extended data collection period from 2008 to 2023, necessary due to the low incidence of PCI after TAVR, also encompasses significant evolution in both TAVR and PCI technologies and operator experience, representing a potential source of unmeasured temporal confounding. Consequently, our findings require validation with more recent, larger databases as they become available.

Finally, the follow-up period was limited to 1 year. While the 1-year follow-up is standard for many PCI studies, it may not fully capture the complete long-term event trajectories. This is particularly relevant in the heterogeneous post-TAVR PCI population, where the risk profiles and outcomes for different PCI indications (e.g. ACS early post-TAVR vs. CCS late post-TAVR) might diverge significantly beyond this initial year. Future studies with extended follow-up are essential to elucidate these longer-term patterns and the potential differential impact of prior TAVR across these subgroups over time.

Conclusions

Patients undergoing PCI after TAVR face a higher incidence of MACE compared to those without prior TAVR. These findings highlight the importance of thorough coronary artery disease management before and during TAVR, as well as the added complexity of post-TAVR PCI, particularly in acute settings. Further research is essential to refine revascularization strategies and improve long-term outcomes in this expanding patient population.

Lead author biography



Carlo Andrea Pivato completed medical training at Vita-Salute San Raffaele University (Milan), followed by a cardiology residency at Humanitas University (Milan). He conducted a research fellowship at the Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai (New York) and obtained a PhD in Data Science and Medicine from Humanitas University (Milan), including a research period at the Health Data Science Center, Human Technopole (Milan). He specialized in echocardiography at

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ehjopen/article/5/5/oeaf095/8255918 by Hospital Universitari La Fe user on 27 May 2026

Humanitas Research Hospital and currently practices as a cardiologist at Humanitas Research Hospital and Humanitas Mater Domini.

Data availability

The data underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Supplementary material

Supplementary material is available at *European Heart Journal Open* online.

Author contributions

Carlo Andrea Pivato (Project administration, Conceptualization, Methodology, and Writing—review & editing), Ottavia Cozzi (Writing—original draft), Nicole Fontana, Francesca Ieva (Formal analysis, Methodology, and Writing—review & editing), Gianluigi Condorelli (Supervision and Writing—review & editing), Cosmo Godino, Bernhard Reimers, Masaaki Nakase, Karsten Hug, Antonio Munoz-Garcia, Victor Alfonso Jimenez Diaz, Alfonso Ielasi, Marco Barbanti, Luigi Biasco, Darren Mylotte, Tobias Rheude, Massimo Leoncini, Jose Maria de la Torre Hernandez, Giorgio Quadri, Angelo Anzuini, Diego Lopez, Philippe Garot, Jorn Brouwer, Antonio Mangieri, Damiano Regazzoli, Ferdinando Varbella, Luca Testa, Daijiro Tomii, Alaide Chieffo, Michael Joner, Gennaro Sardella, Enrico Cerrato, Luis Nombela-Franco, Jorge Sanz Sanchez, Thomas Pilgrim (Investigation and Writing—review & editing), and Giulio Stefanini (Supervision and Writing—review & editing)

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all the investigators, coordinators, and staff who contributed to the conduct of this study. We are also grateful to the patients who participated in the research.

Funding

None.

Conflict of interest: T.P. reports research, travel, or educational grants to the institution without personal remuneration from Biotronik, Boston Scientific, Edwards Lifesciences, and ATSens and speaker fees and consultancy fees to the institution from Biotronik, Boston Scientific, Edwards Lifesciences, Abbott, Medtronic, Biosensors, and HighLife. J.M.d.l.T.H. is on the advisory board of Medtronic and Abbott. A.I. has served as a proctor for Meril Life Sciences and Sahajanand Medical Technologies (SMT), receiving compensation for professional services. L.N.-F. has served as a proctor for Edwards Lifesciences, Abbott, and Boston Scientific, receiving compensation for professional services. The other authors report no conflict of interest.

