

---

## Medical Policy



Nonprofit corporations and independent licensees  
of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association

**Joint Medical Policies are a source for BCBSM and BCN medical policy information only. These documents are not to be used to determine benefits or reimbursement. Please reference the appropriate certificate or contract for benefit information. This policy may be updated and is therefore subject to change.**

---

**\*Current Policy Effective Date: 5/1/25**  
(See policy history boxes for previous effective dates)

### **Title: Transcatheter Mitral Valve Procedures**

---

#### **Description/Background**

##### **Repair Versus Replacement**

Transcatheter mitral valve repair is an alternative to surgical therapy for mitral regurgitation (MR) in native/primary mitral valves that have not been surgically altered in the past.

Transcatheter mitral valve replacement is being investigated as a less invasive means of replacing a valve by implanting a catheter based artificial heart valve (bioprosthesis valve) into an existing valve (valve-in-valve), when there is mitral regurgitation, mitral stenosis, and complications of a previously placed mitral valve prosthesis.

Mitral regurgitation (MR) is a common valvular heart disease that can result from a primary structural abnormality of the mitral valve (MV) complex or a secondary dilatation of an anatomically normal MV due to a dilated left ventricle caused by ischemic or dilated cardiomyopathy. Surgical therapy may be underutilized, particularly in patients with multiple comorbidities, suggesting that there is an unmet need for less invasive procedures for MV repair. Two devices, MitraClip™ and PASCAL™, have approval from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for the treatment of severe symptomatic MR due to a primary abnormality of the MV (primary MR) in patients considered at prohibitive risk for surgery. MitraClip is also approved for patients with heart failure and moderate-to-severe or severe symptomatic secondary MR despite the use of maximally tolerated guideline-directed medical therapy. The Edwards SAPIEN 3 transcatheter heart valve has been approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for transcatheter mitral valve-in-valve replacement (TMViVR) in patients with a failing surgical bioprosthetic mitral valve who are at high or greater risk for repeat surgery.

#### **MITRAL REGURGITATION**

##### **Epidemiology and Classification**

Mitral regurgitation is the second most common valvular heart disease, occurring in 7% of people older than age 75 years and accounting for 24% of all patients with valvular heart disease.(1,2) MR with accompanying valvular incompetence leads to left ventricular (LV)

volume overload with secondary ventricular remodeling, myocardial dysfunction, and left heart failure. Clinical signs and symptoms of dyspnea and orthopnea may also be present in patients with valvular dysfunction.(3) MR severity is classified as mild, moderate, or severe disease on the basis of echocardiographic and/or angiographic findings (1+, 2+, and 3+ to 4+ angiographic grade, respectively).

Patients with MR generally fall into two categories, primary (also called degenerative) and secondary (also called functional) MR. Primary MR results from a primary structural abnormality in the valve, which causes it to leak. This leak may result from a floppy leaflet (called prolapse) or a ruptured cord that caused the leaflet to detach partially (called flail).(4) Because the primary cause is a structural abnormality, most cases of primary MR are surgically corrected. Secondary MR results from LV dilatation due to ischemic or dilated cardiomyopathy. This causes the mitral value (MV) leaflets not to co-apt or meet in the center.(3) Because the valves are structurally normal in secondary MR, correcting the dilated LV using medical therapy is the primary treatment strategy used in the United States (U.S.).

## **Standard Management**

### **Surgical Management**

In symptomatic patients with primary MR, surgery is the main therapy. In most cases, MV repair is preferred over replacement, as long as the valve is suitable for repair and personnel with appropriate surgical expertise are available. The American College of Cardiology and the American Heart Association have issued joint guidelines for the surgical management of MV (see Supplemental Information).(5)

The use of standard open MV repair is limited by the requirement for thoracotomy and cardiopulmonary bypass, which may not be tolerated by elderly or debilitated patients due to their underlying cardiac disease or other conditions. In a single-center evaluation of 5737 patients with severe MR in the U. S., Goel et al (2014) found that 53% of patients did not have MV surgery performed, suggesting an unmet need for such patients.(6)

Isolated MV surgery (repair or replacement) for severe chronic secondary MR is a high risk procedure and can have uncertain durable effects on symptoms. Recommendations from major societies (7,8) regarding MV surgery in the setting of severe chronic secondary MR in conjunction with coronary artery bypass graft surgery or surgical aortic valve replacement remain fluid because the current evidence is inconsistent on whether MV surgery produces a clinical benefit.(9-12)

## **TRANSCATHETER MV REPAIR**

Transcatheter approaches have been investigated to address the unmet need for less invasive MV repair, particularly among inoperable patients who face prohibitively high surgical risks due to age or comorbidities. MV repair devices under development address various components of the MV complex and generally are performed on the beating heart without the need for cardiopulmonary bypass.(1,13) Approaches to MV repair include direct leaflet repair,(14) repair of the mitral annulus via direct annuloplasty, or indirect repair based on the annulus's proximity to the coronary sinus. There are also devices in development to counteract ventricular remodeling, and systems designed for complete MV replacement via catheter.

