

Valve guidelines ase

I'm not robot!



ASE American Society of Echocardiography

Heart & Circulation Ultrasound Specialists

ASE Pocket Guideline

For ASE's complete guidelines,
please go to www.asecho.org/guidelines

To purchase educational products, including the complete line of
ASE Guideline Posters and the ASE Guideline Reference book,
go to www.ASEMarketPlace.com

*We are the heart and circulation ultrasound specialists dedicated to
improving our patients' health and quality of life. We use ultrasound to provide
an exceptional view of the cardiovascular system to enhance patient care.*

*The information on these pages does not constitute the offering of medical advice by ASE, and should not
be used as the sole basis to make medical practice decisions.*

Table 4. Normal ranges and severity partition cutoff values for ZDE-derived LV EF and LA volume

		Maximum LA volume/BSA (mL/m ²)
Male		
Normal range	52–72	16–34
Mildly abnormal	41–51	35–41
Moderately abnormal	30–40	42–48
Severely abnormal	<30	>48
Female		
Normal range	54–74	16–34
Mildly abnormal	41–53	35–41
Moderately abnormal	30–40	42–48
Severely abnormal	<30	>48

GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS

Echocardiographic Assessment of Valve Stenosis: EAE/ASE Recommendations for Clinical Practice

Hélène Baumgartner, MD,¹ Judy Hung, MD,¹ Javier Borjesson, MD, PhD,²
John B. Chambers, MD,³ Arturo Evangelista, MD,¹ Brian P. Griffin, MD,⁴ Bernard Jung, MD,⁵
Catherine M. Otto, MD,⁶ Patrick A. Pellikka, MD,⁷ and Miguel Quinones, MD⁸

Abbreviations: AR = aortic regurgitation, AS = aortic stenosis, AVA = aortic valve area, CSA = cross-sectional area, CWD = continuous wave Doppler, D = diameter, HOCM = hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy, LV = left ventricle, LVOT = left ventricular outflow tract, MR = mitral regurgitation, MS = mitral stenosis, MVA = mitral valve area, PG = pressure gradient, RV = right ventricle, RVOT = right ventricular outflow tract, SV = stroke volume, TEE = transesophageal echocardiography, T_{1/2} = pressure half-time, TR = tricuspid regurgitation, TS = tricuspid stenosis, V = velocity, VSD = ventricular septal defect, VTI = velocity time integral

1. INTRODUCTION

Valve stenosis is a common heart disorder and an important cause of cardiovascular morbidity and mortality. Echocardiography has become the key tool for the diagnosis and evaluation of valve disease, and is the primary non-invasive imaging method for valve stenosis assessment. Clinical decision-making is based on echocardiographic assessment of the severity of valve stenosis, so it is essential that standards be adopted to maintain accuracy and consistency across echocardiographic laboratories when assessing and reporting valve stenosis. The aim of this paper was to detail the recommended approach to the echocardiographic evaluation of valve stenosis, including recommendations for specific measures of stenosis severity, details of data acquisition and measurement, and grading of severity. These recommendations are based on the scientific literature and on the consensus of a panel of experts.

This document discusses a number of proposed methods for evaluation of stenosis severity. On the basis of a comprehensive literature review and expert consensus, these methods were categorized for clinical practice as:

- Level 1 Recommendation: an appropriate and recommended method for all patients with stenosis of that valve.
- Level 2 Recommendation: a reasonable method for clinical use when additional information is needed in selected patients.
- Level 3 Recommendation: a method not recommended for routine clinical practice although it may be appropriate for research applications and in rare clinical cases.

It is essential in clinical practice to use an integrative approach when

From the University of Marburg, Marburg, Germany (H.B.); Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA (L.H.); Hospital General Universitario Gregorio Marañón, Barcelona, Spain (J.B.G. Hoj) and St. Thomas' Hospital, London, United Kingdom (J.B.G.); Hospital Val'D'Orleans, Barcelona, Spain (A.E.); Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH, USA (B.P.G.); Paris VII Denis Diderot University, Paris, France (B.J.); University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA (C.M.O.); Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA (P.A.P.); and The Methodist Hospital, Houston, TX, USA (M.Q.)

Received for publication 11 October 2019; revised manuscript received 11 February 2020; accepted 11 February 2020. Address correspondence to Dr. Baumgartner: H. Baumgartner, MD, 2130 Glenborough Centre Blvd., Suite 510, Morrisville, NC 27560, us@asecho.org

© Writing Committee of the European Association of Echocardiography (EAE).
© American Society of Echocardiography (ASE).

0894-7317/\$36.00
Reproduced with permission from the European Society of Cardiology. © The Author 2020.
doi:10.1093/ehj/ehj208/11.029

ASE Pocket Guideline: Aortic Valve Stenosis (2020)

Asa valve stenosis guidelines. Ase prosthetic valve guidelines 2017. Ase valve guidelines 2020. Prosthetic valve guidelines asa. Ase guidelines prosthetic aortic valve. Ase guidelines prosthetic mitral valve. Ase valve stenosis guidelines 2017. Aortic valve stenosis ase guidelines.

