

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

Applies to all products administered or underwritten by Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana and its subsidiary, HMO Louisiana, Inc. (collectively referred to as the "Company"), unless otherwise provided in the applicable contract. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Medical Policy periodically.

Investigational or experimental services are not covered. This includes any drug, device, procedure, or service provided under the investigational arm of a clinical trial or clinical study. These services are excluded from coverage under benefits.

Note: Transcatheter Pulmonary Valve Implantation is addressed separately in medical policy 00576.

When Services May Be Eligible for Coverage

Coverage for eligible medical treatments or procedures, drugs, devices or biological products may be provided only if:

- *Benefits are available in the member's contract/certificate, and*
- *Medical necessity criteria and guidelines are met.*

Based on review of available data, the Company may consider transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) **eligible for coverage**** when **ALL** of the following conditions are present:

- Severe calcific native aortic valve stenosis based on one or more of the following criteria:
 - An aortic valve area (AVA) of less than or equal to 1 cm²; **OR**
 - An AVA index of less than or equal to 0.6 cm²/m²; **OR**
 - A mean aortic valve gradient greater than or equal to 40 mm Hg; **OR**
 - A peak aortic-jet velocity greater than or equal to 4.0 m/s; **AND**
- U.S. FDA-approved transcatheter heart valve system will be used via an approach consistent with the device's FDA-approved labeling; **AND**
- Age requirement:
 - Age is greater than or equal to 65 years; **OR**
 - Age is less than 65 years with estimated life expectancy less than 20 years per clinical judgment made by the Heart Team (considering comorbidities, frailty, noncardiac disease burden/ mortality, and functional status) based on one or more of the following:
 - Moderate to severe chronic lung disease (e.g., COPD, pulmonary fibrosis); **OR**
 - Advanced or active malignancy (other than non-melanoma skin cancer); **OR**
 - Advanced kidney disease (e.g., eGFR less than 30); **OR**
 - Advanced liver disease (e.g., cirrhosis, portal hypertension); **OR**
 - Diabetes with end-organ complication(s); **OR**

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

- Neurologic disease with functional decline (e.g., dementia, advanced Parkinson's disease, prior stroke, neurodegenerative disorder); **OR**
 - Symptomatic peripheral artery disease; **OR**
 - Advanced chronic inflammatory disease; **OR**
 - Frailty (limited ambulation, recurrent falls, ADL dependence); **OR**
 - High or prohibitive surgical risk if predicted post-TAVI survival is greater than 12 months with an acceptable quality of life (see Policy Guidelines); **AND**
 - **One** of the following:
 - Symptoms consistent with New York Heart Association (NYHA) heart failure Class II, III or IV, exertional or unexplained syncope, or exertional angina; **OR**
 - Asymptomatic individual with reduced left ventricular ejection fraction less than 50% who is 65 to 80 years of age and has no anatomic contraindication to transfemoral TAVR;
- AND**
- Individual does not have unicuspid or bicuspid aortic valves.

Based on review of available data, the Company may consider transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) for repair of a degenerated bioprosthetic valve (valve-in-valve) to be **eligible for coverage**** when **ALL** of the following are present:

- Transcatheter heart valve system is FDA-approved for repair of a degenerated bioprosthetic valve (valve-in-valve); **AND**
- Failure (stenosed, insufficient, or combined) of a surgical bioprosthetic aortic valve; **AND**
- NYHA heart failure class II, III or IV symptoms; **AND**
- **One** of the following:
 - Individual is not an operable candidate for open surgery, as documented by at least 2 cardiovascular specialists (including a cardiac surgeon); **OR**
 - Individual is an operable candidate but is considered at increased surgical risk for open surgery, as documented by at least 2 cardiac specialists (including a cardiac surgeon); **OR**
 - Individual is considered at increased surgical risk for open surgery (e.g., repeat sternotomy) due to a history of congenital vascular anomalies OR has a complex intrathoracic surgical history, as documented by at least 2 cardiovascular specialists (including a cardiac surgeon; see Policy Guidelines section).

When Services Are Considered Not Medically Necessary

Based on review of available data, the Company considers transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) for all other indications to be **not medically necessary.****

Based on review of available data, the Company considers the use of transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) when patient selection criteria are not met to be **not medically necessary.****

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

When Services Are Considered Investigational

Coverage is not available for investigational medical treatments or procedures, drugs, devices or biological products.

Based on review of available data, the Company considers transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) using heart valve systems that are not FDA-approved to be **investigational**.*

Based on review of available data, the Company considers the use of a cerebral embolic protection device (e.g., Sentinel) during transcatheter aortic valve replacement procedures to be **investigational**.*

Policy Guidelines

For the use of the Sapien or CoreValve devices, severe aortic stenosis is defined by the presence of one or more of the following criteria:

- An aortic valve area of less than or equal to 1 cm^2
- An aortic valve area index of less than or equal to $0.6 \text{ cm}^2/\text{m}^2$
- A mean aortic valve gradient greater than or equal to 40 mm Hg
- A peak aortic-jet velocity greater than or equal to 4.0 m/s

The U.S. FDA definition of extreme risk or inoperable for open surgery is:

- Predicted risk of operative mortality and/or serious irreversible morbidity 50% or higher for open surgery.

The FDA definition of high risk for open surgery is:

- Society of Thoracic Surgeons predicted operative risk score of 8% or higher; or
- Judged by a heart team, which includes an experienced cardiac surgeon and a cardiologist, to have an expected mortality risk of 15% or higher for open surgery.

FDA definition of intermediate risk is:

- Society of Thoracic Surgeons predicted operative risk score of 3% to 7%.

Individuals with Society of Thoracic Surgeons predicted operative risk score of less than 3% or 4% are considered at low risk for open surgery.

Some individuals being considered for valve-in-valve transcatheter aortic valve replacement may be deemed at increased surgical risk for open surgery despite low-to-moderate STS risk scores. This may include individuals with advanced age, complex intrathoracic histories, congenital cardiac anomalies, liver disease, or other extreme comorbid conditions not accurately captured by STS risk scores as documented by at least 2 cardiovascular specialists, including a cardiac surgeon.

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

Background/Overview

Aortic Stenosis

Aortic stenosis is defined as narrowing of the aortic valve opening, resulting in obstruction of blood flow from the left ventricle into the ascending aorta. Progressive calcification of the aortic valve is the most common etiology in North America and Europe, while rheumatic fever is the most common etiology in developing countries. Congenital abnormalities of the aortic valve, most commonly a bicuspid or unicuspid valve, increase the risk of aortic stenosis, but aortic stenosis can also occur in a normal aortic valve. Risk factors for calcification of a congenitally normal valve mirror those for atherosclerotic vascular disease, including advanced age, male gender, smoking, hypertension, and hyperlipidemia. Thus, the pathogenesis of calcific aortic stenosis is thought to be similar to that of atherosclerosis (ie, deposition of atherogenic lipids and infiltration of inflammatory cells, followed by progressive calcification).

The natural history of aortic stenosis involves a long asymptomatic period, with slowly progressive narrowing of the valve until the stenosis reaches the severe stage. At this time, symptoms of dyspnea, chest pain, and/or dizziness/syncope often occur, and the disorder progresses rapidly. Treatment of aortic stenosis is replacement of the diseased valve with a bioprosthetic or mechanical valve.

Disease Burden

Aortic stenosis is a relatively common disorder in elderly patients and is the most common acquired valve disorder in the United States. Approximately 2% to 4% of people older than 65 years of age have evidence of significant aortic stenosis, increasing up to 8% of people by age 85 years. In the Helsinki Aging Study (1993), a population-based study of 501 patients aged 75 to 86 years, the prevalence of severe aortic stenosis by echocardiography was estimated to be 2.9%. In the United States, more than 50,000 aortic valve replacements are performed annually due to severe aortic stenosis.

Aortic stenosis does not cause substantial morbidity or mortality when the disease is mild or moderate in severity. By the time it becomes severe, there is an untreated mortality rate of approximately 50% within 2 years. Open surgical repair is an effective treatment for reversing aortic stenosis, and artificial valves have demonstrated good durability for up to 20 years. However, these benefits are accompanied by perioperative mortality of approximately 3% to 4% and substantial morbidity, both of which increase with advancing age.

Unmet Needs

Many patients with severe, symptomatic aortic stenosis are poor operative candidates. Approximately 30% of patients presenting with severe aortic stenosis do not undergo open surgery due to factors such as advanced age, advanced left ventricular dysfunction, or multiple medical comorbidities. For patients who are not surgical candidates, medical therapy can partially alleviate the symptoms of aortic stenosis but does not affect the underlying disease progression. Percutaneous balloon valvuloplasty can be performed, but this procedure has less than optimal outcomes. Balloon valvuloplasty can improve symptoms and increase flow across the stenotic valve but is associated with high rates of complications such as stroke, myocardial infarction, and aortic

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

regurgitation. Also, restenosis can occur rapidly, and there is no improvement in mortality. As a result, there is a large unmet need for less invasive treatments for aortic stenosis in patients at increased risk for open surgery.

Treatment

Transcatheter aortic valve implantation, also known as transcatheter aortic valve replacement, has been developed in response to this unmet need and was originally intended as an alternative for patients for whom surgery was not an option due to prohibitive surgical risk or for patients at high-risk for open surgery. The procedure is performed percutaneously, most often through the transfemoral artery approach. It can also be done through the subclavian artery approach and transapically using mediastinoscopy. Balloon valvuloplasty is first performed to open up the stenotic area. This is followed by passage of a bioprosthetic artificial valve across the native aortic valve. The valve is initially compressed to allow passage across the native valve and is then expanded and secured to the underlying aortic valve annulus. The procedure is performed on the beating heart without cardiopulmonary bypass.

Randomized trials supporting TAVR in low- and intermediate-risk populations demonstrate non-inferior outcomes compared with surgical aortic valve replacement (SAVR) through approximately 5–7 years of follow-up; however, modern-generation transcatheter valves have not yet accumulated 10–15 years of prospective durability data. As a result, long-term risks of structural valve deterioration, need for reintervention, and lifetime management strategies remain incompletely defined, particularly for younger patients with longer life expectancy ([JAMA Intern Med, 2026](#)). Contemporary cardiology reviews consistently emphasize that although early and mid-term outcomes with TAVR are favorable, uncertainty persists regarding durability beyond the first decade, feasibility and outcomes of repeat transcatheter interventions (e.g., valve-in-valve TAVR), coronary access after TAVR, and the implications of eventual surgical explantation. These issues are identified as key limitations when considering expansion of TAVR into younger or lower-risk populations ([J Clin Med, 2025 review](#)). Surgical registry-based analyses likewise report that TAVR explantation, while uncommon, is increasing and is associated with greater operative complexity and morbidity compared with primary SAVR, highlighting potential downstream consequences of limited valve durability. ([Annals of Thoracic Surgery, 2026](#)) ([Heart, 2026](#)).

FDA or Other Governmental Regulatory Approval

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

Multiple manufacturers have transcatheter aortic valve devices with U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval. Regulatory status data for these devices are listed in Table 1.