### ***Direct Leaflet Approximation***

Devices currently approved by the FDA for transcatheter mitral valve repair (TMVR) undergo direct mitral leaflet repair (also referred to as transcatheter edge-to-edge repair). Of the transcatheter MV repair devices under investigation, MitraClip has the largest body of evidence evaluating its use; it has been in use in Europe since 2008.(14) The MitraClip system is deployed percutaneously and approximates the open Alfieri edge-to-edge repair approach to treating MR. The delivery system consists of a catheter, a steerable sleeve, and the MitraClip device, which is a 4-mm wide clip fabricated from a cobalt-chromium alloy and polypropylene fabric. MitraClip is deployed via a transfemoral approach, with transseptal puncture used to access the left side of the heart and the MV. Placement of MitraClip leads to coapting of the mitral leaflets, thus creating a double-orifice valve.

The PASCAL (PAddles Spacer Clasps ALfieri) Mitral Repair System (Edwards Lifesciences) is also a direct coaptation device and works in a similar manner to the MitraClip system.(15) PASCAL has been in clinical use since 2016 and was approved for use in Europe in 2019.(16) The delivery system consists of a 10-mm central spacer that attaches to the MV leaflets by 2 paddles and clasps.

### ***Other MV Repair Devices***

Devices for TMVR repair that use different approaches are in development. Techniques to repair the mitral annulus include those that target the annulus itself (direct annuloplasty) and those that tighten the mitral annulus via manipulation of the adjacent coronary sinus (indirect annuloplasty). Indirect annuloplasty devices include the Carillon Mitral Contour System (Cardiac Dimension) and the Monarc™ device (Edwards Lifesciences). The CE-marked Carillon Mitral Contour System is comprised of self-expanding proximal and distal anchors connected with a nitinol bridge, with the proximal end coronary sinus ostium and the distal anchor in the great cardiac vein. The size of the connection is controlled by manual pullback on the catheter. The Carillon system was evaluated in the Carillon Mitral Annuloplasty Device European Union Study (AMADEUS) and the follow-up Tighten the Annulus Now study, with further studies planned.(17) The Monarc system also involves 2 self-expanding stents connected by a nitinol bridge, with 1 end implanted in the coronary sinus via internal jugular vein and the other in the great cardiac vein. Several weeks after implantation, the biologically degradable coating over the nitinol bridge degrades, allowing the bridge to shrink and the system to shorten. It has been evaluated in the Clinical Evaluation of the Edwards Lifesciences Percutaneous Mitral Annuloplasty System for the Treatment of Mitral Regurgitation (EVOLUTION I) trial.(18)

Direct annuloplasty devices include the Mitralign Percutaneous Annuloplasty System (Mitralign) and the AccuCinch® System (Guided Delivery Systems), both of which involve transcatheter placement of anchors in the MV; they are cinched or connected to narrow the mitral annulus. Other transcatheter direct annuloplasty devices under investigation include the enCorTC™ device (MiCardia), which involves a percutaneously insertable annuloplasty ring that is adjustable using radiofrequency energy, a variation on its CE-marked enCorSQ™ Mitral Valve Repair System, and the Cardioband™ Annuloplasty System (Valtech Cardio), an implantable annuloplasty band with a transfemoral venous delivery system.

### **Transcatheter Mitral Valve-in-Valve Replacement**

Mitral valve-in-valve replacement is a minimally invasive procedure designed to treat patients with failing surgical bioprosthetic mitral valves who are at high risk for complications with repeat open-heart surgery. The Edwards SAPIEN 3 Transcatheter Heart Valve received FDA approval in June 2017 (PMA #P140031) for patients with a failing surgical bioprosthetic mitral valve who are at high or prohibitive risk for repeat surgery. The procedure involves deploying the

replacement valve within the failing bioprosthetic valve using a catheter-based transapical or transseptal approach. Once in position, the replacement valve is expanded, pushing the leaflets of the failing bioprosthetic valve aside and taking over the valve function.

### **Medical Management**

The standard treatment for patients with chronic secondary MR is medical management. Patients with chronic secondary MR should receive standard therapy for heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; standard management includes angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor (or angiotensin II receptor blocker or angiotensin receptor-neprilysin inhibitor), beta-blocker and mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist, and diuretic therapy as needed to treat volume overload.(3,4) Resynchronization therapy may provide symptomatic relief, improve LV function, and in some patients, lessen the severity of MR.