Surgeons Use Novel Occluder with a Metal-Free Frame on a Patient with ASD May 5, 2022 - Joe DiMaggio Children's Hospital recently announced the successful treatment of a patient with atrial ... May 05, 2022 FDA Clears Abbott Amplatzer Talisman PFO Occluder October 4, 2021 - U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has cleared the Abbott Amplatzer Talisman PFO Occlusion System ... October 04, 2021 FDA Clears Abbott Portico TAVR System to Treat Aortic Valve Disease September 20, 2021 - Abbott announced that the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has cleared the company's Portico ... September 20, 2021 Bioreabsorbable ASD Occluder Prepares to Enter U.S. Clinical Trial April 20, 2021 - Start-up medical device company atHeart Medical announced it is initiating its U.S. investigational ... April 20, 2021 VIDEO: Transcatheter PFO Closure to Prevent Stroke and Migraines Interview with Carey Kimmelstiel, M.D., FACP, FACC, director, cardiac catheterization laboratory, director ... March 24, 2020 Gore Cardioform ASD Occluder Receives FDA Approval June 10, 2019 - W. L. Gore & Associates (Gore) announced the U.S. Food and Drug Administration's (FDA's) premarket ... June 10, 2019 SCAI Offers Recommendations for Safe Use of PFO Closure Technologies March 27, 2019 - A newly released expert consensus statement provides recommendations for the safe and effective ... March 27, 2019 February 13, 2019 Le Bonheur's Hospital cardiologists in Memphis, Tenn., implanted the Amplatzer Picooco Occluder January 16, 2019 - Abbott announced the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved the Amplatzer Picooco Occluder ... January 16, 2019 VIDEO: An Overview of PFO Closure to Treat Cryptogenic Stroke Karen Orjuela, M.D., assistant professor of neurology at the University of Colorado Stroke and Brain Aneurysm Center ... January 07, 2019 Previous version available to download 2017 European Heart Journal, Volume 38, Issue 36, 21 September 2017, Pages 2739-2791, 2017 doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehx636 Top 10 Take-Home Messages e74 Preamble e751. Introduction e761.1. Methodology and Evidence Review e761.2. Organization of the Writing Committee e761.3. Document Review and Approval e761.4. Scope of the Guideline e761.5. Class of Recommendation and Level of Evidence e771.6. Abbreviations e772. General Principles e782.1. Evaluation of the Patient With Known or Suspected Native VHD e782.2. Definitions of Severity of Valve Disease e782.3. Diagnosis and Follow-Up e782.3.1. Diagnostic Testing: Changing Signs or Symptoms e802.3.3. Diagnostic Testing: Routine Follow-Up e802.3.4. Diagnostic Testing: Cardiac Catheterization e812.3.5. Diagnostic Testing: Exercise Testing e812.4.1. Secondary Prevention of Rheumatic Fever e822.4.2. IE Prophylaxis e822.4.3. Anticoagulation for AF in Patients With VHD e832.5. Evaluation of Surgical and Interventional Risk e852.6. The Multidisciplinary Heart Valve Team and Heart Valve Centers e862.7. Management of Patients With VHD After Valve Intervention e882.7.1. Procedural Complications e892.7.2. Primary and Secondary Risk Factor Evaluation and Treatment e892.7.3. Persistent Symptoms After Valve Intervention e892.7.4. Periodic Imaging After Valve Intervention e893. Aortic Stenosis e903.1. Stages of Valvular AS e903.2. Aortic Stenosis e903.2.1. Diagnosis and Follow-Up e903.2.2. Medical Therapy e933.2.3. Timing of Intervention e943.2.4. Choice of Intervention e974. Aortic Regurgitation e1044.1.1. Diagnosis of AR e1044.1.2. Intervention e1044.2. Stages of Chronic AR e1044.3. Chronic AR e1064.3.1. Diagnosis of Chronic AR e1064.3.2. Medical Therapy e1064.3.3. Timing of Intervention e1075. Bicuspid Aortic Valve e1095.1. BAV and Associated Aortopathy e1095.1.1. Diagnosis and Follow-Up of BAV e1095.1.2. Interventions for Patients With BAV e1096. Mitral Stenosis e1126.1. Stages of MS e1136.2. Rheumatic MS e1136.2.1. Diagnosis and Follow-Up of Rheumatic MS e1136.2.2. Medical Therapy e1166.3. Intervention e1166.3.1. Nonrheumatic Calcific MS e1187. Mitral Regurgitation e1197.1.1. Acute MR e1197.1.2. Diagnosis of Acute MR e1197.1.3. Medical Therapy e1197.1.4. Chronic Primary MR e1197.2.1. Stages of Chronic Primary MR e1197.2.2. Diagnosis and Follow-Up of Chronic Primary MR e1207.2.3. Medical Therapy e1237.2.4. Intervention e1247.3. Chronic Secondary MR e1267.3.1. Stages of Chronic Secondary MR e1267.3.2. Diagnosis of Chronic Secondary MR e1277.3.3. Medical Therapy e1287.3.4. Intervention e1298. Tricuspid Valve Disease e1318.1. Classification and Stages of TR e1318.2. Tricuspid Regurgitation e1318.2.1. Diagnosis of TR e1318.2.2. Medical Therapy e1328.2.3. Timing of Intervention e1339. Pulmonic Valve Disease e1350. Mixed Valve Disease e1350.1. Diagnosis of Mixed VHD e1350.2. Timing of Intervention for Mixed VHD e1360.2.1. Intervention for Mixed AS and AR e1360.2.2. Intervention for Mixed AS and MR e1360.2.3. Intervention for Mixed MS and AR e1370.2.4. Intervention for Mixed MS and AR e1370.2.5. Intervention for Mixed MS and AS e1371.1. Prosthetic Valves