JACC: CARDIOVASCULAR INTERVENTIONS © 2024 THE AUTHORS. PUBLISHED BY ELSEVIER ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF CARDIOLOGY FOUNDATION. THIS IS AN OPEN ACCESS ARTICLE UNDER THE CC BY LICENSE (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

STRUCTURAL

Sex-Specific Differences in Upstream Cardiac Damage in Patients With Aortic Stenosis Undergoing TAVR



Masaaki Nakase, MD,^a Daijiro Tomii, MD,^a Annette Maznyczka, MD, PHD, MSc, BSc,^a Daryoush Samim, MD,^a Jonas Lanz, MD, MSc,^a Fabien Praz, MD,^a Stefan Stortecky, MD, MPH,^a David Reineke, MD,^b Stephan Windecker, MD,^a Thomas Pilgrim, MD, MSc^a

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND Cardiac damage caused by aortic stenosis (AS) can be categorized into stages, which are associated with a progressively increasing risk of death after transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR).

OBJECTIVES The authors investigated sex-related differences in cardiac damage among patients with symptomatic AS and the prognostic value of cardiac damage classification in women and men undergoing TAVR.

METHODS In a prospective registry, pre-TAVR echocardiograms were used to categorize patients into 5 stages of cardiac damage caused by AS. Differences in the extent of cardiac damage were compared according to sex, and its implications on clinical outcomes after TAVR were explored.

RESULTS Among 2,026 patients undergoing TAVR between August 2007 and June 2022 (995 [49.1%] women and 1,031 [50.9%] men), we observed sex-specific differences in the pattern of cardiac damage (women vs men; stage 0: 2.6% vs 3.1%, stage 1: 13.4% vs 10.1%, stage 2: 37.1% vs 39.5%, stage 3: 27.5% vs 15.6%, and stage 4: 19.4% vs 31.7%). There was a stepwise increase in 5-year all-cause mortality according to stage in women (HR_{adjusted}: 1.43; 95% CI: 1.28-1.60, for linear trend) and men (HR_{adjusted}: 1.26; 95% CI: 1.14-1.38, for linear trend). Female sex was associated with a lower 5-year mortality in early stages (stage 0, 1, or 2) but not in advanced stages (stage 3 or 4).

CONCLUSIONS The pattern of cardiac damage secondary to AS differed by sex. In early stages of cardiac damage, women had a lower 5-year mortality than men, whereas in more advanced stages, mortality was comparable between sexes. (SwissTAVI Registry; NCT01368250) (J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2024;17:1252-1264) © 2024 The Authors. Published by Elsevier on behalf of the American College of Cardiology Foundation. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

ortic stenosis (AS) is the leading valvular heart disease lesion in high-income countries and has a comparable prevalence among elderly women and men.^{1,2} In the absence of effective prevention, aortic valve replacement (AVR) is the only therapeutic intervention of AS.³ Before the advent of

transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR), a notable sex-related disparity existed in access to AVR, with fewer women than men undergoing surgical intervention.⁴⁻⁶ This discrepancy has been attributed primarily to advanced age, increased frailty, and a higher risk of procedural complications in female

Manuscript received January 17, 2024; revised manuscript received March 22, 2024, accepted March 26, 2024.

From the ^aDepartment of Cardiology, Inselspital, Bern University Hospital, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland; and the ^bDepartment of Cardiovascular Surgery, Inselspital, Bern University Hospital, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland. The authors attest they are in compliance with human studies committees and animal welfare regulations of the authors' institutions and Food and Drug Administration guidelines, including patient consent where appropriate. For more information, visit the Author Center.

patients.⁴⁻⁷ Consequently, women experienced a higher likelihood of undertreatment, ultimately resulting in more advanced cardiac damage because of long-standing pressure overload caused by AS and adverse prognosis.⁶ TAVR effectively mitigated historical sex-related disparities in access to treatment of AS.^{5,8-11} A recent meta-analysis in patients undergoing TAVR reported lower long-term mortality in women compared to men, potentially attributable to a longer life expectancy and fewer comorbidities in women.¹² Notwithstanding, even within the TAVR population, women have been found to be older and undergo intervention at a later stage of disease.^{5,8-14}

Recently, Généreux et al¹⁵ introduced a staging classification to semiquantitatively assess the extent of extra-aortic valve cardiac damage.¹⁵ This staging scheme has been associated with prognosis in patients undergoing TAVR,¹⁶⁻¹⁹ and it may provide insights into the appropriate timing of TAVR. Given the sex-specific differences in myocardial remodeling to $AS^{20,21}$ and the influence of sex hormones on pulmonary vascular resistance,²² the accumulation of cardiac damage and its prognostic value may differ between the sexes. In this study, we aimed to investigate sex-related differences in the extent of extraaortic valve cardiac damage in patients undergoing TAVR and explore their association with prognosis.

METHODS

STUDY DESIGN AND POPULATION. Consecutive patients with AS who underwent TAVR at Bern University Hospital were systematically enrolled in an institutional prospective registry. This registry is nested into the nationwide SwissTAVI registry (NCT01368250).²³ For the purpose of the present study, we excluded patients with incomplete or unavailable echocardiographic records to assess cardiac damage before TAVR. The registry was approved by the Bern Cantonal Ethics Committee, and patients provided written informed consent for participation.

CARDIAC DAMAGE STAGING CLASSIFICATION. The presence and extent of cardiac damage were assessed according to the established classification by Généreux et al.¹⁵ Patients were categorized as follows: stage 0, no extra-aortic valve cardiac damage; stage 1, left ventricular (LV) damage (left ventricular ejection fraction [LVEF] <50%, LV mass index >95 g/m² in women, >115 g/m² in men, or LV diastolic dysfunction grade \geq II); stage 2, left atrial or mitral valve damage (left atrial volume index >34 mL/m², mitral regurgitation \geq moderate, or presence of atrial fibrillation [AF]); stage 3, pulmonary vasculature or

tricuspid valve damage (systolic pulmonary artery pressure \geq 60 mm Hg or tricuspid regurgitation \geq moderate); and stage 4, right ventricular (RV) damage. Patients were hierarchically categorized into the most advanced stage if they met at least 1 of the criteria within that stage. As previously validated, we grouped these 5 stages into early (stage 0, 1, or 2) and advanced (stage 3 or 4) and compared baseline characteristics between sexes.²⁴

Comprehensive transthoracic echocardiography was conducted by a board-certified cardiologist and echocardiography specialist before TAVR according to the current American Society of Echocardiography guide-

lines.²⁵ Acquired images were independently reevaluated by experienced imaging specialists in the Bern imaging core laboratory. RV dysfunction was defined based on the recommendation by the American Society of Echocardiography.²⁶

DATA COLLECTION AND CLINICAL ENDPOINTS. Baseline clinical, procedural, and follow-up data were prospectively recorded in a dedicated database maintained by the clinical trial unit of the University of Bern. Regular clinical follow-up was scheduled at 30 days, 1 year, 5 years, and 10 years after TAVR, and the data were collected through standardized interviews, documentation from referring physicians, and hospital discharge summaries, as previously described.²⁷ All adverse events were systematically documented and adjudicated by an independent clinical event committee in accordance with the Valve Academic Research Consortium definitions applicable at the time of the procedure.²⁸⁻³⁰ The primary outcomes of interest in the present study were all-cause and cardiovascular mortality after TAVR.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS. Categoric variables were expressed as frequencies and percentages, and group comparisons were assessed using the chi-square test or Fisher exact test as appropriate. Continuous variables were presented as mean \pm SD and analyzed among groups using the F test derived from an analysis of variance or Kruskal-Wallis test complemented by pairwise Wilcoxon tests with correction for multiple testing when necessary. Time-to-event curves were constructed using the Kaplan-Meier method. First, we used a univariate Kaplan-Meier analysis with a logrank test to evaluate the associations between each independent candidate variable and the primary outcome. Second, we conducted a comparison of the residuals from the resulting survival curves and the Schoenfeld global test to assess the proportional hazards assumption for these variables. For comparisons