---

### **Regulatory Status**

In October 2013, the MitraClip® Clip Delivery System (Abbott Vascular) was approved by FDA through the premarket approval process for treatment of "significant symptomatic mitral regurgitation (MR  $\geq 3+$ ) due to primary abnormality of the mitral apparatus (degenerative MR) in patients who have been determined to be at a prohibitive risk for mitral valve surgery by a heart team."(19)

In June 2017, the Edwards SAPIEN 3 Transcatheter Heart Valve received FDA approval through the premarket approval process for the treatment of patients with a "failing surgical bioprosthetic mitral valve who have been determined to be at high or greater risk for open-heart surgery by a heart team."

In 2020 the FDA expanded the PMA to include the Sapien 3 Ultra Transcatheter Heart Valve System (Edwards Lifesciences) for replacement of a failing (narrowed, leaky, or both) previously implanted surgical artificial...mitral heart valve in patients who are too high risk for open-heart surgery.

In March 2019, the FDA approved a new indication for MitraClip, for "treatment of patients with normal mitral valves who develop heart failure symptoms and moderate-to-severe or severe mitral regurgitation because of diminished left heart function (commonly known as secondary or functional mitral regurgitation) despite being treated with optimal medical therapy. Optimal medical therapy includes combinations of different heart failure medications along with, in certain patients, cardiac resynchronization therapy and implantation of cardioverter defibrillators."

In September 2022, the FDA approved the PASCAL Precision Transcatheter Valve Repair System through the premarket approval process for treatment of "significant, symptomatic mitral regurgitation (MR  $\geq 3+$ ) due to primary abnormality of the mitral apparatus (degenerative MR) in patients who have been determined to be at prohibitive risk for mitral valve surgery by a heart team."(20)

FDA product code for MitrClip and PASCAL: NKM.  
FDA product code for Edwards SAPIEN 3: NPV

Permavalve™ (MicroInterventional Devices), under investigation in the United States, is a transcatheter MV replacement device that is delivered via the transapical approach.

---

## Medical Policy Statement

Transcatheter mitral valve repair<sup>a</sup> (e.g., MitraClip®) has been established and may be considered a useful option when performed with FDA approved devices when specified criteria are met.

Transcatheter mitral valve implantation (replacement<sup>a</sup>) (e.g., Edwards Sapien 3 Transcatheter Heart Valve, Sapien 3 Ultra Transcatheter Heart Valve) has been established and may be considered a useful option when performed with FDA approved devices when specified criteria are met.

Transcatheter implantable mitral valve annulus reshaping devices used for the treatment of mitral valve regurgitation are considered experimental/investigational. This device has not been shown to improve clinical health outcomes.

---

## Inclusionary and Exclusionary Guidelines

### Inclusions:

Transcatheter mitral valve repair<sup>a</sup> with an FDA-approved mitral valve repair system (i.e., Mitraclip®) is indicated when all of the following criteria are met:

- Significant symptomatic mitral regurgitation ( $MR \geq 3+$ ) due to one of the following:
  - Primary abnormality of the mitral apparatus (degenerative MR)
  - Heart failure and secondary mitral regurgitation despite the use of maximally tolerated guideline-directed medical therapy
- Individuals who have been determined to be at prohibitive risk for open mitral valve surgery by a heart team, which includes a cardiac surgeon experienced in mitral valve surgery and a cardiologist experienced in mitral valve disease
- Existing comorbidities would not preclude the expected benefit from reduction of the mitral regurgitation.

Percutaneous transcatheter mitral valve-in-valve implantation (replacement<sup>a</sup>) using an FDA-approved device (i.e., Edwards Sapien 3 Transcatheter Heart Valve System, Sapien 3 Ultra Transcatheter Heart Valve System) when all of the following are met:

- Symptomatic heart disease due to failure (stenosed, insufficient, or combined) of a surgical bioprosthetic mitral valve or a prosthetic ring from a prior repair
- Determination by a heart team, including a cardiac surgeon, that the individual is at high or greater risk for open surgical therapy (i.e., predicted risk of surgical mortality greater than or equal to 8% at 30 days, based on the Society of Thoracic Surgeons risk score and other clinical co-morbidities)

## **Exclusions:**

- Transcatheter mitral valve repair<sup>a</sup> or transcatheter mitral valve-in-valve implantation (replacement<sup>a</sup>) procedures when one of the following apply:
  - Individuals who cannot tolerate procedural anticoagulation or post procedural antiplatelet regimen
  - Active endocarditis of the mitral valve
  - Rheumatic mitral valve disease
  - Evidence of intracardiac, inferior vena cava (IVC) or femoral venous thrombus
  - The individual is an appropriate candidate for the standard, open surgical approach but has refused
- Transcatheter mitral valve annulus reshaping devices
- Non-FDA approved systems or approaches including:
  - Perma valve™ system

<sup>a</sup>Repair (MitraClip) and replacement (Edwards Sapien 3, Sapien 3 Ultra Transcatheter Heart Valve) are separate procedures and involve different devices

---

**CPT/HCPCS Level II Codes** (Note: The inclusion of a code in this list is not a guarantee of coverage. Please refer to the medical policy statement to determine the status of a given procedure.)