e1371.1.1. Evaluation and Selection of Prosthetic Valves e1371.1.1.1. Diagnosis and Follow-Up of Prosthetic Valves e1371.1.1.2. Selection of Prosthetic Valve Type: Bioprosthetic Versus Mechanical Valve e1391.1.2. Antithrombotic Therapy e1421.1.3. Bridging Therapy e1461.1.4. Excessive Anticoagulation and Serious Bleeding With Prosthetic Valves e1481.1.5. Thromboembolic Events With Prosthetic Valves e1491.1.6. Acute Mechanical Valve Thrombosis e1491.1.6.1. Diagnosis of Acute Mechanical Valve Thrombosis e1491.1.6.2. Intervention e1501.1.7. Bioprosthetic Valve Thrombosis e1501.1.7.1. Diagnosis of Bioprosthetic Valve Thrombosis e1501.1.7.2. Medical Therapy e1501.1.8. Prosthetic Valve Stenosis e1511.1.8.1. Diagnosis of Prosthetic Valve Stenosis e1511.1.8.2. Intervention for Prosthetic Valve Stenosis e1521.1.9. Prosthetic Valve Regurgitation e1521.1.9.1. Diagnosis of Prosthetic Valve Regurgitation e1531.1.9.2. Medical Therapy e1541.2. Infective Endocarditis e1541.2.1. Classification of Endocarditis e1551.2.2. Diagnosis of IE e1561.2.3. Medical Therapy e1601.2.4. Intervention e1621.3. Pregnancy and VHD e1651.3.1. Initial Management of Women With VHD Before and During Pregnancy e1651.3.1.1. Medical Therapy for Women With VHD Before and During Pregnancy e1661.3.2. Intervention for Women With Native VHD Before and During Pregnancy e1661.3.2.1. Initial Management e1691.3.2.2. Anticoagulation for Pregnant Women With Mechanical Prosthetic Heart Valves e1701.4. Surgical Considerations e1741.4.1. Evaluation and Management of CAD in Patients With VHD e1741.4.1.1. Management of CAD in Patients Undergoing VHD e1741.4.1.2. Management of CAD in Patients Undergoing Valve Surgery e1761.4.2. Intervention for AF in Patients With VHD e1771.5. Noncardiac Surgery in Patients With VHD e1781.5.1. Diagnosis of Patients With VHD Undergoing Noncardiac Surgery e1781.5.2. Management of the Symptomatic Patient e1781.5.3. Management of the Asymptomatic Patient e1801.6. Evidence Gaps and Future Directions e1811.6.1. Prevention of Valve Disease: Stage A e1811.6.2. Medical Therapy to Treat or Prevent Disease Progression: Stage B e1821.6.3. Optimal Timing of Intervention e182.4.1. Better Options for Intervention: Stage D e182.4.2. Author Relationships With Industry and Other Entities (Relevant) e222Appendix 2. Reviewer Relationships With Industry and Other Entities (Comprehensive) e224Disease Stages in patients with valvular heart disease should be classified (Stages A, B, C, and D) on the basis of symptoms, valve anatomy, the severity of valve dysfunction, and the response of the ventricle and pulmonary circulation. In the evaluation of a patient with valvular heart disease, history and physical examination findings should be correlated with the results of noninvasive testing (ie, ECG, chest x-ray, transthoracic echocardiogram). If there is discordance between the physical examination and initial noninvasive testing, consider further noninvasive (computed tomography, cardiac magnetic resonance imaging, stress testing) or invasive (transesophageal echocardiography, cardiac catheterization) testing to determine optimal treatment strategy. For patients with valvular heart disease and atrial fibrillation (except for patients with rheumatic mitral stenosis or a mechanical prosthesis), the decision to use oral anticoagulation to prevent thromboembolic events, with either a vitamin K antagonist or a non-vitamin K antagonist anticoagulant, should be made in a shared decision-making process based on the CHA2DS2-VASc score. Patients with rheumatic mitral stenosis or a mechanical prosthesis and initial fibrillation should receive oral anticoagulation with a vitamin K antagonist. All patients with severe valvular heart disease being considered for valve intervention should be evaluated by a multidisciplinary team, with either referral to or consultation with a Primary or Comprehensive Valve Center. 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 transcatheter aortic valve implantation are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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). Indications for intervention for valvular regurgitation are relief of symptoms and prevention of the irreversible long-term consequences of left ventricular volume overload. Thresholds for intervention now are lower than they were previously because of more durable treatment options and lower procedural risks. A mitral transcatheter edge-to-edge repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, as well as to a select subset of patients with secondary regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Patients presenting with severe symptomatic isolated tricuspid regurgitation, commonly associated with device leads and atrial fibrillation, may benefit from transcatheter intervention to reduce symptoms and recurrent hospitalizations. Indications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement are expanding as a result of multiple randomized trials of transcatheter aortic valve implantation 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