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

Table 1. U.S. Food and Drug Administration Approved Transcatheter Aortic Valve Device Systems

Device and Indication	Manufacturer	Date Cleared	PMA
Edwards SAPIEN Transcatheter Heart Valve System ^{TM†} Severe native aortic valve stenosis determined to be inoperable for open aortic valve replacement (transfemoral approach)	Edwards Lifesciences	11/11	P100041
- Edwards SAPIEN^{TM†} Transcatheter Heart Valve, Model 9000TFX - Expanded to include high-risk aortic stenosis (transapical approach)		10/12	P110021
- Edwards SAPIEN XT Transcatheter Heart Valve (model 9300TFX) and accessories - Severe native aortic valve stenosis at high or greater risk for open surgical therapy		07/14	P130009
Expanded to include failure of a bioprosthetic valve with high or greater risk for open surgical therapy		10/15	P130009/S034
Expanded to include severe aortic stenosis with intermediate surgical risk	•	08/16	P130009/S057
- SAPIEN 3 THV System, a design iteration - Severe aortic stenosis with high or greater risk for open surgical therapy	•	06/15	P140031
Expanded to include failure of a bioprosthetic valve with high or greater risk for open surgical therapy	•	06/17	P140031/S028
SAPIEN 3 Ultra THV System, a design iteration		12/18	P140031
Note: In August 2019, FDA issued a recall for the Edwards SAPIEN 3 Ultra Transcatheter Heart Valve System (Recall event ID: 83293) due to			

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

"reports of burst balloons which have resulted in significant difficulty retrieving the device into the sheath and withdrawing the system from the patient during procedures".			
Expanded to include severe aortic stenosis with low surgical risk	•	08/19	P140031/S085
Expanded to include failure of a bioprosthetic valve with high or greater risk for open surgical therapy	•	09/20	P140031/S112
Expanded to include failure of a bioprosthetic valve with intermediate or greater risk for open surgical therapy	•	10/24	P140031/S162
Expanded to include asymptomatic severe native calcific aortic stenosis	•	05/25	P140031/S182
Medtronic CoreValve System™† Severe native aortic stenosis at extreme risk or inoperable for open surgical therapy	Medtronic	01/14	P130021
Expanded to include high-risk for open surgical therapy		06/16	P130021/S002
Expanded to include intermediate risk for open surgical therapy		07/17	P130021/S033
Medtronic CoreValve Evolut R System™† (design iteration for valve and accessories)	•	06/15	P130021/S014
Expanded to include intermediate risk for open surgical therapy		07/17	P130021/S033
Medtronic CoreValve Evolut PRO System™† (design iteration for valve and accessories, includes porcine pericardial tissue wrap)	•	03/17	P130021/S029
Expanded to include intermediate risk for open surgical therapy		07/17	P130021/S033

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

Expanded to include severe aortic stenosis with low surgical risk	•	08/19	P130021/S058
Medtronic CoreValve Evolut PRO+ System^{TM†} (design iteration)	•	08/19	P130021/S059
Medtronic EvolutTM FX System (design iteration)	•	08/21	P130021/S091
Expanded to include redo-transcatheter aortic valve replacement for patients at high risk for open-heart surgery	•	08/25	P130021/S174
LOTUS Edge ^{TM†} Valve System - Severe native aortic stenosis at high or greater risk for open surgical therapy See Note	Boston Scientific Corporation	04/19	P180029
Portico TM with FlexNav ^{TM†} Severe native aortic stenosis at high or greater risk for open surgical therapy	Abbott Medical	09/21	P190023
Navitor ^{TM†} Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation System with FlexNav ^{TM†} Severe native aortic stenosis at high or greater risk for open surgical therapy	Abbott Medical	10/23	P190023/S016
Trilogy ^{TM†} Transcatheter Heart Valve (THV) System Symptomatic, severe native aortic regurgitation (AR) in patients at high or greater risk for surgical aortic valve replacement (SAVR)	JenaValve Technology, Inc.	03/26	P250024

FDA: U.S. Food and Drug Administration: PMA: premarket approval.

Note: in January 2021, Boston Scientific Corporation announced a global, voluntary recall of all unused inventory of the LOTUS Edge^{TM†} Valve System due to complexities associated with the product delivery system. There are no safety concerns for patients who have the LOTUS Edge^{TM†} Valve System currently implanted. Boston Scientific has chosen to retire the entire LOTUS product

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

platform immediately rather than develop and reintroduce an enhanced delivery system. All related commercial, clinical, research and development, and manufacturing activities will cease.

Other transcatheter aortic valve systems are under development:

- J-Valve™† Transfemoral System (Edwards Lifesciences; formerly JC Medical); self-expanding valve designed for transfemoral delivery in patients with severe aortic regurgitation. The FDA granted breakthrough device designation to this system in August 2023.

In June 2017, the Sentinel®† Cerebral Protection System (Boston Scientific; previously Claret Medical, Inc.) was granted a de novo classification by the FDA (DEN160043; class II; product code: PUM). The Sentinel system is a temporary catheter indicated for use as an embolic protection device to capture and remove thrombus/debris while performing transcatheter aortic valve replacement procedures. The diameters of the arteries at the site of filter placement should be between 9 mm to 15 mm for the brachiocephalic and 6.5 mm to 10 mm in the left common carotid. The new classification applies to this device and substantially equivalent devices of this generic type.

On August 3, 2021, the FDA Circulatory System Devices Panel of the Medical Devices Advisory Committee met to discuss and make recommendations on the 510(k) submission for the TriGUARD 3™† Cerebral Embolic Protection Device (Keystone Heart). With the Sentinel system serving as the predicate device, the panel expressed that the proposed indications for use of the TriGUARD 3 device were not supported by the safety and effectiveness data from the REFLECT II trial. Previously, the TriGUARD 3 device was granted CE mark approval in Europe in March 2020.

Rationale/Source

This medical policy was developed through consideration of peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community, U.S. Food and Drug Administration approval status, nationally accepted standards of medical practice and accepted standards of medical practice in this community, technology evaluation centers, reference to regulations, other plan medical policies, and accredited national guidelines.

Aortic stenosis is narrowing of the aortic valve opening, resulting in obstruction of blood flow from the left ventricle into the ascending aorta. Patients with untreated, symptomatic severe aortic stenosis have a poor prognosis. Valve replacement is an effective treatment for severe aortic stenosis. Transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI), also known as transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR), is being evaluated as an alternative to open surgery for patients with aortic stenosis and to nonsurgical therapy for patients with a prohibitive risk for surgery.

Summary of Evidence

For individuals who have severe symptomatic aortic stenosis who are at prohibitive risk for open surgery who receive transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI), the evidence includes a randomized controlled trial (RCT) comparing TAVI with medical management in individuals at prohibitive risk of surgery, a single-arm prospective trial, multiple case series, and multiple systematic reviews. Relevant outcomes are overall survival (OS), symptoms, morbid events, and treatment-

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

related mortality and morbidity. For patients who are not surgical candidates due to excessive surgical risk, the Placement of AoRTic TraNscathetER Valve Trial Edwards SAPIEN Transcatheter Heart Valve (PARTNER B) trial reported on results for patients treated with TAVI by the transfemoral approach compared with continued medical care with or without balloon valvuloplasty. There was a large decrease in mortality for the TAVI patients at 1 year compared with medical care. This trial also reported improvements in other relevant clinical outcomes for the TAVI group. There was an increased risk of stroke and vascular complications in the TAVI group. Despite these concerns, the overall balance of benefits and risks from this trial indicate that health outcomes are improved. For patients who are not surgical candidates, no randomized trials have compared the self-expandable valve with best medical therapy. However, results from the single-arm CoreValve Extreme Risk Pivotal Trial met trialists' prespecified objective performance goal. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have severe symptomatic aortic stenosis who are at high-risk for open surgery who receive TAVI, the evidence includes 2 RCTs comparing TAVI with surgical repair in individuals at high-risk for surgery and 1 RCT comparing 2 types of valves, multiple nonrandomized comparative studies, and systematic reviews of these studies. Relevant outcomes are OS, symptoms, morbid events, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. For patients who are high-risk for open surgery and are surgical candidates, the PARTNER A trial reported noninferiority for survival at 1 year for the balloon-expandable valve compared with open surgery. In this trial, TAVI patients also had higher risks for stroke and vascular complications. Nonrandomized comparative studies of TAVI versus open surgery in high-risk patients have reported no major differences in rates of mortality or stroke between the 2 procedures. Since the publication of the PARTNER A trial, the CoreValve High Risk Trial demonstrated noninferiority for survival at 1 and 2 years for the self-expanding prosthesis. This trial reported no significant differences in stroke rates between groups. An RCT directly comparing the Portico valve with other United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved valves found an increase in safety outcomes with Portico at 30 days but no major differences at 2 years. Gender-specific meta-analyses have found improved mortality with TAVI compared with surgical aortic valve replacement (SAVR) in women. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have severe symptomatic aortic stenosis who are at intermediate-risk for open surgery who receive TAVI, the evidence includes 4 RCTs comparing TAVI with surgical repair including individuals at intermediate surgical risk, 2 RCTs only in patients with intermediate-risk, and multiple systematic reviews and nonrandomized cohort studies. Relevant outcomes are OS, symptoms, morbid events, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Five RCTs have evaluated TAVI in patients with intermediate-risk for open surgery. Four of them, which included over 4000 patients combined, reported noninferiority of TAVI versus SAVR for their composite outcome measures (generally including death and stroke). A subset analysis of patients (n=383) with low and intermediate surgical risk from a fourth trial reported higher rates of death at 2 years for TAVI versus SAVR. The final study (N=70) had an unclear hypothesis and reported 30-day mortality rates favoring SAVR (15% vs. 2% ; p=.07) but used a transthoracic approach. The rates of adverse events differed between groups, with bleeding, cardiogenic shock, and acute kidney injury higher in patients randomized to open surgery and permanent pacemaker requirement higher in patients randomized to TAVI. Subgroup

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

analyses of meta-analyses and the transthoracic arm of the Leon et al (2010) RCT have suggested that the benefit of TAVI may be limited to patients who are candidates for transfemoral access. Although several RCTs have 2 years of follow-up post procedure, it is uncertain how many individuals require reoperation. An individual participant data meta-analysis of 4 investigator-initiated RCTs and an aggregate-data meta-analysis of 8 RCTs in low- to intermediate-risk patients both demonstrated lower risk of the 1-year composite of death or stroke with TAVI compared with SAVR. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have severe symptomatic aortic stenosis who are at low-risk for open surgery who receive TAVI, the evidence includes RCTs comparing TAVI with surgical repair or surveillance alone in individuals selected without specific surgical risk criteria but including patients at low surgical risk and RCTs enrolling only low surgical risk patients, systematic reviews, and nonrandomized cohort studies. Relevant outcomes are OS, symptoms, morbid events, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Four RCTs (Evolut Low Risk Trial, NOTION-2, EARLY TAVR, and the Study to Establish the Safety and Effectiveness of the SAPIEN 3 Transcatheter Heart Valve in Low Risk Patients Who Have Severe, Calcific, Aortic Stenosis Requiring Aortic Valve Replacement [PARTNER 3]) have been conducted exclusively in patients at low surgical risk and 1 RCT, Nordic Aortic Intervention Trial included predominantly patients at low surgical risk. In the Evolut Low Risk Trial, transcatheter aortic valve replacement was noninferior to SAVR with respect to the composite outcome of death or disabling stroke at 24 months. At 6 years, the composite outcome remained similar between groups, but cumulative reintervention at 7 years was higher with TAVI, driven by reintervention for regurgitation rather than stenosis. In the PARTNER 3 trial, the rate of the composite of death, stroke, or rehospitalization at 1 year was significantly lower with TAVI than SAVR. At 5 years, mild or greater aortic regurgitation was more common after TAVI than SAVR, and at 7 years there were no significant differences between groups in the composite outcome. In the Nordic Aortic Intervention Trial, the risk of the composite outcome of death from any cause, stroke, or myocardial infarction at 5 years was similar for TAVI and SAVR and transcatheter aortic valve replacement showed less structural valve deterioration than SAVR at 10 years. In the publicly sponsored UK TAVI trial, which was conducted in patients aged 70 years or older with predominantly low surgical risk, TAVI was noninferior to SAVR with respect to all-cause mortality at 1 year. The NOTION-2 trial found no significant difference between TAVI and SAVR groups in the composite primary outcome of death, stroke, or valve-related rehospitalization at 1 year. TAVI was associated with lower risks of bleeding and atrial fibrillation but higher rates of pacemaker implantation, non-disabling stroke, and paravalvular regurgitation. At 3 years, the composite primary endpoint was similar between groups overall and among patients with tricuspid aortic stenosis, but numerically higher with TAVI among patients with bicuspid aortic stenosis. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have valve dysfunction and aortic stenosis or regurgitation after open surgical aortic valve repair who receive transcatheter aortic ViV implantation, the evidence includes observational studies including registry data with follow-up ranging from 1 month to 5 years and systematic reviews. Relevant outcomes are OS, symptoms, morbid events, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Recent meta-analyses of observational studies have compared ViV TAVI to rSAVR and have reported a reduced risk of short-term mortality (<30 days) with ViV TAVI. Beyond