## **Established codes:**

33418                      33419                      0345T                      0483T\*                      0484T

## **Other codes (investigational, not medically necessary, etc.):**

0543T                      0544T

\* Per American Academy of Professional Coders, 0483T is billed when the procedure comprises of implantation/replacement of a mitral valve with mitral regurgitation, mitral stenosis, and complication of a previously placed mitral valve prosthesis.

---

## **Rationale**

This review was informed, in part, by a TEC Assessment (2014) that evaluated the use of transcatheter mitral valve repair in patients with symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation (MR) at prohibitive risk for mortality during open surgery.(19)

Evidence reviews assess the clinical evidence to determine whether the use of a technology improves the net health outcome. Broadly defined, health outcomes are length of life, quality of life, and ability to function-including benefits and harms. Every clinical condition has specific outcomes that are important to patients and to managing the course of that condition. Validated outcome measures are necessary to ascertain whether a condition improves or worsens; and whether the magnitude of that change is clinically significant. The net health outcome is a balance of benefits and harms.

To assess whether the evidence is sufficient to draw conclusions about the net health outcome of technology, 2 domains are examined: the relevance and the quality and credibility. To be relevant, studies must represent 1 or more intended clinical use of the technology in the

intended population and compare an effective and appropriate alternative at a comparable intensity. For some conditions, the alternative will be supportive care or surveillance. The quality and credibility of the evidence depend on study design and conduct, minimizing bias and confounding that can generate incorrect findings. The randomized controlled trial (RCT) is preferred to assess efficacy; however, in some circumstances, nonrandomized studies may be adequate. RCTs are rarely large enough or long enough to capture less common adverse events and long-term effects. Other types of studies can be used for these purposes and to assess generalizability to broader clinical populations and settings of clinical practice.

## **MITRACLIP REPAIR AND PASCAL**

### **Primary Mitral Valve Regurgitation at Prohibitive Surgical Risk**

#### ***Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose***

The purpose of transcatheter mitral valve repair using MitraClip or PASCAL in individuals who have primary MR and are at prohibitive risk for open surgery is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The following PICOs were used to select literature to inform this review.

#### ***Populations***

The relevant population of interest are individuals with symptomatic primary MR and at prohibitive risk for open surgery.

MR severity is classified as mild, moderate, or severe disease on the basis of echocardiographic and/or angiographic findings (1+, 2+, and 3-4+ angiographic grade, respectively). MR with accompanying valvular incompetence leads to left ventricular (LV) volume overload with secondary ventricular remodeling, myocardial dysfunction, and left heart failure. Clinical signs and symptoms of dyspnea and orthopnea may also present in individuals with valvular dysfunction.

#### ***Intervention***

The therapy being considered is transcatheter mitral valve repair using MitraClip or PASCAL.

#### ***Comparators***

Comparators of interest are medical management. Given that primary MR is a mechanical problem and there is no effective medical therapy, an RCT comparing MitraClip or PASCAL with medical management is not feasible or ethical.

#### ***Outcomes***

The general outcomes of interest are overall survival (OS), morbid events, functional outcomes, and treatment-related morbidity.

#### **Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.

- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

## Review of Evidence

### Randomized Controlled Trials

The ongoing CLASP IID/IIF pivotal trial for the PASCAL device is enrolling adults with MR (3+ to 4+) into 1 of 3 cohorts, 2 of which have undergone interim analyses and were evaluated by the FDA for pre-marketing approval. The main cohort constituted a randomized, multicenter noninferiority study comparing PASCAL and MitraClip in patients with primary MR. The second cohort constituted a single-arm registry study (the PASCAL IID registry, described in the Non-Randomized Studies section) that enrolled patients with primary MR who were eligible for treatment in the study with PASCAL but were ineligible for randomization due to complex mitral valve anatomy (rendering them unsuitable for treatment with MitraClip).(20,22) The third cohort constituted a randomized, multicenter study comparing PASCAL and MitraClip in patients with functional (secondary) MR receiving guideline-directed medical therapy, results of which have not yet been reported.(23)