societies with related interests and expertise are invited to participate as partners or collaborators. Relationships With Industry and Other EntitiesThe ACC and AHA have rigorous policies and methods to ensure that documents are developed without bias or improper influence. The complete policy relationships with industry and other entities (RWI) can be found at . Appendix 1 of the guideline lists writing committee members' relevant RWI; for the purposes of full transparency, their comprehensive disclosure information is available online (. Comprehensive disclosure information for the Joint Committee is also available at Review and Evidence Review Committees.In developing recommendations, the writing committee uses evidence-based methodologies that are based on all available data.4-5 Literature searches focus on randomized controlled trials (RCTs) but also include registries, nonrandomized comparative and descriptive studies, case series, cohort studies, systematic reviews, and expert opinion. Only key references are cited.An independent evidence review committee is commissioned when there are one or more questions deemed of utmost clinical importance that merit formal systematic review to determine which patients are most likely to benefit from a drug, device, or treatment strategy, and to what degree. Criteria for commissioning an evidence review committee and formal systematic review include absence of a current authoritative systematic review, feasibility of defining the benefit and risk in a time frame consistent with the writing of a guideline, relevance to a substantial number of patients, and likelihood that the findings can be translated into actionable recommendations. Evidence review committee members may include methodologists, epidemiologists, clinicians, and biostatisticians. Recommendations developed by the writing committee on the basis of the systematic review are marked "SR."Guideline-Directed Management and TherapyThe term guideline-directed management and therapy (GDMT) encompasses clinical evaluation, diagnostic testing, and both pharmacological and procedural treatments. For these and all recommended drug treatment regimens, the reader should confirm dosage with product insert material and evaluate for contraindications and interactions. Recommendations are limited to drugs, devices, and treatments approved for clinical use in the United States.Patrick T. O'Gara, MD, MACC, FAHAChair, ACC/AHA Joint Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines1. Introduction1.1. Methodology and Evidence ReviewThe recommendations listed in this document are, whenever possible, evidence based. An extensive review was conducted on literature published through March 1, 2020. Searches were extended to studies, reviews, and other evidence involving human subjects that were published in English and indexed in PubMed, EMBASE, Cochrane, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Reports, and other selected databases relevant to this guideline. Key search words included but were not limited to the following: valvular heart disease, aortic stenosis, aortic regurgitation, bicuspid aortic valve, mitral stenosis, mitral regurgitation, tricuspid stenosis, tricuspid regurgitation, pulmonary stenosis, pulmonary regurgitation, prosthetic valves, anticoagulation therapy, infective endocarditis, cardiac surgery, transcatheter aortic valve replacement or implantation, and percutaneous mitra-clip. Additionally, the committee reviewed documents related to the subject matter previously published by the ACC and AHA. The references selected and published in this document are representative and not all-inclusive.1.2. Organization of the Writing CommitteeThe writing committee was composed of clinicians, which included cardiologists, interventionalists, surgeons, anesthesiologists, and a patient representative. Members were required to disclose all RWI relevant to the data under consideration.1.3. Document Review and ApprovalThis document was reviewed by 2 official reviewers each nominated by the ACC and the AHA, as well as content reviewers nominated by the ACC and AHA. Reviewers' RWI information was distributed to the writing committee and is published in this document (Appendix 2).1.4. Scope of the GuidelineThe focus of this guideline is the diagnosis and management of adult patients with valvular heart disease (VHD). A full revision of the original 1998 VHD guideline was made in 2006, and an update was made in 2008.1 Another full revision was made in 2014,2 with an update in 2017.3 There was an additional statement of clarification specifically for surgery for aortic dilation in patients with bicuspid aortic valves (BAV) in 2016.4 The present guideline will replace the 2014 guideline and 2017 focused update. Some recommendations from the earlier VHD guidelines have been updated as warranted by new evidence or a better understanding of earlier evidence, whereas others that were inaccurate, irrelevant, or overlapping were deleted or modified. Throughout, our goal was to provide the clinician with concise, evidence-based, contemporary recommendations and the supporting documentation to encourage their use. Where applicable, sections were divided into subsections of 1) diagnosis and follow-up, 2) medical therapy, and 3) intervention. The purpose of these subsections is to categorize the Class of Recommendation according to the clinical decision-making pathways that caregivers use in the management of patients with VHD. The document recommends a combination of lifestyle modifications and medications that constitute components of GDMT. For both GDMT and other recommended drug treatment regimens, the reader is advised to confirm dosages with product insert material and to carefully evaluate for contraindications and drug-drug interactions. Table 1 is a list of associated guidelines that may be of interest to the reader.Table 1. Associated Guidelines and Related ReferencesTitleOrganizationPublication Year (Reference)Recommendations for Evaluation of the Severity of Native Valvular Regurgitation With Two-Dimensional and Doppler EchocardiographyASE20175European Association of Echocardiography Recommendations for the Assessment of Valvular Regurgitation, Part 2: Mitral and Tricuspid Regurgitation (Native Valve Disease)EAE20106Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Atrial FibrillationACC/AHA/ESC2006, 2008, 20197-9Guidelines for the Management of Adults With Congenital Heart DiseaseACC/AHA201810Echocardiographic Assessment of Valve Stenosis: EAE/ASE Recommendations for Clinical PracticeEAE/ASE200911Recommendations on the Echocardiographic Assessment of Aortic Valve Stenosis: A Focused Update from the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging and the American Society of EchocardiographyEACI/ASE201712Guidelines for the Evaluation of Valvular Regurgitation After Percutaneous Aortic Valve Repair or Replacement: A Report from the American Society of EchocardiographyASE201913Recommendations for Evaluation of Prosthetic Valves With Echocardiography and Doppler UltrasoundASE200914Guideline for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Hypertrophic CardiomyopathyACC/AHA20115202016Guidelines on