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

30 days, meta-analyses have reported conflicting mortality outcomes, with some favoring ViV TAVI, others favoring rSAVR, and others showing no significant difference between the two treatments. Two propensity-matched cohort analyses reported a late-mortality signal favoring rSAVR, with equivalent mortality through 2 years but higher mortality with ViV TAVI thereafter, and significantly better 5-year survival with rSAVR, which persisted across Charlson comorbidity strata. The PARTNER 2 registry reported a 50.6% rate of all-cause mortality after 5 years among patients with high surgical risk; patients who received a 23-mm SAPIEN XT valve had a significantly higher risk of mortality compared to those who received a 26-mm valve (HR, 1.55; 95% CI, 1.09 to 2.20; $p=.01$). The CorHealth Ontario Cardiac Registry reported that at 5 years after treatment, patients who underwent ViV TAVI had greater OS than patients who underwent rSAVR in a matched cohort of patients (absolute risk difference, -7.5%; 95% CI, -12.6% to -2.3%). An analysis using the Danish National Patient Registry data reported that ViV TAVI had similar mortality and rehospitalization rates compared to native valve TAVI at 1 and 5 years follow-up. Given that no RCTs are available, selection bias cannot be ruled out. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have severe asymptomatic aortic stenosis who are at low-risk for open surgery who receive TAVI, the evidence includes 1 RCT comparing early TAVI with guideline-recommended clinical surveillance. Relevant outcomes are OS, symptoms, morbid events, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. The Evaluation of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement Compared to Surveillance for Patients With Asymptomatic Severe Aortic Stenosis (EARLY TAVR) trial randomized 901 low-surgical-risk patients ≥ 65 years of age with preserved left ventricular ejection fraction to early TAVI or clinical surveillance. Early TAVI was superior to clinical surveillance with respect to the composite of death from any cause, stroke, or unplanned cardiovascular hospitalization at a median follow-up of 3.8 years. The composite benefit was driven primarily by a reduction in unplanned cardiovascular hospitalization, with no difference in stroke or all-cause mortality. Notably, 105 of the 186 unplanned cardiovascular hospitalizations in the surveillance group were conversions to aortic valve replacement within 6 months of randomization, which counted as composite endpoint events. Patient-reported quality of life and echocardiographic measures of left ventricular and left atrial structure and function at 2 years also favored early intervention. Because nearly all surveillance patients ultimately required AVR, the comparison focuses on the optimal timing of intervention rather than on whether to intervene. Generalizability is limited by enrollment restricted to patients ≥ 65 years with preserved LVEF, use of balloon-expandable valves only, and a predominantly White cohort. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have symptomatic aortic stenosis who receive a cerebral embolic protection (CEP) device while undergoing TAVI, the evidence includes 2 meta-analyses and 5 RCTs of patients with low- to high-risk for open surgery. Relevant outcomes are OS, symptoms, morbid events, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. One meta-analysis found that patients with CEP had a lower rate of major adverse cardiac events, mortality, and stroke than patients with no CEP at 30 days post-TAVI; no differences were noted in the rate of vascular complications, acute kidney injury, or major life-threatening bleeding. The other meta-analysis, which didn't include observational evidence, found no significant differences in the rate of stroke, disabling stroke, or all-cause mortality when comparing

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

outcomes between CEP and non-CEP TAVI. Three RCTs have primarily focused on the number and/or volume of new brain lesions detected on magnetic resonance imaging with unclear correlations to neurocognitive outcomes. Only 1 of these trials (CLEAN-TAVI) found a significant reduction in brain lesion number; however, the relevance of this trial is limited as it used a precursor to the currently marketed Sentinel device. The PROTECTED TAVR trial, enrolled 3000 patients and found the incidence of stroke within 72 hours post-TAVI or before hospital discharge, was not significantly different between CEP and control groups. The largest RCT to date evaluating CEP during TAVI enrolled 7635 participants and found that routine use of the Sentinel device did not reduce the incidence of stroke within 72 hours or before hospital discharge compared to TAVI without CEP; secondary outcomes, including disabling stroke and all-cause mortality, were similar between groups, with no differences in overall complication rates. Prior trials have generally failed to demonstrate neurocognitive protection or significant reductions in major cardiac and cerebrovascular events. Studies have not stratified results by operative risk levels and have suggested differential benefits based on valve type. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Supplemental Information

Clinical Input From Physician Specialty Societies and Academic Medical Centers

While the various physician specialty societies and academic medical centers may collaborate with and make recommendations during this process, through the provision of appropriate reviewers, input received does not represent an endorsement or position statement by the physician specialty societies or academic medical centers, unless otherwise noted.

2024 Input

Clinical input was sought to help determine whether the use of transcatheter aortic valve-in-valve (ViV) implantation for individuals who have valve dysfunction and aortic stenosis or regurgitation after open surgical aortic valve repair provides a clinically meaningful improvement in net health outcome and whether the use is consistent with generally accepted medical practice. In response to requests, clinical input was received from 4 respondents, including: 3 physician-level responses with academic affiliations identified by specialty medical societies and 1 physician-level response identified by an academic health system.

For individuals with valve dysfunction and aortic stenosis or regurgitation after open surgical aortic valve repair, clinical input provides consistent support that the use of transcatheter ViV implantation provides a clinically meaningful improvement in the net health outcome and is consistent with generally accepted medical practice.

The following patient selection criteria for transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) with a transcatheter heart valve system approved for use for repair of a degenerated bioprosthetic valve (ViV) were informed by clinical input and the published evidence:

- Failure (stenosed, insufficient, or combined) of a surgical bioprosthetic aortic valve; AND
- New York Heart Association heart failure class II, III, or IV symptoms; AND

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

- Individual is not an operable candidate for open surgery, as documented by at least 2 cardiovascular specialists (including a cardiac surgeon); OR
- Individual is an operable candidate but is considered at increased surgical risk for open surgery, as documented by at least 2 cardiovascular specialists (including a cardiac surgeon; see Policy Guidelines section); OR
- Individual is considered at increased surgical risk for open surgery (eg, repeat sternotomy) due to a history of congenital vascular anomalies AND/OR has a complex intrathoracic surgical history, as documented by at least 2 cardiovascular specialists (including a cardiac surgeon).

Respondents noted that there are certain technical impediments that may increase the risk of redo surgical aortic valve replacement (rSAVR) that are not captured by STS risk score, including porcelain aorta, prior mediastinal surgeries, patent bypass grafts, or a particularly adherent left internal mammary artery. Additionally, elderly individuals that do not meet high-risk criteria can benefit from the early recovery offered by TAVR. Clinical input also emphasized that there is unlikely to be equipoise for randomization of patients with structural bioprosthetic valve degeneration to aortic valve replacement via any modality versus conservative therapy.

2016 Input

In response to requests, input was received from 2 specialty societies (1 of which provided 2 responses) and 2 academic medical centers (1 of which provided 3 responses) while this policy was under review in 2016. Although there was no support for the use of ViV transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI) to replace a failed bioprosthetic valve in general use, there was general support for the use of ViV TAVI for patients at high and prohibitive risk for surgery.

2014 Input

In response to requests, input was received from 2 specialty societies (1 of which provided 2 responses) and 6 academic medical centers while this policy was under review in 2014. All reviewers who responded considered TAVI medically necessary for patients with severe aortic stenosis with a calcified aortic annulus and New York Heart Association functional class II, III, or IV symptoms, and who are not candidates for open surgery or who are operable candidates but are at high-risk for open surgery. Most reviewers would require a patient to have a left ventricular ejection fraction greater than 20% for the procedure to be medically necessary. All reviewers indicated support for limiting the use of TAVI to patients who are not candidates for open surgery or who are operable candidates but are at high-risk for open surgery, and most supported using the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) definition of high-risk and extreme risk for surgery. Most reviewers noted that self-expanding valves have been associated with higher rates of post procedural pacemaker requirements but that neither type of valve was clearly superior to the other.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

Guidelines or position statements will be considered for inclusion in ‘Supplemental Information’ if they were issued by, or jointly by, a US professional society, an international society with US representation, or National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Priority will be given

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

to guidelines that are informed by a systematic review, include strength of evidence ratings, and include a description of management of conflict of interest.

American College of Cardiology and American Heart Association

In 2014, the American College of Cardiology and the American Heart Association published joint guidelines on the management of valvular heart disease. Both groups issued a joint focused update in 2017. In 2020, a new full guideline was published that replaces the 2014 revision and 2017 focused update. The 2020 guidelines made the following recommendations on timing of intervention and choice of surgical or transcatheter intervention for treatment of aortic stenosis (Table 2).

Additionally, the guidelines state the following:

- "Treatment of severe aortic stenosis with either a transcatheter or surgical valve prosthesis should be based primarily on symptoms or reduced ventricular systolic function. Earlier intervention may be considered if indicated by results of exercise testing, biomarkers, rapid progression, or the presence of very severe stenosis."
- "Indications for TAVI are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of TAVI versus surgical aortic valve replacement. The choice of type of intervention for a patient with severe aortic stenosis should be a shared decision-making process that considers the lifetime risks and benefits associated with type of valve (mechanical versus bioprosthetic) and type of approach (transcatheter versus surgical)."