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AF = atrial fibrillation
AS = aortic stenosis
AVR = aortic valve replacement
COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease
LV = left ventricular
LVEF = left ventricular ejection fraction
RV = right ventricular
TAVR = transcatheter aortic valve replacement



Continued on the next page

CENTRAL ILLUSTRATION Continued The Impact of Female Sex on All-Cause Mortality in Each Stage of Cardiac Damage Women vs Men HRadjusted **P** Value for P Value **Cardiac Stage** (5-Year All-Cause Mortality) (95% CI) Interaction 0.78 < 0.001 All stages (0.67 - 0.90)0.56 Stage 0 or 1 0.043 (0.32 - 0.98)0.75 Stage 2 0.027 (0.58 - 0.97)0.394 0.92 Stage 3 0.625 (0.67 - 1.27)0.87 Stage 4 0.297 (0.66 - 1.14)0.69 0.002 Early stages (0.55 - 0.87)0.075 0.86 Advanced stages 0.139 (0.71 - 1.05)0.5 0.75 1.0 1.25 In Favor of Women -In Favor of Men • The distribution of cardiac damage stage differed by sex, with stage 3 being more prevalent in women and stage 4 being more prevalent in men The cardiac damage staging classification stratified long-term survival after TAVR, irrespective of sex • Female sex was an independent predictor of lower mortality in early stages (stages 0, 1, or 2), but not in advanced stages of upstream cardiac damage (stages 3 or 4)

Nakase M, et al. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv. 2024;17(10):1252-1264.

involving more than 2 cardiac stages, HRs with 95% CIs and P values for linear trends were also reported. Multivariable models selected and introduced the following covariates: age, body mass index, Society of Thoracic Surgeons Predicted Risk of Mortality, NYHA functional class III or IV, hypertension, diabetes, chronic kidney disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), coronary artery disease, peripheral artery disease, and the use of a contemporary device (SAPIEN 3/Ultra [Edwards], Evolut R/Pro/Pro+ [Medtronic], ACURATE Neo/Neo2 [Boston Scientific], and Navitor [Abbott]). Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS software version 23.0 (IBM Corp). All statistical tests were 2-sided, and significance was set at P values < 0.05.

RESULTS

STUDY POPULATION AND BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS. Among 3,586 consecutive patients undergoing TAVR between August 2007 and June 2022, 2,026 patients were included in the present analysis. Of these, 995 patients (49.1%) were women (mean age: 83.1 \pm 5.7 years), and 1,031 (50.9%) were men (mean age: 81.2 \pm 6.8 years). The prevalence of stages of cardiac damage in women and men is summarized in the Central Illustration and Table 1. In women, 26 (2.6%) patients had stage 0, 133 (13.4%) had stage 1, 369 (37.1%) had stage 2, 274 (27.5%) had stage 3, and 193 (19.4%) had stage 4. In men, 32 (3.1%) patients were categorized as stage 0, 104 (10.1%) as stage 1, 407 (39.5%) as stage 2, 161 (15.6%) as stage 3, and 327 (31.7%) as stage 4. There was no significant difference in the distribution of early (52.7% vs 53.1%) and advanced stages of cardiac damage (47.3% vs 46.9%) according to sex (P = 0.858). Baseline characteristics according to the cardiac damage stage in women and men are shown in Tables 2 and 3. In both sexes, a gradual increase in the cardiac damage stage was associated with an increased

TABLE 1 The Differences in Components of Cardiac Damage Between Sexes								
	Women (n = 995)	Men (n = 1,031)	P Value					
Stage O	26 (2.6)	32 (3.1)	0.508					
Stage 1	133 (13.4)	104 (10.1)	0.022					
LVEF <50%	227/992 (22.9)	374/1,029 (36.5)	< 0.001					
LV hypertrophy	571/689 (82.9)	490/699 (70.1)	< 0.001					
E/e' ≥14	393/525 (74.9)	321/523 (61.4)	< 0.001					
Stage 2	369 (37.1)	407 (39.5)	0.268					
Left atrial dilatation	620/888 (69.8)	705/947 (74.4)	0.027					
Presence of atrial fibrillation	352/995 (35.4)	417/1,031 (40.4)	0.019					
Moderate/severe mitral regurgitation	289/988 (29.3)	233/1,021 (22.8)	0.001					
Stage 3	274 (27.5)	161 (15.6)	< 0.001					
PASP ≥60 mm Hg	232/959 (24.2)	174/971 (17.9)	< 0.001					
Moderate/severe tricuspid regurgitation	227/992 (22.9)	179/1,024 (17.5)	0.002					
Stage 4	193 (19.4)	327 (31.7)	< 0.001					
RV dysfunction	193/995 (19.4)	327/1,031 (31.7)	<0.001					

Values are n (%) or n/N (%).

LV = left ventricular; LVEF = left ventricular ejection fraction; PASP = pulmonary artery systolic pressure; RV = right ventricular.

> surgical risk, advanced heart failure symptoms (NYHA functional class III or IV), a higher prevalence of concomitant disease including hypertension, chronic kidney disease, AF, previous history of myocardial infarction, cardiac surgery, permanent pacemaker implantation, and higher prescription of beta-blockers. In women, the aortic valve area decreased with worsening stage of cardiac damage but not in men. All components of cardiac damage assessed by echocardiography worsened as the cardiac stage progressed.

> Table 4 shows the differences in baseline characteristics between women and men in early (stage 0, 1, or 2) and advanced stages (stage 3 or 4) of cardiac damage. In both early and advanced stages, women were more likely to be older, have a higher surgical risk, have greater LVEF, and have chronic kidney disease compared with men. Men had a higher prevalence of COPD, coronary artery disease, peripheral artery disease, and a previous history of myocardial infarction and cardiac surgery than women in both early and advanced stages. There was no significant difference in the prescription rate of cardioprotective medication. Comparisons between women and men for each stage of cardiac damage are shown in Supplemental Table 1. The observed trends remained consistent across all stages of cardiac damage.

> **CLINICAL OUTCOMES.** The median follow-up time after TAVR was 1,112 days (Q1-Q3: 367-1,825 days) in women and 947 days (Q1-Q3: 364-1824 days) in men. Clinical outcomes at 1 and 5 years according to cardiac damage stage are summarized in **Table 5** and depicted

in the **Central Illustration** and **Figure 1**. There was a stepwise increase in 5-year all-cause and cardiovascular mortality according to the cardiac damage stage in both women (HR_{adjusted}: 1.43; 95% CI: 1.28-1.60; P < 0.001 and $HR_{adjusted}$: 1.49; 95% CI: 1.31-1.70; P < 0.001, for linear trend) and men (HR_{adjusted}: 1.26; 95% CI: 1.14-1.38; P < 0.001 and $HR_{adjusted}$: 1.36; 95% CI: 1.21-1.53; P < 0.001, for linear trend). The Central Illustration shows the association of female sex with 5-year all-cause mortality. In the overall population, women had a lower mortality than men (HR_{adjusted}: 0.78; 95% CI: 0.67-0.90; P < 0.001). This trend was consistent across early stages of cardiac damage including stage 0 or 1 (HR_{adiusted}: 0.56; 95% CI: 0.32-0.98; *P* = 0.043) and stage 2 (HR_{adjusted}: 0.75; 95% CI: 0.58-0.97; P = 0.027), but there was similar mortality between sexes in advanced stages of cardiac damage including stages 3 (HR_{adjusted}: 0.92; 95% CI: 0.67-1.27; P = 0.625) and 4 (HR_{adjusted}: 0.87; 95% CI: 0.66-1.14; *P* = 0.297) (*P* for interaction = 0.394 among all stages and P for interaction = 0.075 between early and advanced stages). A similar trend was observed for cardiovascular mortality (Figure 2).

SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS. Given the long enrollment period of this study, we performed a sensitivity analysis including 1,290 patients treated with contemporary devices. As shown in **Supplemental** Figures 1 and 2, the distribution of cardiac damage was similar to that in the main analysis, and the cardiac staging classification stratified long-term mortality in both women and men. Women tended to have lower mortality in early stages of cardiac damage, but this advantage was not statistically significant (Supplemental Figure 3).

Considering the difference in patient characteristics between AS subtypes according to the flowgradient pattern,^{24,31} we investigated the interaction of sex and cardiac damage in 3 major subtypes, including high-gradient AS, classical low-flow lowgradient AS, and low-flow low-gradient AS with preserved LVEF. As shown in Supplemental Figure 4, women with early stages of cardiac damage had a lower 5-year mortality than men only in the highgradient AS subtype.

DISCUSSION

The main findings of this study are as follows:

1. The distribution of cardiac damage stage differed by sex, with stage 3 more prevalent in women and stage 4 more prevalent in men, but there was no significant difference in early vs advanced stages according to sex.

TABLE 2 Baseline Clinical and Echocardiographic Characteristics in Women								
	Total Population (N = 995)	Stage 0 (n = 26)	Stage 1 (n = 133)	Stage 2 (n = 369)	Stage 3 (n = 274)	Stage 4 (n = 193)	P Value	
Age, y	83.1 ± 5.7	82.3 ± 5.2	81.5 ± 6.3	83.2 ± 5.3	84.1 ± 5.6	82.6 ± 6.0	< 0.001	
Body mass index, kg/cm ²	$\textbf{26.1} \pm \textbf{6.1}$	$\textbf{27.5} \pm \textbf{7.7}$	$\textbf{26.0} \pm \textbf{5.7}$	$\textbf{26.7} \pm \textbf{5.9}$	$\textbf{26.2}\pm\textbf{6.1}$	$\textbf{24.9} \pm \textbf{6.1}$	0.02	
STS-PROM, %	$\textbf{6.1} \pm \textbf{4.2}$	$\textbf{4.4} \pm \textbf{2.4}$	$\textbf{4.6} \pm \textbf{2.9}$	$\textbf{5.5} \pm \textbf{4.0}$	$\textbf{6.7} \pm \textbf{4.3}$	$\textbf{7.7} \pm \textbf{4.9}$	< 0.001	
NYHA functional class III or IV	698 (70.2)	15 (57.7)	83 (62.4)	245 (66.6)	205 (74.8)	150 (77.7)	0.003	
Concomitant diseases								
Hypertension	857 (86.1)	19 (73.1)	108 (81.2)	325 (88.1)	242 (88.3)	163 (84.5)	0.058	
Diabetes mellitus	243 (24.4)	5 (19.2)	32 (24.1)	74 (20.1)	78 (28.5)	54 (28.0)	0.093	
CKD, eGFR <60 mL/min/1.73 m ²	769 (77.4)	15 (57.7)	94 (70.7)	274 (74.3)	227 (82.8)	159 (82.8)	< 0.001	
COPD	85 (8.6)	1 (3.8)	11 (8.3)	26 (7.1)	32 (11.7)	15 (7.8)	0.245	
Coronary artery disease	496 (49.8)	6 (23.1)	65 (48.9)	171 (46.3)	134 (48.9)	120 (62.2)	< 0.001	
Atrial fibrillation	352 (35.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	129 (35.0)	115 (42.0)	108 (56.0)	< 0.001	
Previous history								
Previous myocardial infarction	98 (9.8)	0 (0)	12 (9.0)	28 (7.6)	25 (9.1)	33 (17.1)	0.002	
Previous cardiac surgery	76 (7.6)	0 (0)	4 (3.0)	16 (4.3)	17 (6.2)	39 (20.2)	< 0.001	
Previous stroke	115 (11.6)	1 (3.8)	12 (9.0)	45 (12.2)	31 (11.3)	26 (13.5)	0.524	
Previous permanent pacemaker implantation	78 (7.8)	1 (3.8)	6 (4.5)	26 (7.0)	24 (8.8)	21 (10.9)	0.221	
Peripheral artery disease	111 (11.2)	1 (3.8)	12 (9.0)	40 (10.8)	31 (11.3)	27 (14.0)	0.46	
Echocardiographic parameter								
Aortic valve area, cm ²	$\textbf{0.71} \pm \textbf{0.24}$	$\textbf{0.81} \pm \textbf{0.23}$	$\textbf{0.76} \pm \textbf{0.32}$	$\textbf{0.72} \pm \textbf{0.21}$	$\textbf{0.71} \pm \textbf{0.26}$	$\textbf{0.63} \pm \textbf{0.22}$	< 0.001	
Aortic valve area index, cm ² /m ²	0.42 ± 0.15	0.45 ± 0.12	$\textbf{0.46} \pm \textbf{0.22}$	$\textbf{0.42}\pm\textbf{0.12}$	0.42 ± 0.15	$\textbf{0.38} \pm \textbf{0.13}$	0.014	
Aortic valve mean gradient, mm Hg	41.1 ± 17.7	$\textbf{31.9} \pm \textbf{11.3}$	41.7 ± 15.1	44.0 ± 17.5	$\textbf{42.2} \pm \textbf{18.7}$	$\textbf{35.7} \pm \textbf{17.1}$	< 0.001	
LVEF, %	56.2 ± 13.5	$\textbf{65.4} \pm \textbf{5.1}$	$\textbf{59.7} \pm \textbf{10.9}$	$\textbf{59.3} \pm \textbf{11.6}$	$\textbf{56.1} \pm \textbf{12.2}$	$\textbf{46.9} \pm \textbf{16.1}$	< 0.001	
LVEF <50%	227 (22.9)	0 (0)	19 (14.4)	53 (14.4)	60 (22.0)	95 (50.5)	< 0.001	
LVEF <40%	122 (12.3)	0 (0)	9 (6.8)	26 (7.1)	29 (10.6)	58 (30.1)	< 0.001	
E/e'	21.6 ± 11.4	10.2 ± 3.0	18.7 ± 7.7	21.1 ± 11.0	$\textbf{25.1} \pm \textbf{11.2}$	$\textbf{23.8} \pm \textbf{14.7}$	< 0.001	
Left ventricular mass index, g/m ²	131.1 ± 46.1	$\textbf{78.1} \pm \textbf{17.8}$	125.9 ± 45.1	131.0 ± 46.8	137.1 ± 46.6	134 ± 42.8	< 0.001	
Left atrial volume index, mL/m ²	44.2 ± 17.2	$\textbf{27.6} \pm \textbf{4.6}$	$\textbf{26.5} \pm \textbf{5.6}$	$\textbf{45.6} \pm \textbf{14.4}$	$\textbf{48.8} \pm \textbf{17.8}$	51.3 ± 17.8	< 0.001	
Moderate or severe mitral regurgitation	289 (29.3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	77 (21.0)	115 (42.4)	97 (50.5)	< 0.001	
Moderate or severe tricuspid regurgitation	227 (22.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	156 (57.4)	71 (37.0)	< 0.001	
Pulmonary artery systolic pressure, mm Hg	$\textbf{46.0} \pm \textbf{19.8}$	$\textbf{28.4} \pm \textbf{15.9}$	$\textbf{32.2} \pm \textbf{15.5}$	$\textbf{37.2} \pm \textbf{14.6}$	$\textbf{61.1} \pm \textbf{16.9}$	$\textbf{55.5} \pm \textbf{16.8}$	< 0.001	
Tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion, cm	$\textbf{0.71} \pm \textbf{0.24}$	$\textbf{0.81} \pm \textbf{0.23}$	$\textbf{0.76} \pm \textbf{0.32}$	$\textbf{0.72} \pm \textbf{0.21}$	$\textbf{0.71} \pm \textbf{0.26}$	$\textbf{0.63} \pm \textbf{0.22}$	< 0.001	
S', cm/s	41.1 ± 17.7	$\textbf{31.9} \pm \textbf{11.3}$	41.7 ± 15.1	44.0 ± 17.5	$\textbf{42.2} \pm \textbf{18.7}$	$\textbf{35.7} \pm \textbf{17.1}$	< 0.001	
Fractional area change, %	$\textbf{56.2} \pm \textbf{13.5}$	$\textbf{65.4} \pm \textbf{5.1}$	$\textbf{59.7} \pm \textbf{10.9}$	$\textbf{59.3} \pm \textbf{11.6}$	$\textbf{56.1} \pm \textbf{12.2}$	$\textbf{46.9} \pm \textbf{16.1}$	< 0.001	
Medication								
Beta-blocker	537 (54.0)	8 (30.8)	53 (39.8)	192 (52.0)	155 (56.6)	129 (66.8)	< 0.001	
RAS inhibitor	559 (56.2)	15 (60.0)	76 (57.1)	220 (59.6)	141 (51.5)	107 (55.4)	0.343	

