



TAVI with the
Edwards SAPIEN 3
platform is
superior to open
heart surgery
at 1 year.^{1,2,3}



Edwards

Proven benefits of TAVI

Several studies have shown that transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI) has benefits for patient symptoms, recovery and quality of life compared with surgical aortic valve implantation (SAVR).^{1,3-7}



Shorter, less invasive procedure

Mean procedure time of 59 minutes for TAVI vs. 208 minutes with SAVR.^{1†} TAVI is a less invasive treatment and shortens the recovery time compared with SAVR.^{5*}



Lower Mortality

Lower death or disabling stroke with TAVI (1%) than with SAVR (2.9%) at 1 year (p=0.03).^{1†}



Fewer complications

Low risk of major adverse cerebrovascular and cardiac events (MACCE) and life threatening bleeding with TAVI.^{3,6‡} – Considering bias and the higher mortality risk of patients selected for TAVI, risk of MACCEs was not higher with TAVI vs. SAVR up to 1 year.^{3,6‡}



Less time in ICU & hospital

Mean hospital stay of 3 vs. 7 days with SAVR (p< 0.001).^{1†}
Time in intensive care 2 vs. 3 days with SAVR.^{1†}



Faster recovery & return home

96% of patients undergoing TAVI with SAPIEN 3 valve were discharged home (routine discharge) compared to 73.1% with SAVR.^{1†}



Lower rehospitalisation

Rehospitalisation due to heart failure at 1 year after procedure at only 1.4% with SAPIEN 3 TAVI vs 3.6% with surgery (P=0.029).⁴



QoL Benefits

Significant improvements in measures of QoL vs. SAVR.^{7◇}

* High-risk patients (n=40)
† Low-risk patients (n=1,000)
‡ High-risk patients (n=618)
◇ Low-risk patients (n=1,000)





What could TAVI mean for your severe AS patients?

- Safe and effective procedure
- Increased quality of life with short hospital stay and procedure time
- Low complication and reintervention rates

References

1. Mack MJ et al, Transcatheter Aortic-Valve Replacement with a Balloon-Expandable Valve in Low-Risk Patients, *N Engl J Med*. 2019 May.
2. Pibarot P, Ternacle J, Jaber WA, et al; PARTNER 2 Investigators. Structural deterioration of transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve bioprostheses in the PARTNER-2 Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2020;76(16):1830-1843.
3. Eltchaninoff H, Tchétché D, RHEIA Trial - Transcatheter versus surgical aortic valve replacement in women, Presented at ESC 2024 Aug.
4. Data on file at Edwards Lifesciences.
5. Kleczyński, P, Bagieński M, Sorysz D, et al. Short- and intermediate-term improvement of patient quality of life after transcatheter aortic valve implantation: a single-centre study. *Kardiol Pol* 2014;72:612–616.
6. Tamburino C, Barbanti M, Capodanno D et al. Comparison of complications and outcomes to one year of transcatheter aortic valve implantation versus surgical aortic valve replacement in patients with severe aortic stenosis. *Am J Cardiol*. 2012;109:1487–93.
7. Baron SJ, et al. Health Status After Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Low-Risk Patients With Aortic Stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2019 Dec 10;74(23):2833-2842.

Medical device for professional use. For a listing of indications, contraindications, precautions, warnings, and potential adverse events, please refer to the Instructions for Use (consult eifu.edwards.com where applicable).

Edwards, Edwards Lifesciences, the stylized E logo, Edwards SAPIEN, Edwards SAPIEN 3, SAPIEN and SAPIEN 3 are trademarks or service marks of Edwards Lifesciences Corporation or its affiliates. All other trademarks are the property of their respective owners.

© 2024 Edwards Lifesciences Corporation. All rights reserved. PP--EU-6708 v2.0

Edwards Lifesciences Sàrl • Route de l'Etraz 70, 1260 Nyon, Switzerland • edwards.com



Edwards