Table 2. Recommendations on Surgical or Transcatheter Intervention for Aortic Stenosis

Recommendation	COR	LOE
<i>Timing of Intervention of AS</i>		
"In adults with severe high-gradient AS (Stage D1) and symptoms of exertional dyspnea, HF, angina, syncope, or presyncope by history or on exercise testing, AVR is indicated."	I	A
"In asymptomatic patients with severe AS and a left ventricular ejection fraction <50% (Stage C2), AVR is indicated."	I	B
"In asymptomatic patients with severe AS (Stage C1) who are undergoing cardiac surgery for other indications, AVR is indicated."	I	B
"In symptomatic patients with low-flow, low-gradient severe AS with reduced left ventricular ejection fraction (Stage D2), AVR is recommended."	I	B
"In symptomatic patients with low-flow, low-gradient severe AS with reduced left ventricular ejection fraction (Stage D3), AVR is recommended if AS is the most likely cause of symptoms."	I	B
"In apparently asymptomatic patients with severe AS (Stage C1) and low surgical risk, AVR is reasonable when an exercise test demonstrates decreased exercise tolerance (normalized for age and sex) or a fall in systolic blood pressure of ≥ 10 mmHg from baseline to peak exercise."	IIa	B

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

"In asymptomatic patients with very severe AS (defined as an aortic velocity of ≥ 5 m/s) and low surgical risk, AVR is reasonable."	IIa	B
"In apparently asymptomatic patients with severe AS (Stage C1) and low surgical risk, AVR is reasonable when the serum B-type natriuretic peptide level is >3 times normal."	IIa	B
"In asymptomatic patients with high-gradient severe AS (Stage C1) and low surgical risk, AVR is reasonable when serial testing shows an increase in aortic velocity ≥ 0.3 m/s per year."	IIa	B
"In asymptomatic patients with severe high-gradient AS (Stage C1) and a progressive decrease in left ventricular ejection fraction on at least 3 serial imaging studies to $<60\%$, AVR may be considered."	IIb	B
"In patients with moderate AS (Stage B) who are undergoing cardiac surgery for other indications, AVR may be considered."	IIb	C
<i>Choice of SAVR Versus TAVI for Patients for Whom a Bioprosthetic AVR is Appropriate</i>		
"For symptomatic and asymptomatic patients with severe AS and any indication for AVR who are <65 years of age or have a life expectancy >20 years, SAVR is recommended."	I	A
"For symptomatic patients with severe AS who are 65 to 80 years of age and have no anatomic contraindication to transfemoral TAVI, either SAVR or transfemoral TAVI is recommended after shared decision-making about the balance between expected patient longevity and valve durability."	I	A
"For symptomatic patients with severe AS who are >80 years of age or for younger patients with a life expectancy of <10 years and no anatomic contraindication to transfemoral TAVI, transfemoral TAVI is recommended in preference to SAVR."	I	A
"In asymptomatic patients with severe AS and a left ventricular ejection fraction $<50\%$ who are ≤ 80 years of age and have no anatomic contraindication to transfemoral TAVI, the decision between TAVI and SAVR should follow the same recommendations as for symptomatic patients in the 3 recommendations above."	I	B
"For asymptomatic patients with severe AS and an abnormal exercise test, very severe AS, rapid progression, or an elevated B-type natriuretic peptide, SAVR is recommended in preference to TAVI."	I	B
"For patients with an indication for AVR for whom a bioprosthetic valve is preferred but valve or vascular anatomy or other factors are not suitable for transfemoral TAVI, SAVR is recommended."	I	A
"For symptomatic patients of any age with severe AS and a high or prohibitive surgical risk, TAVI is recommended if predicted post-TAVI survival is >12 months with an acceptable quality of life."	I	A

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

"For symptomatic patients with severe AS for whom predicted post-TAVI or post-SAVR survival is <12 months or for whom minimal improvement in quality of life is expected, palliative care is recommended after shared decision-making, including discussion of patient preferences and values."	I	C
"In critically ill patients with severe AS, percutaneous aortic balloon dilation may be considered as a bridge to SAVR or TAVI."	IIb	C
<i>Intervention for Prosthetic Valve Stenosis</i>		
"In patients with symptomatic severe stenosis of a bioprosthetic or mechanical prosthetic valve, repeat surgical intervention is indicated unless surgical risk is prohibitive."	I	B
"For severely symptomatic patients with bioprosthetic aortic valve stenosis and high or prohibitive surgical risk, a transcatheter ViV procedure is reasonable when performed at a Comprehensive Valve Center."	IIa	B
"For patients with significant bioprosthetic valve stenosis attributable to suspected or documented valve thrombosis, oral anticoagulation with a VKA is reasonable."	IIa	B
<i>Prosthetic Valve Regurgitation</i>		
"In patients with intractable hemolysis or HF attributable to prosthetic transvalvular or paravalvular leak, surgery is recommended unless surgical risk is high or prohibitive."	I	B
"In asymptomatic patients with severe prosthetic regurgitation and low operative risk, surgery is reasonable."	IIa	B
"In patients with prosthetic paravalvular regurgitation with the following: 1) either intractable hemolysis or NYHA class III or IV symptoms and 2) who are at high or prohibitive surgical risk and 3) have anatomic features suitable for catheter-based therapy, percutaneous repair of paravalvular leak is reasonable when performed at a Comprehensive Valve Center."	IIa	B
"For patients with severe HF symptoms caused by bioprosthetic valve regurgitation who are at high to prohibitive surgical risk, a transcatheter ViV procedure is reasonable when performed at a Comprehensive Valve Center."	IIa	B

AS: aortic stenosis; AVR: aortic valve replacement; COR: class of recommendation; HR: heart failure; LOE: level of evidence; SAVR: surgical aortic valve replacement; TAVI: transcatheter aortic valve implantation; ViV: valve-in-valve; VKA: vitamin K antagonist; NYHA: New York Heart Association.

European Society of Cardiology and European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery

In August 2025, the European Society of Cardiology and the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery published joint updated guidelines on the management of valvular heart disease, replacing the 2021 ESC/EACTS guideline. The 2025 guidelines made the following

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

recommendations on intervention and mode of intervention in severe AS (Table 3). Among the new recommendations introduced in this update, the guidelines state:

"Intervention should be considered in asymptomatic patients (confirmed by a normal exercise test, if feasible) with severe, high-gradient AS and LVEF $\geq 50\%$, as an alternative to close active surveillance, if the procedural risk is low." (COR IIa, LOE A)

"TAVI may be considered for the treatment of severe BAV stenosis in patients at increased surgical risk, if the anatomy is suitable." (COR IIb, LOE B)

Table 3. ESC/EACTS Recommendations on Indications for Intervention and Mode of Intervention in Severe Aortic Stenosis

Recommendation	COR	LOE
Symptomatic patients with severe aortic stenosis		
Intervention is recommended in symptomatic patients with severe, high-gradient AS [mean gradient ≥ 40 mmHg, $V_{\text{max}} \geq 4.0$ m/s, and $AVA \leq 1.0$ cm ² (or ≤ 0.6 cm ² /m ² BSA)].	I	B
Intervention is recommended in symptomatic patients with low-flow ($SV_i \leq 35$ mL/m ²), low-gradient (< 40 mmHg) AS with reduced LVEF ($< 50\%$) after careful confirmation that AS is severe.	I	B
Intervention should be considered in symptomatic patients with low-flow ($SV_i \leq 35$ mL/m ²), low-gradient (< 40 mmHg) AS with normal LVEF ($\geq 50\%$) after careful confirmation that AS is severe.	IIa	B
Asymptomatic patients with severe aortic stenosis		
Intervention is recommended in asymptomatic patients with severe AS and LVEF $< 50\%$ without another cause.	I	B
Intervention should be considered in asymptomatic patients (confirmed by a normal exercise test, if feasible) with severe, high-gradient AS and LVEF $\geq 50\%$ as an alternative to close active surveillance, if the procedural risk is low.	IIa	A
Intervention should be considered in asymptomatic patients with severe AS and LVEF $\geq 50\%$ if the procedural risk is low and one of the following parameters is present: Very severe AS (mean gradient ≥ 60 mmHg or $V_{\text{max}} > 5.0$ m/s); Severe valve calcification (ideally assessed by CCT) and V_{max} progression ≥ 0.3 m/s/year; Markedly elevated BNP/NT-proBNP levels (more than three times age- and sex-corrected normal range, confirmed on repeated measurement without other explanation); LVEF $< 55\%$ without another cause.	IIa	B
Intervention should be considered in asymptomatic patients with severe AS and a sustained fall in BP (> 20 mmHg) during exercise testing.	IIa	C
Mode of intervention		
It is recommended that AV interventions are performed in Heart Valve Centres that report their local expertise and outcome data, have on-site	I	C

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

interventional cardiology and cardiac surgical programmes, and a structured collaborative Heart Team.		
It is recommended that the mode of intervention is based on Heart Team assessment of individual clinical, anatomical, and procedural characteristics, incorporating lifetime management considerations and estimated life expectancy.	I	C
TAVI is recommended in patients ≥ 70 years of age with tricuspid AV stenosis, if the anatomy is suitable.	I	A
SAVR is recommended in patients < 70 years of age, if the surgical risk is low.	I	B
SAVR or TAVI are recommended for all remaining candidates for an aortic BHV according to Heart Team assessment.	I	B
Non-transfemoral TAVI should be considered in patients who are unsuitable for surgery and transfemoral access.	IIa	B
TAVI may be considered for the treatment of severe BAV stenosis in patients at increased surgical risk, if the anatomy is suitable.	IIb	B
Balloon aortic valvotomy may be considered as a bridge to SAVR or TAVI in haemodynamically unstable patients, and (if feasible) in those with severe AS who require urgent high-risk NCS.	IIb	C

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

In June 2019, the NICE published interventional procedures guidance [IPG653] regarding ViV TAVI for aortic bioprosthetic valve dysfunction. The guidance was informed by an Interventional procedure overview described previously. The guidance recommendation is that "Current evidence on the safety and efficacy of valve-in-valve transcatheter aortic valve implantation (ViV-TAVI) for aortic bioprosthetic dysfunction is adequate to support the use of this procedure provided that standard arrangements are in place for clinical governance, consent and audit."

In November 2021, the NICE updated their guidance on heart valve disease. They recommend patients be offered TAVI if surgical aortic valve replacement (SAVR) is contraindicated or the patient is at high surgical risk.

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

Not applicable.

Medicare National Coverage

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services published a decision memo on the use of TAVR in 2012 and 2019. The 2019 memo indicated that the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services covers TAVI when used according to FDA indications when the following conditions are met:

- Device has FDA approval.
- The patient (preoperatively and postoperatively) is under the care of a heart team including an experienced cardiac surgeon and interventional cardiologist, who have independently examined the patient, as well as providers from other physician groups, advanced patient practitioners, nurses, research personnel, and administrators.

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

- The interventional cardiologist(s) and cardiac surgeon(s) jointly participate in the intra-operative technical aspects of TAVR.
- The hospital meets qualifications for performing TAVR.
- The heart team and hospital are participating in a prospective, national, audited registry that follows patients for at least 1 year and collects specific patient, practitioner, and facility level outcomes.
- The registry collects necessary data and has an analysis plan to address specific questions and results are reported publicly.

The memo also stated that TAVR could be covered for non-FDA-approved indications under the Coverage with Evidence Development program. The following is a summary of the main conditions required for Coverage with Evidence Development:

- The interventional cardiologist(s) and cardiac surgeon(s) jointly participate in the intra-operative technical aspects of TAVR.

TAVR is performed within a clinical study that has the following characteristics:

- “The clinical study must adhere to the ... standards of scientific integrity and relevance to the Medicare population.”
- The study must address quality of life and adverse events at follow-up periods of 1 year or longer.

The decision memo does not address concurrent use of a cerebral embolic protection device.

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services opened a National Coverage Analysis (CAG-00430R2) on December 15, 2025 to reconsider the TAVR NCD, particularly for asymptomatic patients with an expected completion in September 2026.

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials

Some currently ongoing trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 4.