In the main CLASP IID cohort, eligible patients were randomized 2:1 to TMVR with PASCAL or MitraClip.(20) The primary safety endpoint was a composite of major adverse events at 30-day follow-up, including cardiovascular death, stroke, myocardial infarction, new need for renal replacement therapy, severe bleeding, and/or non-elective mitral valve re-intervention. The primary effectiveness endpoint was the proportion of patients with MR  $\leq 2+$  at 6-month follow-up. The noninferiority margins for the primary safety and effectiveness endpoints were absolute differences between groups of 15% and 18%, respectively. The first planned interim analysis was performed after 180 patients were randomized and had undergone the study procedure attempt. Mean age was approximately 81 years; most participants were male (67% of PASCAL and 68% of MitraClip patients) and White (72% and 76% of PASCAL and MitraClip patients, respectively; 4.3% and 1.6% were Asian and 2.6% and 3.2% were Black or African American, respectively). All 180 patients randomized at the time of analysis underwent the procedure attempt. No differences between groups in New York Heart Association (NYHA) functional class, operative risk scores, or other baseline characteristics were identified. The most common reasons for prohibitive surgical risk were frailty (>84% in both groups) and a predicted mortality risk for mitral valve replacement  $\geq 8\%$  (>14% in both groups). In the primary analyses, PASCAL was noninferior to MitraClip for safety and effectiveness. The proportion of patients in the PASCAL (n=117) and MitraClip groups (n=63) who experienced a major adverse event at 30 days was 3.4% and 4.8% (upper bound of 95% confidence interval [CI] for between-group difference, 5.1%), respectively. The most common major adverse event was severe bleeding in both PASCAL and MitraClip groups (2.6% and 3.2%, respectively). In the PASCAL group, 2 patients died prior to 30-day follow-up and 1 patient had missing 30-day and 6-month data. In the MitraClip group, 1 patient died prior to 30-day follow-up. The proportion of patients in the PASCAL (n=114) and MitraClip groups (n=62) with MR  $\leq 2+$  at 6 months was 96.5% and 96.8%, respectively (lower bound of 95% CI for between-group difference, -6.2%). At 6 months, 6.1% of PASCAL recipients and 11.1% of MitraClip recipients had experienced a major adverse event, and all-cause mortality was 5.1% and 6.3%, respectively. Functional status, exercise capacity, and quality-of-life measures improved from baseline at comparable rates in both groups. No interactions between the primary outcomes and sex or age were identified in either group.



Zahr et al (2023) reported 1-year outcomes of the CLASP IID trial, which compared the safety and effectiveness of the PASCAL device (n=204) with the MitraClip device (n=96) for the treatment of MR in the full cohort of 300 patients.(23) The study population was well-balanced between the 2 groups, with the majority of participants in each group deemed to be at prohibitive surgical risk due to frailty. At 1-year follow-up, data were available for 91.5% and 94.3% of participants in the PASCAL and MitraClip groups, respectively. The primary safety endpoint, the proportion of patients experiencing a major adverse event at 30 days, was similar between the PASCAL (4.6%) and MitraClip (5.4%) groups (upper bound of 95% CI for between-group difference, 4.6%). Severe bleeding was the most common major adverse event in both groups (PASCAL: 3.6%; MitraClip: 2.2%), with 1 cardiovascular death (0.5%) in the PASCAL group and 2 (2.2%) in the MitraClip group. Freedom from major adverse events remained comparable between groups at 1 year (PASCAL: 84.7%; MitraClip: 88.3%; p=.471). The primary effectiveness endpoint, the proportion of patients with MR  $\leq 2+$  at 6 months, was achieved by 97.9% and 95.7% of patients in the PASCAL and MitraClip groups, respectively (absolute difference, 2.2%), meeting the prespecified noninferiority margin. At 1 year, MR reduction to  $\leq 2+$  was sustained in both groups (PASCAL: 95.8%; MitraClip: 93.8%), with no significant differences observed. Both groups experienced significant improvements in functional (NYHA functional class) and quality of life (Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire Score, EQ-5D-5L, mean 6-minute walk distance) from baseline to 1 year (p<.05 for all), with no differences between groups. Study limitations included unblinded treatment allocation, the use of multiple generations of PASCAL and MitraClip devices, and loss to follow-up for time-to-event outcomes. The findings suggest that the PASCAL device is non-inferior to the MitraClip device for the reduction of MR severity and the rate of major adverse events at 1 year, consistent with the interim analysis.

### **Non-Randomized Studies**

Tables 1 and 2 summarize patient characteristics and health outcomes of the case series by Reichenspurner et al (2013) (24) and Lim et al (2013),(25) which were considered higher quality. The Reichenspurner et al (2013) study reported data on 117 patients with primary MR who were enrolled in a European post marketing registry. The Lin et al (2013) study reported data on 127 patients enrolled in the Endovascular Valve Edge-to-Edge Repair Study (EVEREST II) High Risk Registry (HRR) and Real World Expanded Multicenter Study of the MitraClip system (REALISM) registry and then retrospectively identified as meeting the definition of prohibitive risk and were followed for one year. The 30-day mortality rates were 6.0% and 6.3%, and 12- and 25-month mortality rates were 17.1% and 23.6%, respectively.(24,26) In evaluable patients at 12 months, the percentages of patients who had an MR severity grade of 2 or less were 83.3% and 74.6% in the two studies; the percentages with New York Heart Association (NYHA) class I or II functional status were 81% and 87%; and the percentages who improved at least 1 NYHA class level were 68% and 88%, respectively.