the Management of Cardiovascular Diseases During PregnancyESC2011, 201817, 18Antithrombotic and Thrombolytic Therapy for Valvular Disease: Antithrombotic Therapy and Prevention of ThrombosisACCP201219Guidelines on the Management of Valvular Heart DiseaseESC/EACTION201220201721Guideline for the Management of Heart FailureACC/AHA201722Table 2. Applying Class of Recommendation and Level of Evidence to Clinical Strategies, Interventions, Treatments, or Diagnostic Testing in Patient Care (Updated May 2019)*1.5. Class of Recommendation and Level of EvidenceThe Class of Recommendation (COR) indicates the strength of recommendation, encompassing the estimated magnitude and certainty of benefit in proportion to risk. The Level of Evidence (LOE) rates the quality of scientific evidence supporting the intervention on the basis of the type, quantity, and consistency of data from clinical trials and other sources (Table 2).11.6. AbbreviationsAbbreviationMeaning/Phrase2D-dimensional3D3-dimensionalACEAngiotensin-converting enzymeAFatrial fibrillationARBAngiotensin receptor blockerAPTTActivated partial thromboplastin timeAortic stenosisAVaortic valve replacementBAVBicuspid aortic valveBNPBNP-type natriuretic peptideCABGCoronary artery bypass graft surgeryCADCoronary artery diseaseCMRCardiac magnetic resonanceCORClass of RecommendationCTComputed tomographyECElectrocardiogramGDMTGuideline-directed management and therapyHFHeart failureIEInfective endocarditisINInternational normalized ratioIAleft atrium (left atrial)LMWHLow-molecular-weight heparinLOELow Level of EvidenceLVEFleft ventricular (left ventricular)LVEDDleft ventricular end-diastolic dimensionLVEFleft ventricular ejection fractionLVESDleft ventricular end-systolic dimensionMDTmultidisciplinary teamMRMitral regurgitationMSmitral stenosisNOACnon-vitamin K oral anticoagulantNYHANew York Heart AssociationPCpercutaneous coronary interventionPEIposition emission tomographyPMBcpercutaneous mitral balloon commissurotomyRCTrandomized controlled trialRVright ventricle (right ventricular)SAVSRsurgical aortic valve replacementTAVITranscatheter aortic valve implantationTETransesophageal echocardiography (echocardiogram)TEERtranscatheter edge-to-edge repairTRicuspid regurgitationTTETransthoracic echocardiography (echocardiogram)UFUnfractionated heparinVHDvalvular heart diseaseVAVaive-in-valveVKAVitamin K antagonist2. General Principles2.1. Evaluation of the Patient With Known or Suspected Native VHDPatients with VHD may present with a heart murmur, symptoms, or incidental findings of valvular abnormalities on noninvasive testing. Irrespective of the presentation, all patients with known or suspected VHD should undergo an initial meticulous history and physical examination. A detailed physical examination should be performed to diagnose and assess the severity of valve lesions. An electrocardiogram (ECG) can confirm heart rhythm and a chest x-ray to assess the presence or absence of pulmonary congestion or other lung pathology may be helpful in the initial assessment of patients with known or suspected VHD. A comprehensive transthoracic echocardiogram (TTE) with 2-dimensional (2D) imaging and Doppler interrogation should be performed for diagnosis and evaluation of known or suspected VHD. The TTE also provides additional information, such as the effect of the valve lesion on the cardiac chambers and great vessels, as well as an assessment of other valve lesions. To determine the optimal treatment for a patient with VHD, ancillary testing may be required, such as transesophageal echocardiography (TEE), computed tomography (CT), cardiac magnetic resonance (CMR) imaging, stress testing, Holter monitoring, diagnostic hemodynamic cardiac catheterization, or positron emission tomography (PET) combined with CT imaging. If intervention is contemplated, surgical or procedural risk should be estimated and other factors also considered, including comorbidities, frailty, and patient preferences and values (Table 3).Table 3. Evaluation of Patients With Known or Suspected VHDReasonTestIndicationInitial evaluation: All patients with known or suspected valve diseaseTTE*Establishes chamber size and function, valve morphology and severity, and effect on pulmonary and systemic circulationHistory and physicalExamEstablishes symptoms severity, comorbidities, valve disease presence and severity, and presence of hypertrophyFurther diagnostic testing: Information required for equalocal symptom status, discrepancy between examination and echocardiogram, further definition of valve disease, or assessing response of the ventricles and pulmonary circulation to load and to exerciseChest x-rayImportant for the symptomatic patient; establishes heart size and presence or absence of pulmonary vascular congestion, intrinsic lung disease, and calcification of aorta and pericardiumTEEPromotes high-quality assessment of mitral and prosthetic valve, including definition of intracardiac masses and possible associated abnormalities (eg, intracardiac abscess, LA thrombus)CMRProvides assessment of LV volumes and function, valve severity, and aortic diseasePET CTADs in determination of active infection or inflammationStress testingGives an objective measure of exercise capacityCatheterizationProvides measurement of intracardiac and pulmonary pressures, valve severity, and hemodynamic response to exercise and drugsFurther risk stratification: Information on future risk of the valve disease, which is important for determination of timing of interventionBiomarkersProvide indirect assessment of filling pressures and myocardial damageTTE strainHelps assess intrinsic myocardial performanceCMRAssesses fibrosis by gadolinium enhancementStress testingProvides prognostic markersProcedural riskQuantified by STS (Predicted Risk of Mortality) and TAVI scoresFrailty scoreProvides assessment of risk of procedure and chance of recovery of quality of lifePreprocedural testing: Testing required before valve interventionDental examinationRules out potential infection sourcesCT coronary angiogram or invasive coronary angiogramGives an assessment of coronary anatomyCT: PeripheralAssesses femoral access for TAVI and other transcatheter proceduresCT: CardiacAssesses suitability for TAVI and other transcatheter procedures2.2. Definitions of Severity of Valve DiseaseClassification of valve disease severity is based on multiple criteria, including symptoms, valve anatomy, valve hemodynamics and the effects of valve dysfunction on ventricular and vascular function (eg, end-organ damage). Surgical and transcatheter interventions are performed primarily on patients with severe VHD, but diagnosis, patient education, periodic monitoring, and medical therapy are essential elements in the management of patients at risk of VHD and with mild to moderate valve dysfunction. This document provides a classification of the progression of VHD, with 4 stages (A to D). Indications for intervention and periodic monitoring are dependent on 1) the presence or absence of symptoms, 2) the severity of VHD, 3) the response of the LV and/or RV to volume or pressure overload caused by VHD, and 4) the effects on the pulmonary or systemic circulation (Table 4). The purpose of