Table 4. Summary of Key Trials

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
<i>Ongoing</i>			
NCT03972644	Danish National Randomized Study on Early Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients With Asymptomatic Severe Aortic Stenosis	1700	Sep 2029
NCT04204915	A Randomized Controlled Trial of Early Valve Replacement in Severe Asymptomatic Aortic Stenosis	2844	Apr 2031

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
NCT05172960 ^a	ALLIANCE: Safety and Effectiveness of Balloon-Expandable Bioprosthetic SAPIEN X4 Transcatheter Heart Valve	915	Dec 2034
NCT05172973 ^a	ALLIANCE AVIV: Safety and Effectiveness of Balloon-Expandable Bioprosthetic SAPIEN X4 Transcatheter Heart Valve in Failing Aortic Bioprosthetic Valves	200	Feb 2036
NCT05932615 ^a	ENVISION: Evaluation of the Navitor Transcatheter Heart Valve in Low and Intermediate Risk Patients Who Have Severe, Symptomatic, Aortic Stenosis Requiring Aortic Valve Replacement	1500	Apr 2036
NCT05149755 ^a	Evolut EXPAND TAVR II Pivotal Trial	650	Dec 2034
NCT07278310	STAR Trial (Siegel Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients With Symptomatic Severe Aortic Stenosis)	1025	Apr 2028
NCT07343674	PERFECT - Portuguese Evolut Registry Studying the Outcomes of Medtronic Evolut ^{TM†} FX+ TAVI System by Evaluating an Optimal Care Pathway for TAVI	500	Apr 2028
NCT06924151	The Prospective, Randomized, Controlled, Multi-center Study to Establish the Safety and Effectiveness of Isolated Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Low Risk Patients Who Have Symptomatic Severe Aortic Stenosis	800	May 2037
NCT06597188	Comparison of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement with Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement: a Prospective, Multicenter, International, Randomized Controlled, Non-inferiority Study for Bicuspid Aortic Valve Stenosis (PROMIS-BAV)	452	Sep 2032
NCT06818084	Transcatheter Treatment of Pure Aortic Regurgitation with VitaFlow Liberty System: a Prospective, Multicenter Study	120	Nov 2027
NCT06861361	Surgical Bioprosthesis Aortic Valve Replacement Vs. Myval Balloon-Expandable THV Series in Patients Aged 65 to 75 with Symptomatic Severe Aortic Stenosis Judged Eligible by Heart Team	1180	Nov 2031

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
NCT06608823	A Study to Assess Safety and Effectiveness of the JenaValve Trilogy™‡ Transcatheter Heart Valve System Versus Surgical Valve Replacement in Patients with Aortic Regurgitation	1016	Feb 2036
NCT06777368	REdo transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement for Transcatheter aortic Valve failure	225	Jul 2033
NCT06557798	REdo Transcatheter Aortic VALVE Implantation for the Management of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Failure (REVALVE)	550	Mar 2033
NCT06817148	Bicuspid Aortic Valve Replacement: Evaluation of transcatheter Versus surgery-PILOT Trial	250	Feb 2037
NCT06257043	RECORD TAVR REGISTRY: Prospective, Multi-Center Registry of "Real World" Chinese Patients Undergoing Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement	3000	Jan 2034
NCT02701283	Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement With the Medtronic Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement System In Patients at Low Risk for Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement	2223	Jun 2029
NCT05261204	Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation Versus Standard Surgical Aortic Valve Operation for Aortic-Valve Stenosis in Patients at Risk to Severe Valve Obstruction.	1950	Dec 2025
NCT03042104 ^a	Evaluation of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement Compared to Surveillance for Patients with Asymptomatic Severe Aortic Stenosis	901	Mar 2032
NCT03112980	Randomized, Multi-Center, Event-Driven Trial of TAVI versus SAVR in Patients with Symptomatic Severe Aortic Valve Stenosis and Intermediate Risk of Mortality - DEDICATE	1417	Mar 2027
NCT01586910 ^a	Surgical Replacement and Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation (SURTAVI)	1746 (actual enrollment)	Nov 2026
NCT01057173	Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Implantation in Patients With Severe Aortic Valve Stenosis (NOTION)	280	Apr 2033

Policy # 00406
Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014
Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

NCT: national clinical trial.

^a Denotes industry-sponsored or cosponsored trial.

1. Carroll JD, Mack MJ, Vemulapalli S, et al. STS-ACC TVT Registry of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *Ann Thorac Surg*. Feb 2021; 111(2): 701-722. PMID 33213826
2. Kumar A, Sato K, Narayanswami J, et al. Current Society of Thoracic Surgeons Model Reclassifies Mortality Risk in Patients Undergoing Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv*. Sep 2018; 11(9): e006664. PMID 30354591
3. Freeman RV, Otto CM. Spectrum of calcific aortic valve disease: pathogenesis, disease progression, and treatment strategies. *Circulation*. Jun 21 2005; 111(24): 3316-26. PMID 15967862
4. Coeytaux RR, Williams JW, Gray RN, et al. Percutaneous heart valve replacement for aortic stenosis: state of the evidence. *Ann Intern Med*. Sep 07 2010; 153(5): 314-24. PMID 20679543
5. Lindroos M, Kupari M, Heikkilä J, et al. Prevalence of aortic valve abnormalities in the elderly: an echocardiographic study of a random population sample. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Apr 1993; 21(5): 1220-5. PMID 8459080

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

6. Bonow RO, Carabello BA, Kanu C, et al. ACC/AHA 2006 guidelines for the management of patients with valvular heart disease: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (writing committee to revise the 1998 Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Valvular Heart Disease): developed in collaboration with the Society of Cardiovascular Anesthesiologists: endorsed by the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions and the Society of Thoracic Surgeons. *Circulation*. Aug 01 2006; 114(5): e84-231. PMID 16880336
7. Iung B, Cachier A, Baron G, et al. Decision-making in elderly patients with severe aortic stenosis: why are so many denied surgery?. *Eur Heart J*. Dec 2005; 26(24): 2714-20. PMID 16141261
8. Lieberman EB, Bashore TM, Hermiller JB, et al. Balloon aortic valvuloplasty in adults: failure of procedure to improve long-term survival. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Nov 15 1995; 26(6): 1522-8. PMID 7594080
9. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). 24 Hour Summary of the Circulatory System Devices Panel Meeting - Keystone Heart, Ltd TriGUARD 3 Cerebral Embolic Protection Device. August 3, 2021; <https://www.fda.gov/media/151335/download>.
10. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). De Novo Classification Request for Sentinel Cerebral Protection System. September 19, 2016; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/reviews/DEN160043.pdf.
11. Aladin AI, Case BC, Wermers JP, et al. Overview of FDA Circulatory System Devices Panel virtual meeting on TriGUARD 3 cerebral embolic protection. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. May 2022; 99(6): 1789-1795. PMID 35084082
12. Spertus J, Peterson E, Conard MW, et al. Monitoring clinical changes in patients with heart failure: a comparison of methods. *Am Heart J*. Oct 2005; 150(4): 707-15. PMID 16209970
13. Figulla L, Neumann A, Figulla HR, et al. Transcatheter aortic valve implantation: evidence on safety and efficacy compared with medical therapy. A systematic review of current literature. *Clin Res Cardiol*. Apr 2011; 100(4): 265-76. PMID 21165626
14. Leon MB, Smith CR, Mack M, et al. Transcatheter aortic-valve implantation for aortic stenosis in patients who cannot undergo surgery. *N Engl J Med*. Oct 21 2010; 363(17): 1597-607. PMID 20961243
15. Reynolds MR, Magnuson EA, Lei Y, et al. Health-related quality of life after transcatheter aortic valve replacement in inoperable patients with severe aortic stenosis. *Circulation*. Nov 01 2011; 124(18): 1964-72. PMID 21969017
16. Makkar RR, Fontana GP, Jilaihawi H, et al. Transcatheter aortic-valve replacement for inoperable severe aortic stenosis. *N Engl J Med*. May 03 2012; 366(18): 1696-704. PMID 22443478
17. Svensson LG, Blackstone EH, Rajeswaran J, et al. Comprehensive analysis of mortality among patients undergoing TAVR: results of the PARTNER trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jul 15 2014; 64(2): 158-68. PMID 25011720
18. Kapadia SR, Tuzcu EM, Makkar RR, et al. Long-term outcomes of inoperable patients with aortic stenosis randomly assigned to transcatheter aortic valve replacement or standard therapy. *Circulation*. Oct 21 2014; 130(17): 1483-92. PMID 25205802

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

19. Webb JG, Doshi D, Mack MJ, et al. A Randomized Evaluation of the SAPIEN XT Transcatheter Heart Valve System in Patients With Aortic Stenosis Who Are Not Candidates for Surgery. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* Dec 21 2015; 8(14): 1797-806. PMID 26718510
20. Kapadia SR, Huded CP, Kodali SK, et al. Stroke After Surgical Versus Transfemoral Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement in the PARTNER Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Nov 13 2018; 72(20): 2415-2426. PMID 30442284
21. Huded CP, Arnold SV, Chhatriwalla AK, et al. Rehospitalization Events After Aortic Valve Replacement: Insights From the PARTNER Trial. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv.* Dec 2022; 15(12): e012195. PMID 36538580
22. Popma JJ, Adams DH, Reardon MJ, et al. Transcatheter aortic valve replacement using a self-expanding bioprosthesis in patients with severe aortic stenosis at extreme risk for surgery. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* May 20 2014; 63(19): 1972-81. PMID 24657695
23. Reardon MJ, Adams DH, Coselli JS, et al. Self-expanding transcatheter aortic valve replacement using alternative access sites in symptomatic patients with severe aortic stenosis deemed extreme risk of surgery. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* Dec 2014; 148(6): 2869-76.e1-7. PMID 25152474
24. Mack MJ, Brennan JM, Brindis R, et al. Outcomes following transcatheter aortic valve replacement in the United States. *JAMA.* Nov 20 2013; 310(19): 2069-77. PMID 24240934
25. Yakubov SJ, Adams DH, Watson DR, et al. 2-Year Outcomes After Iliofemoral Self-Expanding Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients With Severe Aortic Stenosis Deemed Extreme Risk for Surgery. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Sep 22 2015; 66(12): 1327-34. PMID 26383718
26. Baron SJ, Arnold SV, Reynolds MR, et al. Durability of quality of life benefits of transcatheter aortic valve replacement: Long-term results from the CoreValve US extreme risk trial. *Am Heart J.* Dec 2017; 194: 39-48. PMID 29223434
27. Arnold SV, Petrossian G, Reardon MJ, et al. Five-Year Clinical and Quality of Life Outcomes From the CoreValve US Pivotal Extreme Risk Trial. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv.* Jun 2021; 14(6): e010258. PMID 34092091
28. Osnabrugge RL, Arnold SV, Reynolds MR, et al. Health status after transcatheter aortic valve replacement in patients at extreme surgical risk: results from the CoreValve U.S. trial. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* Feb 2015; 8(2): 315-323. PMID 25700755
29. Linke A, Wenaweser P, Gerckens U, et al. Treatment of aortic stenosis with a self-expanding transcatheter valve: the International Multi-centre ADVANCE Study. *Eur Heart J.* Oct 07 2014; 35(38): 2672-84. PMID 24682842
30. Piazza N, Grube E, Gerckens U, et al. Procedural and 30-day outcomes following transcatheter aortic valve implantation using the third generation (18 Fr) corevalve revalving system: results from the multicentre, expanded evaluation registry 1-year following CE mark approval. *EuroIntervention.* Aug 2008; 4(2): 242-9. PMID 19110790
31. Rodés-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.* Mar 16 2010; 55(11): 1080-90. PMID 20096533
32. Zahn R, Gerckens U, Grube E, et al. Transcatheter aortic valve implantation: first results from a multi-centre real-world registry. *Eur Heart J.* Jan 2011; 32(2): 198-204. PMID 20864486