**Table 1. Key MitraClip Case Series Characteristics**

Study; Trial	Country	Participants	Treatment Delivery	Follow-Up
Reichenspurner et al (2013) ACCESS-EU	Europe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N=117</li> <li>• EF &lt;40% or mean EF: 9.4%</li> <li>• NYHA class ≥3: 74%</li> <li>• MR severity ≥3+: 96.6%</li> <li>• Mean EuroSCORE: 15.5%</li> </ul>	MitraClip	71 had 1-y follow-up data
Lim et al (2014) subset of patients at prohibitive risk of open surgery from EVEREST II HRR and REALISM	U.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N=127</li> <li>• EF &lt;40% or Mean EF: 61%</li> <li>• NYHA class ≥3: 87%</li> <li>• MR severity ≥3+: 100%</li> <li>• Mean STS score: 13.2%</li> <li>• Mean STS score: 13.2%</li> </ul>	MitraClip	1.47 y

EF: ejection fraction; MR: mitral regurgitation; NYHA: New York Heart Association; STS: Society of Thoracic Surgeons surgical risk score.

**Table 2. 12-Month Outcomes for Key Case Series of MitraClip for Primary Mitral Valve Disease**

Study; Trial	Original N	MR Grade at 12 Months, % (n/N)	NYHA Class at 12 Months, % (n/N)	Other Pertinent Outcomes At 12 Months
Reichenspurner et al (2013) ACCESS-EU	117	MR severity ≤2+: 74.6% (53/71)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Class I/II: 81% (63/78)</li> <li>• Improved ≥1 class: 68% (53/78)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change in MLHFQ from baseline, 13.3 points (p=0.03), n=44</li> <li>• Change in 6MWT from baseline, 77.4 m (p&lt;0.001), n=52</li> </ul>
Lim et al (2014) subset of patients at prohibitive risk of open surgery from EVEREST II HRR and REALISM	127	MR severity ≤2+: 83.3% (70/84)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Class I/II: 86.9% (73/84)</li> <li>• Improved ≥1 class: 86.9% (73/84)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SF-36 PCS score change, 6.0 (95% CI, 4.0 to 8.0), n=76</li> <li>• SF-36 MCS score change, 5.6 (95% CI, 2.3 to 8.9), n=76</li> </ul>

CI: confidence interval; MCS: Mental Component Summary; MLHFQ: Minnesota Living with Heart Failure 10 Questionnaire; MR: mitral regurgitation; NYHA: New York Heart Association; PCS: Physical Component Summary; 6MWT: 6-minute walk test; SF-36: 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey.

In reviewing data for MitraClip, the FDA compared the cohort reported by Lin et al (2014, discussed above) with a historical cohort (n=65) generated from the patient-level data Duke Registry of primary MR patients with MR of 3+ or more. The Duke cohort of 65 patients with primary MR was derived from a dataset of 953 patients with an MR severity grade of 3+ or 4+ who were retrospectively identified as being at a prohibitively high risk for surgery based on the same high-risk criteria as those in the EVEREST II HRR and REALISM studies (i.e., Society of Thoracic Surgeons (STS) mortality risk calculation of 12% or higher or protocol-specified surgical risk factors). For the cohort described by Lin et al (2014), compliance to follow-up visits in continuing patients was 98%, 98%, and 95% at 30 days, 12 months, and two years, respectively. Cohort characteristics and results are summarized in Tables 3 and 4. There were no intraprocedural deaths and the MitraClip was implanted successfully in 95% of patients. Eight patients died within 30 days of the procedure or discharge post procedure, resulting in a procedural mortality rate of 6.4% that increased to 24.8% at 12 months. Comparative mortality rates in the Duke cohort at 30 days and 12 months were 10.9% and 30.6%, respectively.

The TEC Assessment identified multiple limitations with use of historical controls in evaluating MitraClip. Specifically, patients in the Duke group did not appear to have been evaluated specifically for the MitraClip procedure (i.e., their anatomic eligibility to receive the device). Data were not available on patient status at beginning of follow-up, which could have had a critical impact on short-term mortality. These control groups are therefore likely to have higher mortality rates than MitraClip groups. In comparing the clinical characteristics of Duke group with patients receiving MitraClip, although mean predicted surgical mortality risks were similar, subjects differed greatly in NYHA functional class and ejection fraction, among other characteristics. Neither of these control groups provides unbiased or precise estimates of the natural history of patients eligible to receive MitraClip. Due to the lack of an appropriate control group and clear evidence about the natural history of patients with primary MR considered at high risk for surgery, the TEC Assessment concluded that a determination whether MitraClip improved, had no effect, or worsened mortality than nonsurgical management could not be made.