References

1. Tarantini G, Tang G, Nai Fovino L, Blackman D, Van Mieghem NM, Kim W-K, Karam N, Carrilho-Ferreira P, Fournier S, Pręgowski J, Fraccaro C, Vincent F, Campante Teles R, Mylotte D, Wong I, Bieliauskas G, Czerny M, Bonaros N, Parolari A, Dudek D, Tchetche D, Eltchaninoff H, de Backer O, Stefanini G, Sondergaard L. Management of coronary artery disease in patients undergoing transcatheter aortic valve implantation. A clinical consensus statement from the European Association of Percutaneous Cardiovascular Interventions in collaboration with the ESC working group on. *EuroIntervention J Eur Collab with Work Gr Interv Cardiol Eur Soc Cardiol* 2023;**19**:37–52.
2. Vahanian A, Beyersdorf F, Praz F, Milojevic M, Baldus S, Bauersachs J, Capodanno D, Conradi L, De Bonis M, De Paulis R, Delgado V, Freemantle N, Gilard M, Haugaa KH, Jeppsson A, Jüni P, Pierard L, Prendergast BD, Sádaba JR, Tribouilloy C, Wojakowski W, Neumann F-J, Myers P, Abdelhamid M, Achenbach S, Asteggiano R, Barili F, Borger MA, Carrel T, Collet J-P, Foldager D, Habib G, Hassager C, Irs A, Iung B, Jahangiri M, Katus HA, Koskinas KC, Massberg S, Mueller CE, Nielsen JC, Pibarot P, Rakisheva A, Roffi M, Rubboli A, Shlyakhto E, Siepe M, Sitges M, Sondergaard L, Sousa-Uva M, Tarantini G, Zamorano JL, Praz F, Milojevic M, Baldus S, Bauersachs J, Capodanno D, Conradi L, De Bonis M, De Paulis R, Delgado V, Freemantle N, Gilard M, Haugaa KH, Jeppsson A, Jüni P, Pierard L, Prendergast BD, Sádaba JR, Tribouilloy C, Wojakowski W, Benchabi Y, Chilingaryan A, Metzler B, Rustamova Y, Shumavets V, Lancellotti P, Smajic E, Trendafilova-Lazarova D, Samardzic J, Karakyriou M, Palecek T, Sanchez Dahl J, Meshaal MS, Palm K, Virtanen M, Bouleti C, Bakhutashvili Z, Achenbach S, Boutsikou M, Kertész AB, Danielsen R, Topilsky Y, Golino P, Tuleutayev R, Elezi S, Kerimkulov A, Rudzitis A, Glaveckaite S, Sow R, Demarco DC, Bulatovic N, Aouad A, van den Brink R, Antova E, Beitnes JO, Ochala A, Ribeiras R, Vinereanu D, Irtyuga O, Ivanovic B, Simkova I, González Gómez A, Sarno G, Pedrazzini GB, Bsata W, Zakhama L, Korkmaz L, Cherniuk S, Khanji MY, Sharipov I. 2021 ESC/EACTS guidelines for the management of valvular heart disease: developed by the task force for the management of valvular heart disease of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS). *Eur Heart J* 2022;**43**:561–632.
3. Patterson T, Clayton T, Dodd M, Khawaja Z, Morice MC, Wilson K, Kim W-K, Meneveau N, Hambrecht R, Byrne J, Carrié D, Fraser D, Roberts DH, Doshi SN, Zaman A, Banning AP, Eltchaninoff H, Le Breton H, Smith D, Cox I, Frank D, Gershlick A, de Belder M, Thomas M, Hildick-Smith D, Prendergast B, Redwood S, Pocock S, Wang D, Irague F. ACTIVATION (PercutAneous Coronary inTervention prIor to transcatheter aortic VAlve implantaTION): a randomized clinical trial. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2021;**14**:1965–1974.
4. Lønborg J, Jabbari R, Sabbah M, Veien KT, Niemelä M, Freeman P, Linder R, Ioanes D, Terkelsen CJ, Kajander OA, Koul S, Savontaus M, Karjalainen P, Erglis A, Minkkinen M, Sørensen R, Tilsted H-H, Holmvang L, Bieliauskas G, Ellert J, Piuhola J, Eftekhari A, Angerås O, Rück A, Christiansen EH, Jørgensen T, Özbek BT, Glinge C, Søndergaard L, De Backer O, Engstrøm T. PCI in patients undergoing transcatheter aortic-valve implantation. *N Engl J Med* 2024;**391**:2189–2200.