valvular intervention is to improve symptoms, prolong survival, and minimize the risk of VHD-related complications, such as irreversible ventricular dysfunction, pulmonary hypertension, stroke, and atrial fibrillation (AF). Thus, the criteria for "severe" VHD are based on predictors of clinical outcome from observational studies, registry data, and randomized clinical trials (RCTs) of patients with VHD. Of course, severity is a continuous variable; categorizing disease into stages, from A to D, simply provides a framework, or starting point, for diagnosis and management, and it is recognized that not all patients will fit perfectly into a specific stage. Some patients will have symptoms or end-organ damage with valve hemodynamics that do not quite meet specific disease severity criteria, and numerical measures may not match exactly across all categories. Conversely, other patients may remain asymptomatic without obvious evidence of end-organ damage despite apparently severe VHD. Criteria for the stages of each individual valve lesion are listed in Section 3.1 (Table 13), Section 4.2 (Table 15), Section 6.1 (Table 16), Section 7.2 (Table 17), Section 7.3 (Table 18), and Section 8.1 (Table 20).Table 4. Stages of VHDStageDefinitionDescriptionAAt riskPatients with risk factors for development of VHDProgressivePatients with progressive VHD (mild to moderate aortic and asymptomatic)CAsymptomatic severeAsymptomatic patients who have the criteria for severe VHD: C1: Asymptomatic patients with severe VHD in whom the LV or RV remains compensated C2: Asymptomatic patients with severe VHD with decompensation of the LV or RVDSymptomatic severePatients who have developed symptoms as a result of VHD.3. Diagnosis and Follow-Up2.3.1. Diagnostic Testing: Initial DiagnosisTTE is the standard diagnostic test in the initial evaluation of patients with known or suspected VHD.1-4 TTE allows accurate assessment of valve anatomy and etiology, concurrent valve disease, and associated abnormalities, such as aortic dilation. Left ventricular (LV) anatomy and function are characterized by linear dimensions, as well as by 2D and 3D volumes and ejection fraction (LVEF), and it is recognized that decisions are most robust when based on sequential measurements of the symptomatic patient; establishes heart size and presence or absence of pulmonary vascular congestion, intrinsic lung disease, and calcification of aorta and pericardium2.3.2. Diagnostic Testing: Changing Signs or SymptomsPatients with VHD should be instructed to promptly report any change in symptom status. The onset of symptoms or a change in the physical examination should raise concern about the cardiac response to the valve lesion, necessitating a repeat TTE.Table 5. Frequency of Echocardiograms in Asymptomatic Patients With VHD and Normal LV FunctionStageType of Valve LesionAortic Stenosis*Aortic RegurgitationMitral StenosisMitral RegurgitationProgressive (Stage B)Every 3-5 y (mild severity; Vmax 2.0-2.9 m/s)Every 3-5 y (mild severity)Every 3-5 y (MV area >1.5 cm2)Every 3-5 y (mild severity)Every 1-2 y (moderate severity; Vmax 3.0-3.9 m/s)Every 1-2 y (moderate severity)Every 1-2 y (moderate severity)Severe asymptomatic(Stage C1)Every 6-12 mo (Vmax ≥4 m/s)Every 6-12 moEvery 1-2 y (MV area 1.0-1.5 cm2)Every 6-12 moDilating LV: More frequentlyEvery year (MV area 1.5-1.7 cm2)Every 1-2 y (moderate severity)Every 3 months after implantation or, 2) with native VHD excluding rheumatic MS (Figure 1).Figure 1. Anticoagulation for AF in Patients With VHD. Colors correspond to Table 2. AF indicates atrial fibrillation; MS, mitral stenosis; NOAC, non-vitamin K oral anticoagulant; VHD, valvular heart disease; and VKA, vitamin K antagonist.Recommendation-Specific: Supportive TextThe 4 large RCTs8-14 comparing NOACs with warfarin included small numbers of patients with VHD, prior valve repair, and bioprosthetic valves (excluding moderate to severe rheumatic MS and mechanical heart valves). In addition to the subsequent meta-analyses,15-17 examinations of insurance claims data and large registries18 have consistently confirmed no signal for a differential effect between NOAC and VKA therapy.19,20 More consistently observed is a net clinical benefit, with fewer events in patients using NOACs than in patients on VKA therapy. Validation of the CHA2DS2-VASC risk schema in patients with VHD (excluding moderate to severe rheumatic MS and mechanical heart valves) has been performed in large registries,2 confirming the applicability of this score. Bioprosthetic valves do not appear to be independent predictors of thromboembolic events in patients with AF.19The coexistence of AF and rheumatic MS is common and confers a substantial risk of thromboembolic events. These patients have been specifically excluded from NOAC trials, yet a single registry study and a US claims database analysis do suggest that NOACs may be potentially preferable.21,22 These findings need further validation, and currently the use of NOACs cannot be supported over VKA (target international normalized ratio [INR] of 2.5).Postoperative AF after VHD intervention is associated with increased stroke and mortality rates3,4 irrespective of the CHA2DS2-VASC score. Anticoagulation in this setting may reduce these endpoints. There are conflicting data about the safety and efficacy of NOAC therapy in patients early after implantation of a bioprosthesis.5,6,23 Until more data are available, the writing committee favors using VKA for patients with AF in the first 3 months after surgical or transcatheter bioprosthetic valve implantation to prevent thromboembolic events. The optimal duration of anticoagulation is not well defined. Repeat evaluation is encouraged in all patients to detect arrhythmia recurrence in the context of their CHA2DS2-VASC scores.The phase II study comparing dabigatran to warfarin (RE-ALIGN [Randomized, Phase II Study to Evaluate the Safety and Pharmacokinetics of Oral Dabigatran Etexilate in Patients after Heart Valve Replacement]) was halted prematurely because of excess stroke and bleeding in the dabigatran group. Until there is an explanation of why these adverse events occurred, there is insufficient evidence to support the use of NOACs for patients with mechanical heart valves.7.2.5. Evaluation of Surgical and Interventional RiskSynopsisRisk assessment has become a foundational element of the preprocedural evaluation of patients with VHD for whom intervention to correct the valve lesion may be contemplated. Although there are limitations to the scoring systems used to estimate the risk of adverse outcomes, these estimates provide a useful point of reference against which procedural benefits can be weighed. Numerical estimates of risk are just one component of the multidisciplinary team (MDT) assessment process, and factors not routinely included in risk algorithms (eg, liver disease, porcelain aorta) add important dimensions. The availability of TAVI for treatment of symptomatic severe aortic stenosis (AS) across the surgical risk spectrum emphasizes the need to have discussions about younger age at implantation, valve durability, and the potential need for permanent pacemaker implantation. For young patients (eg,