The FDA, on the contrary, concluded that totality of the evidence demonstrated reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness of MitraClip to reduce MR and provide patient benefit in this discreet and specific patient population based on the following:(19)

- It is broadly accepted that primary MR is a mechanical problem in which there is a primary abnormality of the mitral apparatus and the “leaflets are broken”. There is no medical therapy for reducing primary MR, which must be treated with mechanical correction of the mitral valve.
- The observed procedural mortality rate with MitraClip was 6.4% (95% CI, 2.8% to 12.0%) at 30 days. This rate was lower than the predicted mortality rate of 13.2% (95% CI, 11.9% to 14.5%) using STS Replacement Risk Score or 9.5% (95% CI, 11.3% to 13.7%) using STS Repair Score for the Lin cohort.
- While acknowledging the pitfalls of using historical controls from the Duke Registry, FDA found no elevated risk of mortality in MitraClip cohort patients over nonsurgical management and both immediate and long-term improvement in MR severity. MR severity grade of 2+ or less and of 1+ or less was observed in 82% and 54% of surviving patients at discharge, respectively. This improvement was sustained at 12 months, with the majority (83.3%) of surviving patients reporting MR severity grade of 2+ or less and 36.9% reporting MR severity grade of 1+ or less. At 12 months, freedom from death and MR severity grade greater than 2+ was 61.4%, and freedom from death and MR severity grade greater than 1+ was 27.2%.
- Quality of life was assessed using the 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36). The mean difference in the Physical Component Summary and Mental Component Summary scores from baseline to 12 months improved by 6 and 5.6 points, respectively, which is above the 2- to 3-point minimally important difference threshold reported in the literature.(27) Sensitivity analyses showed that these effectiveness results were robust to missing data.
- The commercial post-registry data of over 8300 patients (one-third primary MR and two-thirds secondary MR) outside the United States suggests that mortality rates reported in patients at prohibitive risk of surgery undergoing the MitraClip procedure do not appear to be elevated and are not unexpected given the age and burden of comorbidities of the patients treated. Reported mortality ranges were: in-hospital mortality, 0% to 4%; 30-day mortality, 0% to 9.1%; and 6- to 12-month mortality, 8% to 24%. Reported clinical benefits were: improvement in MR severity grade of 2+ or less after MitraClip in more than 75% of patients; improvement in 6-minute walk distance of 60 to >100 meters (the generally

accepted threshold is >40 m), and percentages of patients who improved to a NYHA class of I or II ranged from 48% to 97%.

- The probable adverse event risks of the MitraClip included procedure-related complications such as death (6.3%), stroke (3.4%), prolonged ventilation (3.1%), and transfusion greater than 2 units (12.6%), major vascular complications (5.4%), noncerebral thromboembolism (1.6%), new onset of atrial fibrillation (3.9%), and atrial septal defect (1.6%).

**Table 3. Key Observational Comparative Study Characteristics**

Study	Design	Country	Dates	Participants	Treatment	Treatment	FU
FDA (2013)	Single cohort with historical comparator	U.S.	Unclear	MitraClip cohort <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N=127</li> <li>• Age: 82.4 y</li> <li>• &gt;75 y: 84%</li> <li>• NYHA class ≥III: 87%</li> <li>• STS predicted mortality: 13.2%</li> </ul> Duke cohort <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N=65</li> <li>• Age: 76.8 y</li> <li>• &gt;75 y: 68%</li> <li>• NYHA class ≥III: 44%</li> <li>• STS predicted mortality: 13.3%</li> <li>• LVEF: 44%</li> </ul>	MitraClip	Nonsurgical management	1 yr

FDA: Food and Drug Administration; FU: follow-up; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction; NYHA: New York Heart Association; STS: Society of Thoracic Surgeons

**Table 4. Key Observational Comparative Study Results**

Percent Event Free (95% CI), %					
Study	At 30 Days	At 6 Months	At 12 Months	Freedom From Death and MR >2+	Freedom From Death and NYHA Class III/IV
FDA (2013)	N=192	N=192	N=192	N range, 114-124	N range, 114-124
MitraClip	93.6 (87.6 to 96.8)	84.8 (77.2 to 90.0)	75.2 (66.1 to 82.1)	Baseline: 10% 30 d: 82% 12 mo: 61%	Baseline: 13% 30 d: 76% 12 mo: 64%
Duke cohort	89.1 (78.5 to 94.7)	79.6 (67.4 to 87.6)	69.4 (56.3 to 79.3)	-	-