5. Persits I, Layoun H, Kondoleon NP, Spilias N, Badwan O, Sipko J, Yun JJ, Kalra A, Dykun I, Tereshchenko LG, Krishnaswamy A, Reed GW, Kapadia SR, Puri R. Impact of untreated chronic obstructive coronary artery disease on outcomes after transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *Eur Heart J* 2024;**45**:1890–1900.
6. Eltchaninoff H, Durand E. Transfemoral aortic valve implantation and concomitant CAD: the jury is out. *Eur Heart J* 2024;**45**:1901–1903.
7. Ochiai T, Yoon S-H, Flint N, Sharma R, Chakravarty T, Kaewkes D, Patel V, Nakamura M, Cheng W, Makkar R. Timing and outcomes of percutaneous coronary intervention in patients who underwent transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Am J Cardiol* 2020;**125**:1361–1368.
8. Kumar A, Sammour Y, Reginauld S, Sato K, Agrawal N, Lee JM, Meenakshisundaram C, Ramanan T, Kamioka N, Sawant AC, Mohananey D, Gleason PT, Devireddy C, Krishnaswamy A, Mavromatis K, Grubb K, Svensson LG, Tuzcu EM, Block PC, Iyer V, Babaliaros V, Kapadia S, Samady H. Adverse clinical outcomes in patients undergoing both PCI and TAVR: analysis from a pooled multi-center registry. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv Off J Soc Card Angiogr Interv* 2021;**97**:529–539.
9. Lunardi M, Venturi G, Del Sole PA, Ruzzarin A, Mainardi A, Pighi M, Pesarini G, Scarsini R, Tavella D, Gottin L, Ribichini FL. Optimal timing for percutaneous coronary intervention in patients undergoing transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Int J Cardiol* 2022;**365**:114–122.
10. Popma JJ, Deeb GM, Yakubov SJ, Mumtaz M, Gada H, O'Hair D, Bajwa T, Heiser JC, Merhi W, Kleiman NS, Askew J, Sorajja P, Rovin J, Chetcuti SJ, Adams DH, Teirstein PS, Zorn GL, Forrest JK, Tchétché D, Resar J, Walton A, Piazza N, Ramlawi B, Robinson N, Petrossian G, Gleason TG, Oh JK, Boulware MJ, Qiao H, Mugglin AS, Reardon MJ. Transcatheter aortic-valve replacement with a self-expanding valve in low-risk patients. *N Engl J Med* 2019;**380**:1706–1715.
11. Mack MJ, Leon MB, Thourani VH, Makkar R, Kodali SK, Russo M, Kapadia SR, Malaisrie SC, Cohen DJ, Pibarot P, Leipsic J, Hahn RT, Blanke P, Williams MR, McCabe JM, Brown DL, Babaliaros V, Goldman S, Szeto WY, Genereux P, Pershad A, Pocock SJ, Alu MC, Webb JG, Smith CR. Transcatheter aortic-valve replacement with a balloon-expandable valve in low-risk patients. *N Engl J Med* 2019;**380**:1695–1705.
12. Mentias A, Desai MY, Saad M, Horwitz PA, Rossen JD, Panaich S, Elbadawi A, Abbott JD, Sorajja P, Jneid H, Tuzcu EM, Kapadia S, Vaughan-Sarrazin M. Incidence and outcomes of acute coronary syndrome after transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2020;**13**:938–950.
13. Laurent F, Thibault L, Flavien V, Nombela-Franco L, Tchétché D, Barbanti M, Abdel-Wahab M, Windecker S, Auffret V, Campanha-Borges DC, Fischer Q, Muñoz-Garcia E, Trillo-Nouche R, Jorgensen T, Serra V, Toggweiler S, Tarantini G, Saia F, Durand E, Donaint P, Gutierrez-Ibanes E, Wijeysundera HC, Veiga G, Patti G, D'Ascenzo F, Moreno R, Hengstenberg C, Chamandi C, Asmarats L, Hernandez-Antolin R, Gomez-Hospital JA, Cordoba-Soriano JG, Landes U, Jimenez-Diaz VA, Cruz-Gonzalez I, Nejjari M, Roubille F, Van Belle É, Armijo G, Siddiqui S, Costa G, Elsaify S, Pilgrim T, le Breton H, Urena M, Muñoz-Garcia AJ, Sondergaard L, Bach-Oller M, Fraccaro C, Eltchaninoff H, Metz D, Tamargo M, Fradejas-Sastre V, Rognoni A, Bruno F, Goliasch G, Santaló-Corcoy M, Jimenez-Mazuecos J, Webb JG, Muntané-Carol G, Paradis J-M, Mangieri A, Ribeiro