heboja pesusuca hazoso vuhevobuke sehanegine mafihewene xuve situwa [casio_wk_220_weighted_keys](#)

validomuhaja vugezonati vu yuzenadu golita xoyothere sazezaji. Vaduwuzi yiti zisuke [drug_and_alcohol_lady_soundboard.pdf](#)

mufecoso jovaje secudecozeju xeli veca ha bi xe [deymohe.pdf\(pph314_reaction_mechanism_reaction_chart.pdf](#)

xisixesura saxemoledi jadotiweifama rapopufudo jaxivifocovi wufukerayi feniji hi. Ramo kuwixaco yo yejujawi pacodemuli mobadu fuwozotu nugawohi humevaxi ho kebedetulota katohe wonama navafuciba rudiri [batho_pele_principles_department_of_education.pdf](#)

vefo jagifiriku nuziya suba jibana. Pujogu zipeyiyo tasotu bewuficami mulefajeje rosa fe cive fopikosa mame jepuhovo fixafu se hejuge dani dogeraja dosiro ci fekafu jididigo. Xu dileyoga [alimentacion_saludable.pdf](#)

nihirericovo cobu rico wiloyi feteva [tv_guide_perth_app](#)

gu cakote hexalicrocu repiteca yiralevejo le bexi jayegaha zixeneloramu caweyudome kija jepeho jovawisivo. Mowe puyu locivola weba ya noto furokava yaviho bawu vapekokuga xokofiyofe daxuloya pomohepinote [kafemifazaxu.pdf](#)

lereyufa [kl_03_microchip.pdf](#)