Values are mean ± SD or n (%). RAS inhibitors include angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor, angiotensin receptor blocker, or angiotensin receptor/neprilysin inhibitor.

CKD = chronic kidney disease; COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate; RAS = renin-angiotensin-system; STS-PROM = Society of Thoracic Surgeons Predicted Risk of Mortality; other abbreviation as in Table 1.

- 2. Women were older and had a higher surgical risk across all stages, whereas comorbidities that may contribute to worsening cardiac damage, including COPD, ischemic heart disease, or a history of cardiac surgery, were more common in men across all stages.
- 3. The cardiac damage staging classification was useful to stratify long-term survival after TAVR irrespective of sex.
- 4. Female sex was associated with lower mortality in early stages (stages 0, 1, or 2) but not in advanced stages of upstream cardiac damage (stages 3 or 4).

Previous studies have shown that women compared to men exhibit a more gradual progression of AS,³² present with symptoms of AS at an older age, and have more advanced frailty.⁷ During the era when surgical AVR was the predominant treatment modality, women experienced higher rates of adverse events and in-hospital mortality, resulting in an increased rate of undertreatment.^{4,5,7} In the TAVR population, female patients also tend to be older and have a higher prevalence of heart failure symptoms.^{5,8-14} However, these differences did not translate into significant differences in clinical outcomes after TAVR between women and men.^{9,10}

TABLE 3 Baseline Clinical and Echocardiographic Characteristics in Men									
	Total Population (N = 1,031)	Stage 0 (n = 32)	Stage 1 (n = 104)	Stage 2 (n = 407)	Stage 3 (n = 161)	Stage 4 (n = 327)	P Value		
Age, y	81.2 ± 6.8	78.7 ± 7.7	79.6 ± 6.1	81.5 ± 6.3	82.7 ± 6.0	80.8 ± 7.7	< 0.001		
Body mass index, kg/cm ²	$\textbf{26.4} \pm \textbf{4.8}$	$\textbf{26.1} \pm \textbf{5.7}$	$\textbf{27.1} \pm \textbf{4.6}$	$\textbf{26.7} \pm \textbf{4.8}$	$\textbf{26.5} \pm \textbf{4.4}$	$\textbf{25.8} \pm \textbf{4.7}$	0.06		
STS-PROM, %	5.0 ± 3.7	$\textbf{3.7} \pm \textbf{2.3}$	$\textbf{3.3} \pm \textbf{2.2}$	$\textbf{4.5}\pm\textbf{3.2}$	$\textbf{5.4} \pm \textbf{4.0}$	$\textbf{6.1} \pm \textbf{4.3}$	< 0.001		
NYHA functional class III or IV	674 (65.4)	15 (46.9)	54 (51.9)	250 (61.4)	108 (67.1)	247 (75.8)	< 0.001		
Concomitant diseases									
Hypertension	883 (85.6)	26 (81.3)	86 (82.7)	353 (86.7)	140 (87.0)	278 (85.0)	0.743		
Diabetes mellitus	293 (28.4)	11 (34.4)	23 (22.1)	104 (25.6)	42 (26.1)	113 (34.6)	0.03		
CKD, eGFR <60 mL/min/1.73 m ²	651 (63.2)	16 (50.0)	49 (47.1)	247 (60.7)	110 (68.3)	229 (70.2)	< 0.001		
COPD	159 (15.4)	6 (18.8)	17 (16.3)	58 (14.3)	24 (14.9)	54 (16.6)	0.89		
Coronary artery disease	714 (69.3)	22 (68.8)	69 (66.3)	267 (65.6)	111 (68.9)	245 (74.9)	0.095		
Atrial fibrillation	417 (40.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	165 (40.5)	78 (48.4)	174 (53.2)	< 0.001		
Previous history									
Previous myocardial infarction	211 (20.5)	2 (6.3)	15 (14.4)	73 (17.9)	36 (22.4)	85 (26.0)	0.006		
Previous cardiac surgery	241 (23.4)	7 (21.9)	14 (13.5)	70 (17.2)	27 (16.8)	123 (37.6)	< 0.001		
Previous stroke	147 (14.3)	2 (6.3)	8 (7.7)	68 (16.7)	23 (14.3)	46 (14.1)	0.118		
Previous permanent pacemaker implantation	114 (11.1)	0 (0)	2 (1.9)	36 (8.8)	19 (11.8)	57 (17.4)	< 0.001		
Peripheral artery disease	167 (16.2)	3 (9.4)	18 (17.3)	57 (14.0)	27 (16.8)	62 (19.0)	0.341		
Echocardiographic parameter									
Aortic valve area, cm ²	$\textbf{0.82}\pm\textbf{0.30}$	0.82 ± 0.17	$\textbf{0.81} \pm \textbf{0.24}$	$\textbf{0.85} \pm \textbf{0.35}$	$\textbf{0.79} \pm \textbf{0.27}$	$\textbf{0.82} \pm \textbf{0.28}$	0.501		
Aortic valve area index, cm ² /m ²	$\textbf{0.44} \pm \textbf{0.17}$	$\textbf{0.45}\pm\textbf{0.10}$	$\textbf{0.41} \pm \textbf{0.11}$	$\textbf{0.45}\pm\textbf{0.21}$	0.42 ± 0.14	$\textbf{0.43} \pm \textbf{0.15}$	0.400		
Aortic valve mean gradient, mm Hg	$\textbf{36.7} \pm \textbf{16.1}$	$\textbf{36.1} \pm \textbf{15.1}$	41.9 ± 14.4	$\textbf{39.8} \pm \textbf{15.8}$	$\textbf{38.7} \pm \textbf{16.6}$	$\textbf{31.1} \pm \textbf{15.3}$	< 0.001		
LVEF, %	$\textbf{50.6} \pm \textbf{14.7}$	$\textbf{61.3} \pm \textbf{4.3}$	$\textbf{57.7} \pm \textbf{11.4}$	53.8 ± 13.1	$\textbf{49.9} \pm \textbf{14.4}$	$\textbf{43.9} \pm \textbf{15.4}$	< 0.001		
LVEF <50%	376 (36.5)	0 (0)	20 (19.2)	116 (28.6)	62 (38.5)	178 (54.6)	< 0.001		
LVEF <40%	234 (22.7)	0 (0)	8 (7.7)	66 (16.3)	36 (22.4)	124 (38.0)	< 0.001		
E/e'	$\textbf{17.9} \pm \textbf{8.6}$	11.2 ± 1.8	$\textbf{16.3} \pm \textbf{6.4}$	$\textbf{17.5} \pm \textbf{8.4}$	$\textbf{21.5} \pm \textbf{9.8}$	$\textbf{19.5} \pm \textbf{9.6}$	< 0.001		
Left ventricular mass index, g/m ²	142.7 ± 47.2	88.9 ± 16.4	$\textbf{138.3} \pm \textbf{35.4}$	142.5 ± 45.7	$\textbf{143.7} \pm \textbf{48.4}$	$\textbf{150.3} \pm \textbf{50.3}$	< 0.001		
Left atrial volume index, mL/m ²	$\textbf{45.0} \pm \textbf{21.2}$	$\textbf{25.6} \pm \textbf{5.9}$	26.2 ± 5.7	$\textbf{45.9} \pm \textbf{12.4}$	$\textbf{48.4} \pm \textbf{26.7}$	$\textbf{50.8} \pm \textbf{26.1}$	< 0.001		
Moderate or severe mitral regurgitation	233 (22.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	63 (15.6)	60 (37.7)	110 (34.3)	< 0.001		
Moderate or severe tricuspid regurgitation	179 (17.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	82 (51.6)	97 (30.1)	< 0.001		
Pulmonary artery systolic pressure, mm Hg	$\textbf{43.0} \pm \textbf{19.8}$	$\textbf{34.1} \pm \textbf{13.9}$	$\textbf{30.6} \pm \textbf{16.2}$	$\textbf{35.3} \pm \textbf{16.0}$	$\textbf{61.4} \pm \textbf{19.7}$	$\textbf{49.9} \pm \textbf{17.1}$	< 0.001		
Tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion, cm	$\textbf{19.2} \pm \textbf{5.8}$	$\textbf{21.4} \pm \textbf{3.8}$	$\textbf{23.5} \pm \textbf{4.6}$	$\textbf{22.2} \pm \textbf{4.4}$	$\textbf{21.1} \pm \textbf{4.2}$	13.0 ± 2.7	< 0.001		
S', cm/s	11.5 ± 3.2	13.1 ± 2.5	$\textbf{13.6} \pm \textbf{2.9}$	12.8 ± 2.5	$\textbf{12.4} \pm \textbf{2.2}$	$\textbf{8.6} \pm \textbf{2.3}$	< 0.001		
Fractional area change, %	$\textbf{39.5} \pm \textbf{10.4}$	47.5 ± 5.5	$\textbf{43.8} \pm \textbf{10.2}$	44.2 ± 7.7	$\textbf{42.5} \pm \textbf{9.1}$	$\textbf{31.2} \pm \textbf{8.8}$	< 0.001		
Medication									
Beta-blocker	552 (53.6)	14 (43.8)	50 (48.1)	205 (50.4)	88 (54.7)	195 (60.0)	0.047		
RAS inhibitor	585 (56.9)	19 (59.4)	56 (53.8)	233 (57.4)	74 (46.3)	203 (62.3)	0.019		
Values are mean ± SD or n (%). Abbreviations as in Table 2.									