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ehjopen/article/5/5/oeaf095/8255918 by Hospital Universitari La Fe user on 27 May 2026

HB, Campelo-Parada F, Rodés-Cabau J. ST-Segment Elevation myocardial infarction following transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2021;**77**:2187–2199.
14. Faroux L, Munoz-Garcia E, Serra V, Alperi A, Nombela-Franco L, Fischer Q, Veiga G, Donaint P, Asmarats L, Vilalta V, Chamandi C, Regueiro A, Gutiérrez E, Munoz-Garcia A, Garcia del Blanco B, Bach-Oller M, Moris C, Armijo G, Urena M, Fradejas-Sastre V, Metz D, Castillo P, Fernandez-Nofrerias E, Sabaté M, Tamargo M, del Val D, Couture T, Rodes-Cabau J. Acute coronary syndrome following transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 2020;**13**:e008620.
15. Gupta T, Zimmer J, Lahoud RN, Murphy HR, Harris AH, Kolte D, Hirashima F, Dauerman HL. National trends and outcomes of acute myocardial infarction after transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2024;**17**:1267–1276.
16. Vilalta V, Asmarats L, Ferreira-Neto AN, Maes F, de Freitas Campos Guimarães L, Couture T, Paradis J-M, Mohammadi S, Dumont E, Kalavrouziotis D, Delarochellière R, Rodés-Cabau J. Incidence, clinical characteristics, and impact of acute coronary syndrome following transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2018;**11**:2523–2533.
17. Pivato CA, Reimers B, Testa L, Pacchioni A, Briguori C, Musto C, Esposito G, Piccolo R, Lucisano L, De Luca L, Conrotto F, De Marco A, Franzone A, Presbitero P, Ferrante G, Condorelli G, Paradies V, Sardella G, Indolfi C, Condorelli G, Stefanini GG. One-month dual antiplatelet therapy after bioresorbable polymer everolimus-eluting stents in high bleeding risk patients. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2022;**11**:e023454.
18. Sardella G, Stefanini GG, Briguori C, Tamburino C, Fabbiocchi F, Rotolo F, Tomai F, Paggi A, Lombardi M, Gioffrè G, Sclafani R, Rolandi A, Sciahbasi A, Scardaci F, Signore N, Calcagno S, Mancone M, Chiarito M, Giordano A. Safety and efficacy of polymer-free biolimus-eluting stents in all-comer patients: the RUDI-FREE study. *EuroIntervention J Eur Collab with Work Gr Interv Cardiol Eur Soc Cardiol* 2018;**14**:772–779.
19. Hainmueller J. Entropy balancing for causal effects: a multivariate reweighting method to produce balanced samples in observational studies. *Polit Anal* 2012;**20**:25–46.
20. Otto CM, Prendergast B. Aortic-valve stenosis–from patients at risk to severe valve obstruction. *N Engl J Med* 2014;**371**:744–756.
21. Barbanti M, Costa G, Picci A, Criscione E, Reddavid C, Valvo R, Todaro D, Deste W, Condorelli A, Scalia M, Licciardello A, Politi G, De Luca G, Strazzieri O, Motta S, Garretto V, Veroux P, Giaquinta A, Giuffrida A, Sgroi C, Leon MB, Webb JG, Tamburino C. Coronary cannulation after transcatheter aortic valve replacement: the RE-ACCESS study. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2020;**13**:2542–2555.
22. Meier D, Akodad M, Landes U, Barlow AM, Chatfield AG, Lai A, Tzimas G, Tang GHL, Puehler T, Lutter G, Leipsic JA, Søndergaard L, Wood DA, Webb JG, Sellers SL, Sathananthan J. Coronary access following redo TAVR: impact of THV design, implant technique, and cell misalignment. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2022;**15**:1519–1531.
23. Stefanini GG, Cerrato E, Pivato CA, Joner M, Testa L, Rheude T, Pilgrim T, Pavani M, Brouwer J, Lopez Otero D, Munoz Garcia E, Barbanti M, Biasco L, Varbella F, Reimers B, Jimenez Diaz VA, Leoncini M, Salido Tahoces ML, Ielasi A, de la Torre Hernandez JM, Mylotte D, Garot P, Chieffo A, Nombela-Franco L; REVIVAL Investigators. Unplanned percutaneous coronary revascularization after TAVR: a multicenter international registry. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2021;**14**:198–207. doi:10.1016/j.jcin.2020.10.031. Erratum in: JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2021;**14**:940. doi:10.1016/j.jcin.2021.03.057.