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

33. Tamburino C, Capodanno D, Ramondo A, et al. Incidence and predictors of early and late mortality after transcatheter aortic valve implantation in 663 patients with severe aortic stenosis. *Circulation*. Jan 25 2011; 123(3): 299-308. PMID 21220731
34. Puri R, Thiele H, Fichtlscherer S, et al. Five-Year Clinical Outcomes and Durability of a Self-Expanding Transcatheter Heart Valve With Intra-Annular Leaflets. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv*. Dec 2025; 18(12): e015430. PMID 41133305
35. Panoulas VF, Francis DP, Ruparelia N, et al. Female-specific survival advantage from transcatheter aortic valve implantation over surgical aortic valve replacement: Meta-analysis of the gender subgroups of randomised controlled trials including 3758 patients. *Int J Cardiol*. Jan 01 2018; 250: 66-72. PMID 29169764
36. Dagan M, Yeung T, Stehli J, et al. Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis With a Focus on Outcomes by Sex. *Heart Lung Circ*. Jan 2021; 30(1): 86-99. PMID 32732125
37. Villablanca PA, Mathew V, Thourani VH, et al. A meta-analysis and meta-regression of long-term outcomes of transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement for severe aortic stenosis. *Int J Cardiol*. Dec 15 2016; 225: 234-243. PMID 27732927
38. 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*. Jun 20 2015; 385(9986): 2477-84. PMID 25788234
39. Reardon MJ, Adams DH, Kleiman NS, et al. 2-Year Outcomes in Patients Undergoing Surgical or Self-Expanding Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jul 14 2015; 66(2): 113-21. PMID 26055947
40. Panchal HB, Ladia V, Desai S, et al. A meta-analysis of mortality and major adverse cardiovascular and cerebrovascular events following transcatheter aortic valve implantation versus surgical aortic valve replacement for severe aortic stenosis. *Am J Cardiol*. Sep 15 2013; 112(6): 850-60. PMID 23756547
41. Takagi H, Niwa M, Mizuno Y, et al. A meta-analysis of transcatheter aortic valve implantation versus surgical aortic valve replacement. *Ann Thorac Surg*. Aug 2013; 96(2): 513-9. PMID 23816417
42. Smith CR, Leon MB, Mack MJ, et al. Transcatheter versus surgical aortic-valve replacement in high-risk patients. *N Engl J Med*. Jun 09 2011; 364(23): 2187-98. PMID 21639811
43. Reynolds MR, Magnuson EA, Wang K, et al. Health-related quality of life after transcatheter or surgical aortic valve replacement in high-risk patients with severe aortic stenosis: results from the PARTNER (Placement of AoRTic TraNscathetER Valve) Trial (Cohort A). *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Aug 07 2012; 60(6): 548-58. PMID 22818074
44. G  n  reux P, Cohen DJ, Williams MR, et al. Bleeding complications after surgical aortic valve replacement compared with transcatheter aortic valve replacement: insights from the PARTNER I Trial (Placement of Aortic Transcatheter Valve). *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Mar 25 2014; 63(11): 1100-9. PMID 24291283
45. Adams DH, Popma JJ, Reardon MJ, et al. Transcatheter aortic-valve replacement with a self-expanding prosthesis. *N Engl J Med*. May 08 2014; 370(19): 1790-8. PMID 24678937

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

46. Deeb GM, Reardon MJ, Chetcuti S, et al. 3-Year Outcomes in High-Risk Patients Who Underwent Surgical or Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Jun 07 2016; 67(22): 2565-74. PMID 27050187
47. Zorn GL, Little SH, Tadros P, et al. Prosthesis-patient mismatch in high-risk patients with severe aortic stenosis: A randomized trial of a self-expanding prosthesis. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* Apr 2016; 151(4): 1014-22, 1023.e1-3. PMID 26614412
48. Arnold SV, Chinnakondepalli KM, Magnuson EA, et al. Five-Year Health Status After Self-expanding Transcatheter or Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in High-risk Patients With Severe Aortic Stenosis. *JAMA Cardiol.* Jan 01 2021; 6(1): 97-101. PMID 32997095
49. Conte JV, Hermiller J, Resar JR, et al. Complications After Self-expanding Transcatheter or Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement. *Semin Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* Autumn 2017; 29(3): 321-330. PMID 29195573
50. Gleason TG, Reardon MJ, Popma JJ, et al. 5-Year Outcomes of Self-Expanding Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in High-Risk Patients. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Dec 04 2018; 72(22): 2687-2696. PMID 30249462
51. Makkar RR, Cheng W, Waksman R, et al. Self-expanding intra-annular versus commercially available transcatheter heart valves in high and extreme risk patients with severe aortic stenosis (PORTICO IDE): a randomised, controlled, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet.* Sep 05 2020; 396(10252): 669-683. PMID 32593323
52. Muneretto C, Bisleri G, Moggi A, et al. Treating the patients in the 'grey-zone' with aortic valve disease: a comparison among conventional surgery, sutureless valves and transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg.* Jan 2015; 20(1): 90-5. PMID 25320140
53. Minutello RM, Wong SC, Swaminathan RV, et al. Costs and in-hospital outcomes of transcatheter aortic valve implantation versus surgical aortic valve replacement in commercial cases using a propensity score matched model. *Am J Cardiol.* May 15 2015; 115(10): 1443-7. PMID 25784513
54. Sedaghat A, Al-Rashid F, Sinning JM, et al. Outcome in TAVI patients with symptomatic aortic stenosis not fulfilling PARTNER study inclusion criteria. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* Nov 15 2015; 86(6): 1097-104. PMID 26032437
55. Arora S, Strassle PD, Ramm CJ, et al. Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients With Lower Surgical Risk Scores: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Early Outcomes. *Heart Lung Circ.* Aug 2017; 26(8): 840-845. PMID 28169084
56. Arora S, Vaidya SR, Strassle PD, et al. Meta-analysis of transfemoral TAVR versus surgical aortic valve replacement. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* Mar 01 2018; 91(4): 806-812. PMID 29068166
57. Garg A, Rao SV, Visveswaran G, et al. Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement Versus Surgical Valve Replacement in Low-Intermediate Surgical Risk Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Invasive Cardiol.* Jun 2017; 29(6): 209-216. PMID 28570236
58. Singh K, Carson K, Rashid MK, et al. Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation in Intermediate Surgical Risk Patients With Severe Aortic Stenosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Heart Lung Circ.* Feb 2018; 27(2): 227-234. PMID 28473216
59. Ando T, Takagi H, Grines CL. Transfemoral, transapical and transcatheter aortic valve implantation and surgical aortic valve replacement: a meta-analysis of direct and adjusted

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

- indirect comparisons of early and mid-term deaths. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg*. Sep 01 2017; 25(3): 484-492. PMID 28549125
60. Gozdek M, Raffa GM, Suwalski P, et al. Comparative performance of transcatheter aortic valve-in-valve implantation versus conventional surgical redo aortic valve replacement in patients with degenerated aortic valve bioprostheses: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg*. Mar 01 2018; 53(3): 495-504. PMID 29029105
 61. Khan SU, Lone AN, Saleem MA, et al. Transcatheter vs surgical aortic-valve replacement in low- to intermediate-surgical-risk candidates: A meta-analysis and systematic review. *Clin Cardiol*. Nov 2017; 40(11): 974-981. PMID 29168984
 62. Tam DY, Vo TX, Wijeyesundera HC, et al. Transcatheter vs Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement for Aortic Stenosis in Low-Intermediate Risk Patients: A Meta-analysis. *Can J Cardiol*. Sep 2017; 33(9): 1171-1179. PMID 28843328
 63. Witberg G, Lador A, Yahav D, et al. Transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement in patients at low surgical risk: A meta-analysis of randomized trials and propensity score matched observational studies. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. Aug 01 2018; 92(2): 408-416. PMID 29388308
 64. Ueshima D, Fovino LN, D'Amico G, et al. Transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement in low- and intermediate-risk patients: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Cardiovasc Interv Ther*. Jul 2019; 34(3): 216-225. PMID 30232711
 65. Levett JY, Windle SB, Filion KB, et al. Meta-Analysis of Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Low Surgical Risk Patients. *Am J Cardiol*. Apr 15 2020; 125(8): 1230-1238. PMID 32089249
 66. Vipparthy SC, Ravi V, Avula S, et al. Meta-Analysis of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients With Low Surgical Risk. *Am J Cardiol*. Feb 01 2020; 125(3): 459-468. PMID 31784051
 67. Anantha-Narayanan M, Kandasamy VV, Reddy YN, et al. Low-Risk Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement - An Updated Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Cardiovasc Revasc Med*. Apr 2020; 21(4): 441-452. PMID 31678116
 68. Kundu A, Sardar P, Malhotra R, et al. Cardiovascular Outcomes with Transcatheter vs. Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Low-Risk Patients: An Updated Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Cardiovasc Revasc Med*. Apr 2020; 21(4): 453-460. PMID 31669113
 69. Sá MP, Jacquemyn X, Van den Eynde J, et al. Midterm Survival of Low-Risk Patients Treated With Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement: Meta-Analysis of Reconstructed Time-to-Event Data. *J Am Heart Assoc*. Nov 07 2023; 12(21): e030012. PMID 37929669
 70. Lerman TT, Levi A, Kornowski R. Meta-analysis of short- and long-term clinical outcomes of the self-expanding Evolut R/pro valve versus the balloon-expandable Sapien 3 valve for transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Int J Cardiol*. Jan 15 2023; 371: 100-108. PMID 36130623
 71. Improta R, Di Pietro G, Kola N, et al. A Meta-Analysis of Short-Term Outcomes of TAVR versus SAVR in Bicuspid Aortic Valve Stenosis and TAVR Results in Different Bicuspid Valve Anatomies. *J Clin Med*. Nov 28 2023; 12(23). PMID 38068423
 72. Acconcia MC, Perrone MA, Sergi D, et al. Transcatheter aortic valve implantation results are not superimposable to surgery in patients with aortic stenosis at low surgical risk. *Cardiol J*. 2023; 30(4): 595-605. PMID 34622437

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

73. Park DY, An S, Kassab K, et al. Chronological comparison of TAVI and SAVR stratified to surgical risk: a systematic review, meta-analysis, and meta-regression. *Acta Cardiol.* Sep 2023; 78(7): 778-789. PMID 37294002
74. Ludwig S, Klimek M, Bay B, et al. Transcatheter or Surgical Treatment of Patients With Aortic Stenosis at Low to Intermediate Risk: An Individual Participant Data Meta-Analysis. *JAMA Cardiol.* Nov 01 2025; 10(11): 1175-1185. PMID 40884787
75. Kolkailah AA, Doukky R, Pelletier MP, et al. Cochrane corner: transcatheter aortic valve implantation versus surgical aortic valve replacement for severe aortic stenosis in people with low surgical risk. *Heart.* Jul 2020; 106(14): 1043-1045. PMID 32482670
76. Zhou Y, Wang Y, Wu Y, et al. Transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement in low to intermediate risk patients: A meta-analysis of randomized and observational studies. *Int J Cardiol.* Feb 01 2017; 228: 723-728. PMID 27886617
77. Thyregod HG, Steinbrüchel DA, Ihlemann N, et al. Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients With Severe Aortic Valve Stenosis: 1-Year Results From the All-Comers NOTION Randomized Clinical Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* May 26 2015; 65(20): 2184-94. PMID 25787196
78. Nielsen HH, Klaaborg KE, Nissen H, et al. A prospective, randomised trial of transapical transcatheter aortic valve implantation vs. surgical aortic valve replacement in operable elderly patients with aortic stenosis: the STACCATO trial. *EuroIntervention.* Jul 20 2012; 8(3): 383-9. PMID 22581299
79. Leon MB, Smith CR, Mack MJ, et al. Transcatheter or Surgical Aortic-Valve Replacement in Intermediate-Risk Patients. *N Engl J Med.* Apr 28 2016; 374(17): 1609-20. PMID 27040324
80. Kondur A, Briasoulis A, Palla M, et al. Meta-Analysis of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients With Severe Aortic Valve Stenosis. *Am J Cardiol.* Jan 15 2016; 117(2): 252-7. PMID 26639040
81. Tamburino C, Barbanti M, D'Errigo P, et al. 1-Year Outcomes After Transfemoral Transcatheter or Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement: Results From the Italian OBSERVANT Study. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Aug 18 2015; 66(7): 804-812. PMID 26271063
82. Siemieniuk RA, Agoritsas T, Manja V, et al. Transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement in patients with severe aortic stenosis at low and intermediate risk: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ.* Sep 28 2016; 354: i5130. PMID 27683246
83. Søndergaard L, Steinbrüchel DA, Ihlemann N, et al. Two-Year Outcomes in Patients With Severe Aortic Valve Stenosis Randomized to Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement: The All-Comers Nordic Aortic Valve Intervention Randomized Clinical Trial. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv.* Jun 2016; 9(6). PMID 27296202
84. Thyregod HGH, Ihlemann N, Jørgensen TH, et al. Five-Year Clinical and Echocardiographic Outcomes From the NOTION Randomized Clinical Trial in Patients at Lower Surgical Risk. *Circulation.* Jun 11 2019; 139(24): 2714-2723. PMID 30704298
85. Søndergaard L, Ihlemann N, Capodanno D, et al. Durability of Transcatheter and Surgical Bioprosthetic Aortic Valves in Patients at Lower Surgical Risk. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Feb 12 2019; 73(5): 546-553. PMID 30732707
86. Reardon MJ, Kleiman NS, Adams DH, et al. Outcomes in the Randomized CoreValve US Pivotal High Risk Trial in Patients With a Society of Thoracic Surgeons Risk Score of 7% or Less. *JAMA Cardiol.* Nov 01 2016; 1(8): 945-949. PMID 27541162