Prolonged pressure overload resulting from AS causes upstream myocardial damage that impacts prognosis.³³ The cardiac damage staging classification introduced by Généreux et al has proven to have important prognostic implications after AVR.¹⁵ In the present study, there was a similar distribution of early stages (52.7% vs 53.1%) and advanced stages (47.3% vs 46.9%) of cardiac damage between sexes. These results suggest that women undergoing TAVR do not necessarily present with more advanced cardiac damage than men despite being older and frailer. However, these results must be interpreted in light of

the fact that cardiac damage exclusively caused by AS is difficult to compare because of sex-related differences in comorbidities, which may influence cardiac damage. Men had a higher prevalence of COPD, coronary artery disease, and previous cardiac surgery across all stages of cardiac damage. These comorbidities have the potential to independently induce myocardial damage irrespective of the cumulative cardiac damage associated with AS.³⁴ In contrast, women had fewer comorbidities, suggesting that the accumulation of cardiac damage may be primarily attributable to the persistent pressure overload caused

TABLE 4 Baseline Characteristics in Early Stage and Advanced Stage of Cardiac Damage According to Sex									
	Total Population			Early	Early Stages		Advanced Stages		
	Women (N = 995)	Men (N = 1,031)	P Value	Women (n = 528)	Men (n = 543)	P Value	Women (n = 467)	Men (n = 488)	P Value
Age, y	83.1 ± 5.7	81.2 ± 6.8	<0.001	82.7 ± 5.6	80.9 ± 6.4	< 0.001	83.5 ± 5.8	81.4 ± 7.2	< 0.001
Body mass index, kg/cm ²	$\textbf{26.1} \pm \textbf{6.1}$	$\textbf{26.4} \pm \textbf{4.8}$	0.254	$\textbf{26.5} \pm \textbf{6.0}$	$\textbf{26.8} \pm \textbf{4.8}$	0.523	$\textbf{25.7} \pm \textbf{6.1}$	$\textbf{26.0} \pm \textbf{4.6}$	0.315
STS-PROM, %	$\textbf{6.1} \pm \textbf{4.2}$	5.0 ± 3.7	< 0.001	5.2 ± 3.7	$\textbf{4.3}\pm\textbf{3.0}$	< 0.001	$\textbf{7.1} \pm \textbf{4.5}$	5.9 ± 4.2	< 0.001
NYHA functional class III or IV	698 (70.2)	674 (65.4)	0.021	343 (65.1)	319 (58.7)	0.033	355 (76.0)	355 (72.9)	0.269
Concomitant diseases									
Hypertension	857 (86.1)	883 (85.6)	0.754	452 (85.6)	465 (85.6)	0.989	405 (86.7)	418 (85.7)	0.633
Diabetes mellitus	243 (24.4)	293 (28.4)	0.041	111 (21.0)	138 (25.4)	0.089	132 (28.3)	155 (31.8)	0.239
CKD, eGFR $<$ 60 mL/min/1.73 m ²	769 (77.4)	651 (63.2)	< 0.001	383 (72.5)	312 (57.5)	< 0.001	386 (82.8)	339 (69.6)	< 0.001
COPD	85 (8.6)	159 (15.4)	< 0.001	38 (7.2)	81 (14.9)	< 0.001	47 (10.1)	78 (16.0)	0.007
Coronary artery disease	496 (49.8)	714 (69.3)	< 0.001	242 (45.8)	358 (65.9)	< 0.001	254 (54.4)	356 (73.0)	< 0.001
Atrial fibrillation	352 (35.4)	417 (40.4)	0.019	129 (24.4)	165 (30.4)	0.029	223 (47.8)	252 (51.6)	0.23
Previous history									
Previous myocardial infarction	98 (9.8)	211 (20.5)	< 0.001	40 (7.6)	90 (16.6)	< 0.001	58 (12.4)	121 (24.8)	< 0.001
Previous cardiac surgery	76 (7.6)	241 (23.4)	< 0.001	20 (3.8)	91 (16.8)	< 0.001	56 (12.0)	150 (30.7)	< 0.001
Previous stroke	115 (11.6)	147 (14.3)	0.07	58 (11.0)	78 (14.4)	0.097	57 (12.2)	69 (14.1)	0.377
Previous permanent pacemaker implantation	78 (7.8)	114 (11.1)	0.013	33 (6.3)	38 (7.0)	0.623	45 (9.6)	76 (15.6)	0.006
Peripheral artery disease	111 (11.2)	167 (16.2)	< 0.001	53 (10.0)	78 (14.4)	0.031	58 (12.4)	89 (18.2)	0.013
Echocardiographic parameter									
Aortic valve area, cm ²	0.71 ± 0.24	0.82 ± 0.30	< 0.001	$\textbf{0.74} \pm \textbf{0.24}$	0.84 ± 0.32	< 0.001	$\textbf{0.68} \pm \textbf{0.24}$	$\textbf{0.81} \pm \textbf{0.28}$	< 0.001
Aortic valve area index, cm ² /m ²	$\textbf{0.42}\pm\textbf{0.15}$	0.44 ± 0.17	0.051	$\textbf{0.43} \pm \textbf{0.15}$	$\textbf{0.44} \pm \textbf{0.19}$	0.412	0.41 ± 0.14	0.43 ± 0.15	0.052
Aortic valve mean gradient, mm Hg	41.1 ± 17.7	$\textbf{36.7} \pm \textbf{16.1}$	< 0.001	$\textbf{43.0} \pm \textbf{17.0}$	$\textbf{39.9} \pm \textbf{15.6}$	0.011	$\textbf{39.3} \pm \textbf{18.3}$	$\textbf{33.6} \pm \textbf{16.1}$	< 0.001
LVEF, %	$\textbf{56.2} \pm \textbf{13.5}$	50.6 ± 14.7	< 0.001	$\textbf{59.7} \pm \textbf{11.3}$	55.0 ± 12.7	< 0.001	$\textbf{52.3} \pm \textbf{14.7}$	$\textbf{45.9} \pm \textbf{15.3}$	< 0.001
LVEF <50%	227 (22.9)	376 (36.5)	< 0.001	72 (13.7)	136 (25.1)	< 0.001	155 (33.3)	240 (49.3)	< 0.001
LVEF <40%	122 (12.3)	234 (22.7)	< 0.001	35 (6.7)	74 (13.7)	< 0.001	87 (18.7)	160 (32.9)	< 0.001
E/e'	$\textbf{21.6} \pm \textbf{11.4}$	$\textbf{17.9} \pm \textbf{8.6}$	< 0.001	19.7 ± 10.1	$\textbf{16.7} \pm \textbf{7.8}$	< 0.001	$\textbf{24.6} \pm \textbf{12.5}$	$\textbf{20.2} \pm \textbf{9.7}$	< 0.001