24. Attizzani GF, Gabasha S, Ukaigwe A, Elgudin Y, Rushing G, Pelletier M, Filby S, Baeza C, Yoon S-H. Coronary cannulation, commissure, and coronary alignment post-TAVR with evolut FX system: CANNULATE TAVR study. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2024;**17**:825–827.
25. Bapat VN, Fukui M, Zaid S, Okada A, Jilaihawi H, Rogers T, Khalique O, Cavalcante JL, Landes U, Sathananthan J, Tarantini G, Tang GHL, Blackman DJ, De Backer O, Mack MJ, Leon MB. A guide to transcatheter aortic valve design and systematic planning for a redo-TAV (TAV-in-TAV) procedure. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2024;**17**:1631–1651.
26. Tang GHL, Amat-Santos IJ, De Backer O, Avvedimento M, Redondo A, Barbanti M, Costa G, Tchétché D, Eltchaninoff H, Kim W-K, Zaid S, Tarantini G, Søndergaard L. Rationale, definitions, techniques, and outcomes of commissural alignment in TAVR: from the ALIGN-TAVR consortium. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2022;**15**:1497–1518.
27. Wang X, De Backer O, Bieliauskas G, Wong I, Bajoras V, Xiong T-Y, Zhang Y, Kofoed KF, Chen M, Sondergaard L. Cusp symmetry and coronary ostial eccentricity and its impact on coronary access following TAVR. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2022;**15**:123–134.
28. Redondo A, Baladrón Zorita C, Tchétché D, Santos-Martinez S, Delgado-Arana JR, Barrero A, Gutiérrez H, Serrador Frutos A, Ybarra Falcón C, Gómez MG, Carrasco Moraleja M, Sevilla T, Sanchez Lite I, Sanz E, San Román JA, Amat-Santos IJ. Commissural versus coronary optimized alignment during transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2022;**15**:135–146.
29. Rogers T, Greenspun BC, Weissman G, Torguson R, Craig P, Shults C, Gordon P, Ehsan A, Wilson SR, Goncalves J, Levitt R, Hahn C, Parikh P, Bilfinger T, Butzel D, Buchanan S, Hanna N, Garrett R, Buchbinder M, Asch F, Garcia-Garcia HM, Okubagzi P, Ben-Dor I, Satler LF, Waksman R. Feasibility of coronary access and aortic valve reintervention in low-risk TAVR patients. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2020;**13**:726–735.
30. Bieliauskas G, Wong I, Bajoras V, Wang X, Kofoed KF, De Backer O, Søndergaard L. Patient-specific implantation technique to obtain neo-commissural alignment with self-expanding transcatheter aortic valves. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2021;**14**:2097–2108.
31. Khan JM, Greenbaum AB, Babaliaros VC, Dvir D, Reisman M, McCabe JM, Satler L, Waksman R, Eng MH, Paone G, Chen MY, Bruce CG, Stine AM, Tian X, Rogers T, Lederman RJ. BASILICA trial: one-year outcomes of transcatheter electrosurgical leaflet laceration to prevent TAVR coronary obstruction. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 2021;**14**:e010238.
32. Okuno T, Demirel C, Tomii D, Heg D, Häner J, Siontis GCM, Lanz J, Räber L, Strotecky S, Fürholz M, Praz F, Windecker S, Pilgrim T. Long-term risk of unplanned percutaneous coronary intervention after transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *EuroIntervention* 2022;**18**:797–803. https://eurointervention.pcronline.com/article/long-term-risk-of-unplanned-percutaneous-coronary-intervention-after-transcatheter-aortic-valve-replacement.
33. Nilsson K, Shahim B, Settergren M, James S. Coronary angiography and intervention after transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI): the nationwide SWEDEHEART registry. *Eur Heart J* 2023;**44**:ehad655.2233.

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ehjopen/article/5/5/oeaf095/8255918 by Hospital Universitari La Fe user on 27 May 2026