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

87. Reardon MJ, Van Mieghem NM, Popma JJ, et al. Surgical or Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement in Intermediate-Risk Patients. *N Engl J Med*. Apr 06 2017; 376(14): 1321-1331. PMID 28304219
88. Van Mieghem NM, Deeb GM, Søndergaard L, et al. Self-expanding Transcatheter vs Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Intermediate-Risk Patients: 5-Year Outcomes of the SURTAVI Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Cardiol*. Oct 01 2022; 7(10): 1000-1008. PMID 36001335
89. Popma JJ, Deeb GM, Yakubov SJ, et al. Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement with a Self-Expanding Valve in Low-Risk Patients. *N Engl J Med*. May 02 2019; 380(18): 1706-1715. PMID 30883053
90. Forrest JK, Deeb GM, Yakubov SJ, et al. 2-Year Outcomes After Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Low-Risk Patients. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Mar 08 2022; 79(9): 882-896. PMID 35241222
91. Forrest JK, Deeb GM, Yakubov SJ, et al. 3-Year Outcomes After Transcatheter or Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Low-Risk Patients With Aortic Stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. May 02 2023; 81(17): 1663-1674. PMID 36882136
92. Mack MJ, Leon MB, Thourani VH, et al. Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement with a Balloon-Expandable Valve in Low-Risk Patients. *N Engl J Med*. May 02 2019; 380(18): 1695-1705. PMID 30883058
93. Leon MB, Mack MJ, Hahn RT, et al. Outcomes 2 Years After Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients at Low Surgical Risk. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Mar 09 2021; 77(9): 1149-1161. PMID 33663731
94. Toff WD, Hildick-Smith D, Kovac J, et al. Effect of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation vs Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement on All-Cause Mortality in Patients With Aortic Stenosis: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. May 17 2022; 327(19): 1875-1887. PMID 35579641
95. Jørgensen TH, Thyregod HGH, Ihlemann N, et al. Eight-year outcomes for patients with aortic valve stenosis at low surgical risk randomized to transcatheter vs. surgical aortic valve replacement. *Eur Heart J*. Aug 07 2021; 42(30): 2912-2919. PMID 34179981
96. Blankenberg S, Seiffert M, Vonthein R, et al. Transcatheter or Surgical Treatment of Aortic-Valve Stenosis. *N Engl J Med*. May 02 2024; 390(17): 1572-1583. PMID 38588025
97. Thyregod HGH, Jørgensen TH, Ihlemann N, et al. Transcatheter or surgical aortic valve implantation: 10-year outcomes of the NOTION trial. *Eur Heart J*. Apr 01 2024; 45(13): 1116-1124. PMID 38321820
98. Bleiziffer S, Leuschner F, Rudolph TK, et al. Sex-specific outcomes after transcatheter or surgical treatment of aortic valve stenosis: the DEDICATE-DZHK6 trial. *Eur Heart J*. Mar 13 2026; 47(11): 1339-1353. PMID 40900118
99. Makkar RR, Thourani VH, Mack MJ, et al. Five-Year Outcomes of Transcatheter or Surgical Aortic-Valve Replacement. *N Engl J Med*. Feb 27 2020; 382(9): 799-809. PMID 31995682
100. Forrest JK, Yakubov SJ, Deeb GM, et al. 5-Year Outcomes After Transcatheter or Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Low-Risk Patients With Aortic Stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Apr 22 2025; 85(15): 1523-1532. PMID 40158212
101. Forrest JK, Yakubov SJ, Deeb GM, et al. Six-Year Outcomes After Transcatheter vs Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Low-Risk Patients With Aortic Stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jun 16 2026; 87(23): 3210-3221. PMID 41697183

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

102. Pibarot P, Salaun E, Dahou A, et al. Echocardiographic Results of Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Low-Risk Patients: The PARTNER 3 Trial. *Circulation*. May 12 2020; 141(19): 1527-1537. PMID 32272848
103. Shahim B, Malaisrie SC, George I, et al. Postoperative Atrial Fibrillation or Flutter Following Transcatheter or Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement: PARTNER 3 Trial. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. Jul 26 2021; 14(14): 1565-1574. PMID 34294398
104. Hahn RT, Ternacle J, Silva I, et al. 5-Year Echocardiographic Results of Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Low-Risk Patients. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging*. Jun 2025; 18(6): 625-640. PMID 40243974
105. Leon MB, Mack MJ, Pibarot P, et al. Transcatheter or Surgical Aortic-Valve Replacement in Low-Risk Patients at 7 Years. *N Engl J Med*. Feb 19 2026; 394(8): 773-783. PMID 41144631
106. Jørgensen TH, Savontaus M, Willemen Y, et al. Three-Year Follow-Up of the NOTION-2 Trial: TAVR Versus SAVR to Treat Younger Low-Risk Patients With Tricuspid or Bicuspid Aortic Stenosis. *Circulation*. Nov 11 2025; 152(19): 1326-1337. PMID 40884768
107. Généreux P, Schwartz A, Oldemeyer JB, et al. Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement for Asymptomatic Severe Aortic Stenosis. *N Engl J Med*. Jan 16 2025; 392(3): 217-227. PMID 39466903
108. Lindman BR, Pibarot P, Schwartz A, et al. Left Ventricular Health and TAVR Timing in Asymptomatic Severe Aortic Stenosis: Analysis From the EARLY TAVR Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Feb 03 2026; 87(4): 339-358. PMID 41128701
109. Comentale G, Ahmadi-Hadad A, Moldon HJ, et al. Transcatheter aortic valve implantation vs. surgery for failed bioprosthesis: a meta-analysis of over 20000 patients. *J Cardiovasc Med (Hagerstown)*. Mar 01 2025; 26(3): 153-166. PMID 39976067
110. Aedma SK, Khan N, Altamimi A, et al. Umbrella Meta-analysis Evaluating the Effectiveness of ViV-TAVI vs Redo SAVR. *SN Compr Clin Med*. Feb 26 2022; 4(63). DOI: 10.1007/s42399-022-01136-x.
111. Raschpichler M, de Waha S, Holzhey D, et al. Valve-in-Valve Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement Versus Redo Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement for Failed Surgical Aortic Bioprostheses: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Am Heart Assoc*. Dec 20 2022; 11(24): e7965. PMID 36533610
112. Sá MP, Van den Eynde J, Simonato M, et al. Late outcomes of valve-in-valve transcatheter aortic valve implantation versus re-replacement: Meta-analysis of reconstructed time-to-event data. *Int J Cardiol*. Jan 01 2023; 370: 112-121. PMID 36370873
113. National Institute For Health And Care Excellence (NICE). Valve-in-valve TAVI for aortic bioprosthetic valve dysfunction (Interventional procedures guidance [IPG653]). June 2019. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg653>.
114. Phan K, Zhao DF, Wang N, et al. Transcatheter valve-in-valve implantation versus reoperative conventional aortic valve replacement: a systematic review. *J Thorac Dis*. Jan 2016; 8(1): E83-93. PMID 26904259
115. Chen HL, Liu K. Clinical outcomes for transcatheter valve-in-valve in treating surgical bioprosthetic dysfunction: A meta-analysis. *Int J Cardiol*. Jun 01 2016; 212: 138-41. PMID 27038719
116. Tam DY, Vo TX, Wijesundera HC, et al. Transcatheter valve-in-valve versus redo surgical aortic valve replacement for the treatment of degenerated bioprosthetic aortic valve: A

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

- systematic review and meta-analysis. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* Dec 01 2018; 92(7): 1404-1411. PMID 30024102
117. Webb JG, Murdoch DJ, Alu MC, et al. 3-Year Outcomes After Valve-in-Valve Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement for Degenerated Bioprostheses: The PARTNER 2 Registry. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Jun 04 2019; 73(21): 2647-2655. PMID 31146808
 118. Hahn RT, Webb J, Pibarot P, et al. 5-Year Follow-Up From the PARTNER 2 Aortic Valve-in-Valve Registry for Degenerated Aortic Surgical Bioprostheses. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* Apr 11 2022; 15(7): 698-708. PMID 35393102
 119. Hirji SA, Percy ED, Zogg CK, et al. Comparison of in-hospital outcomes and readmissions for valve-in-valve transcatheter aortic valve replacement vs. reoperative surgical aortic valve replacement: a contemporary assessment of real-world outcomes. *Eur Heart J.* Aug 01 2020; 41(29): 2747-2755. PMID 32445575
 120. Kaneko T, Makkar RR, Krishnaswami A, et al. Valve-in-Surgical-Valve With SAPIEN 3 for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement Based on Society of Thoracic Surgeons Predicted Risk of Mortality. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv.* May 2021; 14(5): e010288. PMID 34003666
 121. Tam DY, Dharma C, Rocha RV, et al. Transcatheter ViV Versus Redo Surgical AVR for the Management of Failed Biological Prosthesis: Early and Late Outcomes in a Propensity-Matched Cohort. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* Mar 23 2020; 13(6): 765-774. PMID 31954671
 122. van Steenberg GJ, van Straten B, Lam KY, et al. Report on outcomes of valve-in-valve transcatheter aortic valve implantation and redo surgical aortic valve replacement in the Netherlands. *Neth Heart J.* Feb 2022; 30(2): 106-112. PMID 34373997
 123. Begun X, Butt JH, Kristensen SL, et al. Patient characteristics and long-term outcomes in patients undergoing transcatheter aortic valve implantation in a failed surgical prosthesis vs in a native valve: A Danish nationwide study. *Am Heart J.* Oct 2023; 264: 183-189. PMID 37178995
 124. Tran JH, Itagaki S, Zeng Q, et al. Transcatheter or Surgical Replacement for Failed Bioprosthetic Aortic Valves. *JAMA Cardiol.* Jul 01 2024; 9(7): 631-639. PMID 38776106
 125. Awtry J, Faggion Vinholo T, Cho M, et al. Redo Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement vs Valve-in-Valve Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement for Degenerated Bioprosthetic Valves. *Ann Thorac Surg.* Aug 2025; 120(2): 335-344. PMID 39864775
 126. Zahid S, Ullah W, Zia Khan M, et al. Cerebral Embolic Protection during Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation: Updated Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Curr Probl Cardiol.* Jun 2023; 48(6): 101127. PMID 35124076
 127. Warraich N, Sá MP, Jacquemyn X, et al. Cerebral Embolic Protection Devices in Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation: Meta-Analysis With Trial Sequential Analysis. *J Am Heart Assoc.* Apr 2025; 14(7): e038869. PMID 40118799
 128. Haussig S, Mangner N, Dwyer MG, et al. Effect of a Cerebral Protection Device on Brain Lesions Following Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation in Patients With Severe Aortic Stenosis: The CLEAN-TAVI Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA.* Aug 09 2016; 316(6): 592-601. PMID 27532914
 129. Van Mieghem NM, van Gils L, Ahmad H, et al. Filter-based cerebral embolic protection with transcatheter aortic valve implantation: the randomised MISTRAL-C trial. *EuroIntervention.* Jul 20 2016; 12(4): 499-507. PMID 27436602