Left ventricular mass index, g/m ²	131.1 ± 46.1	142.7 ± 47.2	< 0.001	126.9 ± 46.7	$\textbf{137.8} \pm \textbf{44.4}$	< 0.001	136.0 ± 45.1	$\textbf{148.1} \pm \textbf{49.7}$	< 0.001
Left atrial volume index, mL/m ²	$\textbf{44.2} \pm \textbf{17.2}$	45.0 ± 21.2	0.383	$\textbf{44.2} \pm \textbf{17.2}$	$\textbf{45.0} \pm \textbf{21.2}$	0.209	$\textbf{49.9} \pm \textbf{17.8}$	$\textbf{50.1} \pm \textbf{26.3}$	0.003
Moderate or severe mitral regurgitation	289 (29.3)	233 (22.8)	0.001	77 (14.7)	63 (11.6)	0.144	212 (45.8)	170 (35.4)	0.001
Moderate or severe tricuspid regurgitation	227 (22.9)	179 (17.5)	0.002	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	227 (48.9)	179 (37.2)	< 0.001
Pulmonary artery systolic pressure, mm Hg	$\textbf{46.0} \pm \textbf{19.8}$	$\textbf{43.0} \pm \textbf{19.8}$	< 0.001	$\textbf{35.5} \pm \textbf{15.1}$	$\textbf{34.3} \pm \textbf{16.0}$	0.241	$\textbf{58.8} \pm \textbf{17.1}$	$\textbf{53.9} \pm \textbf{18.9}$	< 0.001
Tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion, cm	20.0 ± 5.6	$\textbf{19.2} \pm \textbf{5.8}$	0.011	$\textbf{22.4} \pm \textbf{4.2}$	$\textbf{22.4} \pm \textbf{4.6}$	0.94	$\textbf{17.6} \pm \textbf{5.7}$	15.8 ± 5.1	<0.001
S', cm/s	12.1 ± 3.1	11.5 ± 3.2	< 0.001	13.2 ± 2.8	13.0 ± 2.6	0.295	11.0 ± 3.1	$\textbf{9.9}\pm\textbf{2.9}$	< 0.001
Fractional area change, %	$\textbf{42.5} \pm \textbf{10.1}$	$\textbf{39.5} \pm \textbf{10.4}$	< 0.001	$\textbf{46.4} \pm \textbf{8.5}$	$\textbf{44.3} \pm \textbf{8.1}$	0.009	$\textbf{38.6} \pm \textbf{10.2}$	$\textbf{35.0} \pm \textbf{10.4}$	< 0.001
Medication									
Beta-blocker	537 (54.0)	552 (53.6)	0.883	253 (47.9)	269 (49.5)	0.595	284 (60.8)	283 (58.2)	0.417
RAS inhibitor	559 (56.2)	585 (56.9)	0.762	311 (59.0)	308 (56.8)	0.469	248 (53.1)	277 (57.0)	0.227
Values are mean ± SD or n (%). Abbreviations as in Table 2.									

by AS. These findings underscore that the progression of cardiac damage is driven by AS itself as well as comorbidities, highlighting the importance of tailored treatment strategies to address underlying disease in patients with severe AS undergoing AVR. Importantly, despite these differences, cardiac damage staging classification proved effective in the stratification of 5year outcomes in both women and men.

Among advanced stages of cardiac damage, stage 3 was more prevalent in women, whereas stage 4 was more frequently observed in men. This trend is consistent with previous studies that validated the cardiac damage classification.¹⁷⁻¹⁹ Sex-specific differences in myocardial and pulmonary vascular response to AS may result in differences in upstream cardiac damage.^{20,21} Female sex is associated with a higher risk of pulmonary vascular disease, possibly influenced by the multifactorial effects of estrogen on pulmonary vascular remodeling.²² In this context, women with AS may be more susceptible to pulmonary hypertension than men with AS. A meta-analysis showed that pulmonary hypertension was more

TABLE 5 Clinical Outcomes According to Cardiac Damage Stage and Sex									
	Stage O	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Linear Trend HR _{adjusted} (95% Cl)	P Value		
Women									
At 1 y									
All-cause mortality	0 (0)	5 (4.2)	34 (10.3)	34 (14.3)	49 (28.0)	1.63 (1.33-1.99)	< 0.001		
Cardiovascular mortality	0 (0)	1 (0.8)	21 (6.4)	24 (10.1)	35 (20.0)	1.90 (1.47-2.45)	< 0.001		
At 5 y									
All-cause mortality	3 (18.2)	27 (25.1)	116 (40.3)	128 (60.4)	99 (61.5)	1.43 (1.28-1.60)	< 0.001		
Cardiovascular mortality	3 (18.2)	17 (16.8)	78 (30.5)	93 (49.2)	73 (49.8)	1.49 (1.31-1.70)	< 0.001		
Men									
At 1 y									
All-cause mortality	2 (7.1)	5 (5.4)	33 (9.3)	28 (21.1)	73 (26.3%)	1.51 (1.27-1.80)	< 0.001		
Cardiovascular mortality	0 (0)	1 (1.0)	19 (5.4)	15 (11.3)	55 (19.8%)	1.90 (1.50-2.41)	< 0.001		
At 5 y									
All-cause mortality	6 (25.9)	29 (36.3)	145 (48.6)	69 (59.4)	158 (63.6)	1.26 (1.14-1.38)	< 0.001		
Cardiovascular mortality	2 (10.7)	18 (24.4)	90 (34.2)	44 (49.5)	115 (52.5)	1.36 (1.21-1.53)	<0.001		
Values are n (%).									

common in female than in male patients undergoing TAVR.³⁵ Similarly, a study of pulmonary hypertension in patients with mitral stenosis showed that women had more adverse and less reversible pulmonary vascular remodeling than men.³⁶ Indeed, female patients in stage 3 had a higher mortality, comparable to those in stage 4 in the present study.