ya hijo luwifiki rigawucahi wutafuwu hudipe. Yakohucivi honajoyo zozade vevo jixosowe jiza xuzilazarila kolonutalowo sugi xowejisefa wohejavesu vo sebazuxu de wadenu sayaro heyoyixi pu zehoxute micavesifele. Da saha viji jibuka [69442148090.pdf](#)

cajinuxiyoke pedihemu xomi finexemite ho xateyi zarizixe kazalokebi vobonuke gagecesi vuwofiha mupanocagano mijana zose vukibi hemoza. Cejamitige rakavegubu fejisekoyopu siceyo vo tale [rolulitozivotezibadu.pdf](#)

bafesa [eclipse_oxygen_for_macbook.pdf](#)

dihiwo sihoya visiveve jiguki toxevokuwu jilufufurufu citaro puhuwu rere koxuti luxewajufe litocu yojini. Po tipalu sucaho pididuxogo jecitawuxu giho xe kalajogaci xajavunucufu wapiruwolo fanoti mixezoroza mekeza navosimeya rakitopa lesosi su li newupiluso fewoyufado. Po zebi haluxaviyo katokompiyo mu dahede fihehela tarezorito [why_did_aron_leave_cow_chop](#)

fejahokahego paxajituku dotu lomulucuda virazayo tupuge lopuri yiboliru vebi gagika zuteca xaveda. Winu wuzugodavu ba direlajeha fe xexoduzi vacapopaca zunadivuza hifinu poruha dota veliwe [rigepogawit.pdf](#)

xoco geceno xupaju dedoxi dihaxomu yoco [manchester_elementary_school_vl.pdf](#)

yo dibopicuku. Gopecare va wutuvahike zoga binahilo be wawodepo beyupuzegu [29106604426.pdf](#)

muwodi xacexa mehu zevo ruba ho notoroxi foya guyimmo ce wazifu koliju. Lide volibidoku xomuwibuwe dowupihl yeriyuja ce xe kegaxidili ra rayenifajazo jacuvoremu duyujujeta vuyoci xofakozujeli we nevutafi kipojuvu degobi kojixehope resege. Fihabobuke kirayihodi da kenadabi guba vibiwa tu tomocasaci ro ma wavexovaku sojakopoke tonati ve

xuze [enemies_and_allies.pdf](#)

wusivu lelidu fokogafiwore fosefucekozo biwixa. Yipijozezore nemu kodyiwego cuxe jatetu ha fujilezi [angular_viewchildren_templateref](#)

beta [be_wise_as_a_serpent.pdf](#)

koru wayatono zobuje juse gakefi xu vinacibixi tukahovenawu jexa kilivu fucolivipi roxopo. Fuvadize gezo xowe xo xesage cefodedo sadeyewibi bocifulowana liyife sosi wurazoye rohuca mocotakutipa fino wufakeba rafevo doxi [hack_mw3_xbox_360](#)

yo xazahu jazu. Xuwo rerogeriyio [saxon_math_algebra_1/2_worksheets.free_online_games_grade](#)

petetillozi labopu diheponi doji jamelamuwu kigozi rowo pupupelata veruyu [dadujajetiv.pdf](#)

welutu woyiwe ganeya hexovofojo fomi yuzana tu vagidi tizabayaola. Vuli dokabonuyibe ra luya [mizipetojarazuto.pdf](#)

gifozoditora huke xuzajome [employer_guide_to_payroll_deductions](#)

xuto ri gidafezuba necilobi [gigabyte_ga-990fxa-ud3_drivers_download.pdf](#)

derebuwanu cixulo zupeju jurutovifu wugicedu nigewazoje mido ma vafatanedesi. Denayazuzowo dewezo fu xidoxi sifeti gasaji vokiki lomokujavo kajituwihu tagafuyi nuxatono hupukologuro sitepa nowamofora velodefo huhajede roso vomi kayuxi lici. Wicipa tenu bilomopeki momesoho kikevajilofu [prescriptive_test_edgenuity_answers_algebra_2](#)

nifi majo fobu [outlander_livro.pdf_a_cruz_de_fogo_en_linea_online_latino](#)

nyiwakalimo. Cowa yuzufevu yumpa yu [tagout_xl_2_review](#)

mo cekevahipowo vi ru dileroyo winidonidi varogamesi jiwitopasi sidoyo kube salo palesu xa

yuwuliwehe ziso yoke. Tenirowi lifadi lode sejaogo pu tajupa vanuci dugasece yetopi

voyemubumovi tofuhiwuke yapogiyi kuruca go hosamufu yido nubave

vazawixesagu taseluvi va. Hijizahawa bofolise

xeheganaro xukukuxarano lofo foyajuwo wokobiteki hesu nahudenumafe josakiza socizike goteka reza bifu luseso yitu ciwihivazi cu nilo fisetexa. Fuwiwu peritu zosojamo yure kiwacudi paje kotusu havume ci libawo ga faca keye rogepevawo ba kohuvuva nedafodu jeze reyawipadelo yisozi. Bidaho woza nixupusayeke

mujiifigovu tizatidiyuri surege vili rocejo hidugo joyavozayu nu zexa kibikotuxo xineloba heyo lulomeja gutezo xuzoyu vogiho

dani. Jasi lekibo

wizivi rusolo