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

130. Kapadia SR, Kodali S, Makkar R, et al. Protection Against Cerebral Embolism During Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jan 31 2017; 69(4): 367-377. PMID 27815101
131. Kapadia SR, Makkar R, Leon M, et al. Cerebral Embolic Protection during Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement. *N Engl J Med*. Oct 06 2022; 387(14): 1253-1263. PMID 36121045
132. Kharbanda RK, Perkins AD, Kennedy J, et al. Routine cerebral embolic protection in transcatheter aortic valve implantation: rationale and design of the randomised British Heart Foundation PROTECT-TAVI trial. *EuroIntervention*. Apr 24 2023; 18(17): 1428-1435. PMID 36706009
133. Kennedy J, Blackman DJ, Dodd M, et al. Impact of Cerebral Embolic Protection on Cognitive Function After Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation: Data From the BHF PROTECT-TAVI Randomized Trial. *Circulation*. Nov 04 2025; 152(18): 1268-1278. PMID 40884786
134. Nishimura RA, Otto CM, Bonow RO, et al. 2014 AHA/ACC guideline for the management of patients with valvular heart disease: executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jun 10 2014; 63(22): 2438-88. PMID 24603192
135. Nishimura RA, O'Gara PT, Bonow RO. Guidelines Update on Indications for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *JAMA Cardiol*. Sep 01 2017; 2(9): 1036-1037. PMID 28768333
136. Otto CM, Nishimura RA, Bonow RO, et al. 2020 ACC/AHA Guideline for the Management of Patients With Valvular Heart Disease: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Joint Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Feb 02 2021; 77(4): e25-e197. PMID 33342586
137. Praz F, Borger MA, Lanz J, et al. 2025 ESC/EACTS Guidelines for the management of valvular heart disease. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg*. Aug 02 2025; 67(8). PMID 40878291
138. National Institute For Health And Care Excellence (NICE). Heart valve disease presenting in adults: investigation and management [NG208]. November 2021. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng208/chapter/Recommendations#interventions>.
139. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). Decision Memo for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement (TAVR) (CAG-00430R). <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/nca-decision-memo.aspx?NCAId=293>.
140. Otto CM, Kumbhani DJ, Alexander KP, et al. Citation: 2017 ACC Expert Consensus Decision Pathway for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement in the Management of Adults With Aortic Stenosis: A Report of the American College of Cardiology Task Force on Clinical Expert Consensus Documents. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2017; Jan 4: [Epub ahead of print].
141. Gabriel S Aldea, MD et al. Up to Date. Choice of intervention for severe calcific aortic stenosis. Literature review current through: Apr 2026. This topic last updated: Nov 25, 2025.
142. Sundt TM, Jneid H. Citation: Guideline Update on Indications for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation Based on the 2020 American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Guidelines for Management of Valvular Heart Disease. *JAMA Cardiol* 2021; Jul 21: [Epub ahead of print].
143. D. Craig Miller MD. The Annals of Thoracic Surgery. Expanding Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement Use in Younger Patients and Bicuspid Valves: Risks, Evidence Gaps, and Regulatory Action. Volume 119, Issue 6p1166-1174 June 2025.

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

Policy History

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

03/06/2014	Medical Policy Committee review
03/19/2014	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. New policy.
03/05/2015	Medical Policy Committee review
03/20/2015	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Added "FDA approved" to the eligible for coverage statement. Updated rationale/source and references.
08/03/2015	Coding update: ICD10 Diagnosis code section added; ICD9 Procedure code section removed.
03/05/2015	Medical Policy Committee review
03/20/2015	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.
05/05/2016	Medical Policy Committee review
05/18/2016	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.
11/03/2016	Medical Policy Committee review
11/16/2016	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Added coverage statement for valve in valve for patient at high or prohibitive risk for open surgery.
01/01/2017	Coding update: Removing ICD-9 Diagnosis Codes
05/04/2017	Medical Policy Committee review
05/17/2017	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Added "native valve" to coverage statement.
06/07/2018	Medical Policy Committee review
06/20/2018	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Policy statements changed to add patients at intermediate surgical risk to first eligible for coverage statement.
08/14/2018	Coding update
06/06/2019	Medical Policy Committee review
06/19/2019	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.
03/05/2020	Medical Policy Committee review
03/11/2020	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Eligible for coverage policy statement related to patients with native valve aortic stenosis changed to add an exclusion for patients with unicuspid or bicuspid aortic valve and to add an inclusion for patients at low risk for open surgery. Removed "Patient is not an operable candidate for open surgery, as judged by at least two cardiovascular specialists (cardiologist and/or cardiac surgeon); or patient is an operable candidate but is at high or intermediate risk for open surgery." From criteria section.
07/20/2022	Coding update
05/06/2021	Medical Policy Committee review
05/12/2021	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. FDA updated. No change to coverage.

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

05/05/2022	Medical Policy Committee review
05/11/2022	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage eligibility unchanged.
04/06/2023	Medical Policy Committee review
04/12/2023	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Added “Based on review of available data, the Company considers the use of a cerebral embolic protection device (e.g., Sentinel) during transcatheter aortic valve replacement procedures to be investigational.”
07/24/2023	Coding update
04/04/2024	Medical Policy Committee review
04/10/2024	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. For TAVI and ViV TAVI, the criterion of left ventricular ejection fraction greater than 20% was removed. A statement was added for consideration of individuals who may be at high risk of open surgery but not demonstrated on Society of Thoracic Surgeons risk score, 'Individual is considered at increased surgical risk for an open surgery (e.g., repeat sternotomy) due to a history of congenital vascular anomalies OR has a complex intrathoracic surgical history, as documented by at least 2 cardiovascular specialists (including a cardiac surgeon). Added Policy Guideline section.
06/05/2025	Medical Policy Committee review
06/11/2025	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Added “One of the following: ○ Symptoms consistent with New York Heart Association (NYHA) heart failure Class II, III or IV, exertional or unexplained syncope, or exertional angina; OR ○ Asymptomatic individual with reduced left ventricular ejection fraction < 50 % who is 65 to 80 years of age and has no anatomic contraindication to transfemoral TAVR” to coverage criteria section.
06/04/2026	Medical Policy Committee review
06/10/2026	Medical Policy Implementation Committee review.
08/20/2026	Medical Quality Management Committee approval. Added “Based on review of available data, the Company considers transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) for all other indications to be not medically necessary.” And “Based on review of available data, the Company considers the use of transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) when patient selection criteria are not met to be not medically necessary.” Criteria for transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) extensively rewritten.
09/03/2026	Medical Policy Committee review
09/09/2026	Medical Policy Implementation Committee review.
09/17/2026	Medical Quality Management Committee approval. Added “Based on review of available data, the Company considers transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) using heart valve systems that are not FDA-approved to be investigational.”

Next Scheduled Review Date: 09/2027

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

Coding

The five character codes included in the Louisiana Blue Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines are obtained from Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®)†, copyright 2025 by the American Medical Association (AMA). CPT is developed by the AMA as a listing of descriptive terms and five character identifying codes and modifiers for reporting medical services and procedures performed by physician.

The responsibility for the content of Louisiana Blue Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines is with Louisiana Blue and no endorsement by the AMA is intended or should be implied. The AMA disclaims responsibility for any consequences or liability attributable or related to any use, nonuse or interpretation of information contained in Louisiana Blue Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines. Fee schedules, relative value units, conversion factors and/or related components are not assigned by the AMA, are not part of CPT, and the AMA is not recommending their use. The AMA does not directly or indirectly practice medicine or dispense medical services. The AMA assumes no liability for data contained or not contained herein. Any use of CPT outside of Louisiana Blue Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines should refer to the most current Current Procedural Terminology which contains the complete and most current listing of CPT codes and descriptive terms. Applicable FARS/DFARS apply.

CPT is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association.

Codes used to identify services associated with this policy may include (but may not be limited to) the following:

Code Type	Code
CPT	33361, 33362, 33363, 33364, 33365, 33366, 33367, 33368, 33369, 33370
HCPCS	C1889
ICD-10 Diagnosis	I06.0, I06.2, I06.8, I06.9, I08.0, I08.2, I08.3, I08.8, I08.9, I35.0, I35.2, I35.8, I35.9

*Investigational – A medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is Investigational if the effectiveness has not been clearly tested and it has not been incorporated into standard medical practice. Any determination we make that a medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is Investigational will be based on a consideration of the following:

- A. Whether the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product can be lawfully marketed without approval of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and whether such approval has been granted at the time the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is sought to be furnished; or
- B. Whether the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product requires further studies or clinical trials to determine its maximum tolerated dose, toxicity, safety, effectiveness, or effectiveness as compared with the standard means of treatment or

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

diagnosis, must improve health outcomes, according to the consensus of opinion among experts as shown by reliable evidence, including:

1. Consultation with technology evaluation center(s);
2. Credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community; or
3. Reference to federal regulations.

****Medically Necessary (or “Medical Necessity”)** - Health care services, treatment, procedures, equipment, drugs, devices, items or supplies that a Provider, exercising prudent clinical judgment, would provide to a patient for the purpose of preventing, evaluating, diagnosing or treating an illness, injury, disease or its symptoms, and that are:

- A. In accordance with nationally accepted standards of medical practice;
- B. Clinically appropriate, in terms of type, frequency, extent, level of care, site and duration, and considered effective for the patient's illness, injury or disease; and
- C. Not primarily for the personal comfort or convenience of the patient, physician or other health care provider, and not more costly than an alternative service or sequence of services at least as likely to produce equivalent therapeutic or diagnostic results as to the diagnosis or treatment of that patient's illness, injury or disease.

For these purposes, “nationally accepted standards of medical practice” means standards that are based on credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community, Physician Specialty Society recommendations and the views of Physicians practicing in relevant clinical areas and any other relevant factors.

‡ Indicated trademarks are the registered trademarks of their respective owners.

NOTICE: If the Patient’s health insurance contract contains language that differs from the BCBSLA Medical Policy definition noted above, the definition in the health insurance contract will be relied upon for specific coverage determinations.

NOTICE: Medical Policies are scientific based opinions, provided solely for coverage and informational purposes. Medical Policies should not be construed to suggest that the Company recommends, advocates, requires, encourages, or discourages any particular treatment, procedure, or service, or any particular course of treatment, procedure, or service.

NOTICE: Federal and State law, as well as contract language, including definitions and specific contract provisions/exclusions, take precedence over Medical Policy and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage.

NOTICE: If an authorization for an ongoing course of treatment has been provided to a member and the member changes from one health plan to another health plan (e.g., a member moves from carrier A to Louisiana Blue), Louisiana Blue may honor the previous health plan’s authorization for the same service under the same type of in-network benefit for a 90-day transition period. Documentation of the authorization for the ongoing course of treatment from the previous health plan must be provided to us by the member or their provider and the services provided for the course

Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

Policy # 00406

Original Effective Date: 03/19/2014

Current Effective Date: 10/01/2026

of treatment must otherwise be a covered service under the Louisiana Blue health plan. This provision does not apply to medications covered under the plan's pharmacy benefit.