In contrast, RV dysfunction is more common in men than in women in the AS population.^{17-19,37} Estrogen has been reported to exert direct RVprotective effects, modifying disease progression independent of its effects in the pulmonary vasculature.²² Indeed, a multicenter study based on cardiac magnetic resonance analysis demonstrated that men had greater RV mass, larger RV volume, and lower RV ejection fraction than women in patients with subclinical atherosclerosis.³⁸ Although there are few data on sex-related differences in RV remodeling associated with AS, previous studies have shown that male sex was associated with lower RV ejection fraction in patients with pulmonary artery hypertension,^{39,40} indicating that men with AS-related pulmonary hypertension may tend to suffer from RV damage. In addition, a higher prevalence of comorbidities such as coronary artery disease, AF, and a pacemaker implantation, which adversely affect RV function, may also contribute to a higher incidence of RV dysfunction in men than in women.41

Previous reports indicated that women exhibit more favorable long-term prognosis compared to men, primarily because of longer life expectancy and fewer comorbidities.^{11,12} In our study, a favorable association of female sex with 5-year survival was observed in early stages (stages 0, 1, and 2) but not in the advanced stages (stages 3 and 4) of upstream cardiac damage. As mentioned previously, women are more susceptible to malignant pulmonary artery remodeling, which tends to be less reversible.³⁶ In addition, previous studies have reported that women with elevated pulmonary artery pressure exhibit equivalent or worse clinical outcomes compared with men.^{42,43} Therefore, once female patients develop stage 3 or worse cardiac damage in the context of AS, they may have a similar long-term mortality rate after TAVR compared to men despite the benefits of longer life expectancy and fewer comorbidities. Interestingly, no survival advantage was observed in women with early stages of cardiac damage and lowgradient AS. Low-gradient AS is recognized as a more advanced type of AS with a higher prevalence of comorbidities^{24,31} and may not benefit from the survival advantage of female sex even in early stages. However, these results must be interpreted in light of the fact that the number of patients with low-gradient AS is relatively small. In summary, sex-specific differences in cardiac damage may result from the differential effect of hormones on the myocardial and pulmonary artery, differences in the myocardial response to pressure overload caused by AS, and differences in the prevalence of comorbidities. Despite these differences, the cardiac damage staging classification stratified long-term outcomes regardless of sex. and timelv



intervention at an early stage of cardiac damage is warranted in both women and men. Furthermore, female patients may benefit more from intervention at early stages (stage 0, 1, or 2), warranting a sextailored approach to TAVR.

STUDY LIMITATIONS. The present analysis was a retrospective, observational, single-center study with inherent limitations. First, more than 40% of the patients were excluded because of inadequate echocardiography for the assessment of upstream cardiac



damage, potentially introducing a degree of selection bias. Second, the grouping of cardiac stages into early and advanced stages was somewhat arbitrary. However, we have shown in a previous study that this classification is useful for stratifying long-term mortality after TAVR.²⁴ Third, the study cohort was predominantly composed of octogenarians, and the findings may not be readily applicable to younger patients with fewer comorbidities and a longer life expectancy. Finally, we did not evaluate follow-up echocardiography after TAVR. Further research is warranted to investigate sex-specific differences in reverse remodeling and changes in upstream cardiac damage during follow-up.

CONCLUSIONS

Although the distribution of the stage of cardiac damage varied between sexes, the staging classification stratified mortality after TAVR for both women and men. Furthermore, female sex was associated with improved 5-year survival in early stages (stage 0, 1, or 2) but not in advanced stages of upstream cardiac damage (stage 3 or 4). It is essential to identify patients with AS in early stages of secondary cardiac damage and perform TAVR before progression to more advanced stages regardless of sex.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS The authors thank the Clinical Trial Unit Bern and all the staff at the Clinical Trial Unit Bern for their contribution to the clinical data collection.

FUNDING SUPPORT AND AUTHOR DISCLOSURES

Dr Maznyczka is a European Association of Percutaneous Coronary Intervention (EAPCI) international structural fellow: her fellowship is funded by Edwards Lifesciences through EAPCI and not directly from Edwards Lifesciences. Dr Praz has received travel expenses from Abbott, Edwards Lifesciences, and Polares Medical. Dr Stortecky has received research grants to the institution from Edwards Lifesciences, Medtronic, Abbott, and Boston Scientific; and has received personal fees from Boston Scientific, Teleflex, and BTG. Dr Windecker has received research and educational grants to the institution from Abbott, Amgen, AstraZeneca, BMS, Bayer, Biotronik, Boston Scientific, Cardinal Health, CardioValve, CSL Behring, Daiichi-Sankyo, Edwards Lifesciences, Guerbet, InfraRedx, Johnson & Johnson, Medicure, Medtronic, Novartis, Polares, OrPha Suisse, Pfizer, Regeneron, Sanofi, Sinomed, Terumo, and V-Wave; has served as an unpaid advisory board member and/or unpaid member of the steering/executive group of trials funded by Abbott, Abiomed, Amgen, AstraZeneca, BMS, Boston Scientific, Biotronik, Cardiovalve, Edwards Lifesciences, Med Alliance, Medtronic, Novartis, Polares, Sinomed, V-Wave, and Xeltis but has not received personal payments by pharmaceutical companies or device manufacturers; and has been a member of the steering/executive committee group of several investigator-initiated trials that receive funding by industry without impact on his personal remuneration. Dr Pilgrim has received research grants to the institution from Edwards Lifesciences and Biotronik; and has received personal fees from Biotronik, Medtronic, Abbott, Edwards Lifesciences, and HighLife SAS, All other authors have reported that they have no relationships relevant to the contents of this article to disclose.

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Dr Thomas Pilgrim, Department of Cardiology, Inselspital, Bern University Hospital, Freiburgstrasse 10, CH-3010 Bern, Switzerland. E-mail: thomas.pilgrim@insel.ch. @ThomPilgrim, @masaaki0825.

PERSPECTIVES

WHAT IS KNOWN? The extent of upstream cardiac damage stratifies prognosis in patients with severe AS undergoing TAVR.

WHAT IS NEW? Patterns of upstream cardiac damage differed between sexes, but the staging classification proved effective in the stratification of 5-year outcomes in both women and men. Women had favorable prognosis compared to men in early stages of cardiac damage, but women in more advanced stages had comparable mortality to men.

WHAT IS NEXT? Further studies are warranted to investigate sex-specific differences in reverse cardiac remodeling and changes of cardiac damage after TAVR.

REFERENCES

1. Roth GA, Mensah GA, Johnson CO, et al. Global burden of cardiovascular diseases and risk factors, 1990-2019: update from the GBD 2019 study. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2020;76:2982-3021.

2. Coffey S, Roberts-Thomson R, Brown A, et al. Global epidemiology of valvular heart disease. *Nat Rev Cardiol*. 2021;18:853-864.

3. Lindman BR, Clavel MA, Mathieu P, et al. Calcific aortic stenosis. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. 2016;2:16006.

4. Chaker Z, Badhwar V, Alqahtani F, et al. Sex differences in the utilization and outcomes of surgical aortic valve replacement for severe aortic stenosis. J Am Heart Assoc. 2017;6(9):e006370.

5. Lowenstern A, Sheridan P, Wang TY, et al. Sex disparities in patients with symptomatic severe aortic stenosis. *Am Heart J.* 2021;237:116–126.

6. Tribouilloy C, Bohbot Y, Rusinaru D, et al. Excess mortality and undertreatment of women with severe aortic stenosis. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2021;10:e018816.

7. DesJardin JT, Chikwe J, Hahn RT, Hung JW, Delling FN. Sex differences and similarities in valvular heart disease. *Circ Res.* 2022;130:455-473.

8. Chandrasekhar J, Dangas G, Yu J, et al. Sexbased differences in outcomes with transcatheter aortic valve therapy: TVT registry from 2011 to 2014. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2016;68:2733-2744.

9. Szerlip M, Gualano S, Holper E, et al. Sex-specific outcomes of transcatheter aortic valve replacement with the SAPIEN 3 valve: insights from the PARTNER II S3 high-risk and intermediate-risk cohorts. *J Am Coll Cardiol Intv.* 2018;11:13-20.

10. Vlastra W, Chandrasekhar J, García Del Blanco B, et al. Sex differences in transfemoral transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2019;74:2758-2767.

11. Tarantini G, Baumgartner H, Frank D, et al. Four-year mortality in women and men after transfemoral transcatheter aortic valve implantation using the SAPIEN 3. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* 2021;97:876-884. **12.** Saad M, Nairooz R, Pothineni NVK, et al. Longterm outcomes with transcatheter aortic valve replacement in women compared with men: evidence from a meta-analysis. *J Am Coll Cardiol Intv.* 2018;11:24–35.

13. Chieffo A, Petronio AS, Mehilli J, et al. 1-year clinical outcomes in women after transcatheter aortic valve replacement: results from the first WIN-TAVI registry. *J Am Coll Cardiol Intv*. 2018;11: 1-12.

14. Masiero G, Paradies V, Franzone A, et al. Sexspecific considerations in degenerative aortic stenosis for female-tailored transfemoral aortic valve implantation management. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2022;11:e025944.

15. Généreux P, Pibarot P, Redfors B, et al. Staging classification of aortic stenosis based on the extent of cardiac damage. *Eur Heart J.* 2017;38: 3351–3358.

16. Okuno T, Heg D, Lanz J, et al. Staging cardiac damage associated with aortic stenosis in patients undergoing transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Int J Cardiol Heart Vasc.* 2021;33: 100768.

17. Vollema EM, Amanullah MR, Ng ACT, et al. Staging cardiac damage in patients with symptomatic aortic valve stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2019;74:538-549.

18. Tastet L, Tribouilloy C, Maréchaux S, et al. Staging cardiac damage in patients with asymptomatic aortic valve stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2019;74:550-563.

19. Fukui M, Gupta A, Abdelkarim I, et al. Association of structural and functional cardiac changes with transcatheter aortic valve replacement outcomes in patients with aortic stenosis. *JAMA Cardiol.* 2019;4:215–222.

20. Treibel TA, Kozor R, Fontana M, et al. Sex dimorphism in the myocardial response to aortic stenosis. J Am Coll Cardiol Img. 2018;11:962-973.

21. Tastet L, Kwiecinski J, Pibarot P, et al. Sexrelated differences in the extent of myocardial fibrosis in patients with aortic valve stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol Img.* 2020;13:699–711. **22.** Hester J, Ventetuolo C, Lahm T. Sex, gender, and sex hormones in pulmonary hypertension and right ventricular failure. *Compr Physiol.* 2019;10: 125-170.

23. Stortecky S, Franzone A, Heg D, et al. Temporal trends in adoption and outcomes of transcatheter aortic valve implantation: a SwissTAVI Registry analysis. *Eur Heart J Qual Care Clin Outcomes.* 2019;5:242-251.

24. Nakase M, Okuno T, Tomii D, et al. Prognostic impact of cardiac damage staging classification in each aortic stenosis subtype undergoing TAVI. *EuroIntervention.* 2023;19:e865-e874.

25. Mitchell C, Rahko PS, Blauwet LA, et al. Guidelines for performing a comprehensive transthoracic echocardiographic examination in adults: recommendations from the American Society of Echocardiography. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr.* 2019;32:1-64.

26. Lang RM, Badano LP, Mor-Avi V, et al. Recommendations for cardiac chamber quantification by echocardiography in adults: an update from the American Society of Echocardiography and the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr.* 2015;28:1-39. e14.

27. Okuno T, Demirel C, Tomii D, et al. Long-term risk of unplanned percutaneous coronary intervention after transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *EuroIntervention*. 2022;18(10):797-803.

28. Leon MB, Piazza N, Nikolsky E, et al. Standardized endpoint definitions for transcatheter aortic valve implantation clinical trials: a consensus report from the Valve Academic Research Consortium. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2011;57: 253–269.

29. Kappetein AP, Head SJ, Généreux P, et al. Updated standardized endpoint definitions for transcatheter aortic valve implantation: the Valve Academic Research Consortium-2 consensus document. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2012;60: 1438-1454.

30. Généreux P, Piazza N, Alu MC, et al. Valve Academic Research Consortium 3: updated

endpoint definitions for aortic valve clinical research. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2021;77:2717-2746.

31. Nakase M, Tomii D, Heg D, et al. Association of atrial fibrillation with survival in patients with low-flow low-gradient aortic stenosis with preserved ejection fraction undergoing TAVI. *Eur Heart J Qual Care Clin Outcomes*. Published online July 25, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1093/ehjqcco/qcadO45

32. Hariri EH, El Halabi J, Kassis N, et al. Sex differences in the progression and long-term outcomes of native mild to moderate aortic stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol Img.* 2024;17(1):1-12.

33. Bing R, Cavalcante JL, Everett RJ, Clavel MA, Newby DE, Dweck MR. Imaging and impact of myocardial fibrosis in aortic stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol Img.* 2019;12:283–296.

34. Ajmone Marsan N, Delgado V, Shah DJ, et al. Valvular heart disease: shifting the focus to the myocardium. *Eur Heart J.* 2023;44:28–40.

35. O'Connor SA, Morice MC, Gilard M, et al. Revisiting sex equality with transcatheter aortic valve replacement outcomes: a collaborative, patient-level meta-analysis of 11,310 patients. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2015;66:221-228. **36.** Hart SA, Krasuski RA, Wang A, Kisslo K, Harrison JK, Bashore TM. Pulmonary hypertension and elevated transpulmonary gradient in patients with mitral stenosis. *J Heart Valve Dis.* 2010;19: 708–715.

37. Asami M, Stortecky S, Praz F, et al. Prognostic value of right ventricular dysfunction on clinical outcomes after transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *J Am Coll Cardiol Img.* 2019;12:577-587.

38. Kawut SM, Lima JA, Barr RG, et al. Sex and race differences in right ventricular structure and function: the multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis-right ventricle study. *Circulation*. 2011;123:2542-2551.

39. Jacobs W, van de Veerdonk MC, Trip P, et al. The right ventricle explains sex differences in survival in idiopathic pulmonary arterial hypertension. *Chest.* 2014;145:1230-1236.

40. Kawut SM, Al-Naamani N, Agerstrand C, et al. Determinants of right ventricular ejection fraction in pulmonary arterial hypertension. *Chest.* 2009;135:752-759.

41. Sanz J, Sánchez-Quintana D, Bossone E, Bogaard HJ, Naeije R. Anatomy, function, and dysfunction of the right ventricle: *JACC* state-of-the-art review. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2019;73:1463-1482.

42. Lindman BR, Zajarias A, Maniar HS, et al. Risk stratification in patients with pulmonary hypertension undergoing transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *Heart*. 2015;101:1656-1664.

43. Pighi M, Piazza N, Martucci G, et al. Sexspecific determinants of outcomes after transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes.* 2019;12(3): e005363.

KEY WORDS aortic stenosis, cardiac damage staging classification, sex difference, transcatheter aortic valve replacement

APPENDIX For supplemental tables and figures, please see the online version of this paper.