CI: confidence interval; FDA: Food and Drug Administration; MR: mitral regurgitation; NYHA: New York Heart Association

Subsequent to FDA approval of MitraClip in 2013, patients who received MitraClip under Medicare coverage were required to enroll in the joint STS and American College of Cardiology Transcatheter Valve Therapy Registry as part of coverage under evidence development (see the Medicare National Coverage section). Initial results from this U.S.-based registry were reported in 2016 (short-term outcomes) and in 2017 (long-term outcomes) and summarized in Table 5.(28,29) In the initial results of 564 patients enrolled between 2013 to 2014 from 561 U.S. centers, the median STS predicted risk of mortality scores for MV repair and replacement were 7.9% (range, 4.7%-12.2%) and 10.0% (range, 6.3%-14.5%), respectively.(28) The in-hospital mortality rate was 2.3% and the 30-day mortality rate was 5.8%. These results are consistent with those reported in the cohort by Lim et al (2014) used by FDA for approval (26) and supports that a favorable benefit-risk ratio is attainable outside a clinical trial setting in appropriately selected patients. At 1 year, the proportion of patients who died was 25.8%, had a repeat hospitalization for heart failure was 20.2%, and cumulative incidence of mortality or rehospitalization for heart failure was 37.9%.(29) Higher age, lower

baseline left ventricular ejection fraction, worse postprocedural MR, moderate or severe lung disease, dialysis, and severe tricuspid regurgitation were associated with higher mortality or rehospitalization for heart failure. The persistency of mortality (25.8%) and heart failure rehospitalization (20.2%) at 1 year despite of the effectiveness of MitraClip remains a concern. However, the results observed in the Transcatheter Valve Therapy Registry at 1 year were comparable with the 1-year rates observed in the analysis of high-risk patients in the EVEREST II (23.8%) and REALISM (18.0%) studies.(30)

An open-label head-to-head trial by Gerçek et al (2021) evaluated the efficacy of the PASCAL system versus the MitraClip system in patients with severe primary MR.(31) During the study time frame, 38 patients with primary MR underwent percutaneous edge-to-edge MV repair; 22 received the PASCAL device and 16 received MitraClip intervention. The decision of the device used was made at the discretion of the interventionalist. All patients were in NYHA functional class III or IV and had MR severity scores of 3+ or 4+. Procedural success was achieved in 95.5% of patients who had PASCAL implantation versus 87.5% of patients with MitraClip implantation. In 86.4% of patients who received the PASCAL device, a residual MR severity grade <1+ was achieved, whereas, reduction to MR severity grade <1+ with MitraClip was achieved in 62.5% of patients (p=.039). No patients in either group had any periprocedural major adverse events.

The second cohort of patients who were enrolled in the single-arm PASCAL IID registry cohort included: patients with primary MR enrolled in the CLASP IID/IIF trial comparing PASCAL and MitraClip who were eligible for use of PASCAL but ineligible to undergo randomization due to complex mitral valve anatomy precluding use of MitraClip.(20,32) Outcomes of the initial analysis of this registry study are summarized in Table 5. Among 92 patients who underwent successful PASCAL implantation (6 patients did not receive the device due to inability to grasp leaflets, increased transmitral valve gradient, or insufficient MR reduction), mean age was 81 years; most were male (62%) and White (73%; 3.3% were Asian and 4.3% were Black or African American). At 30-day follow-up, 8.7% of patients in the registry cohort had experienced a major adverse event, the most common of which was severe bleeding (4.3%); at 6-month follow-up, 12% had experienced a major adverse event and all-cause mortality was 6.5%. Severity of MR was ≤2+ in 91% of patients at 6 months.

**Table 5. Summary of U.S.-Based Transcatheter Valve Therapy Registry Data**

Study	No. of Patients	Primary MR, %	Secondary MR, %	Post implantation MR Grade ≤2, %	In-Hospital Death, %	30-Day Death, %	6-Month Death %	1-Year Death, %
Sorajja et al (2016)	564	86	14	93	2.3	5.8	NR	NR
Sorajja et al (2017)	2952	86	9	92	2.7	5.2	NR	25.8
FDA (2022)	92	100	0	91	NR	2.2	NR	NR

MR: mitral regurgitation

Other multiple subgroup analyses and systematic reviews have been reported using the EVEREST II HRR, REALISM, CLASP IID/IIF, and other European/Non-European studies/registries but are not discussed further because they did not report results stratified by MR etiology (primary MR or secondary MR) or were of poor quality or did not add substantial clarity to the evidence already discussed herein.(30, 33-47)

## **Section Summary: Primary MV Regurgitation at Prohibitive Surgical Risk**

The evidence for the use of MitraClip and PASCAL in patients with primary MR at prohibitive surgical risk consists of 1 RCT, and otherwise primarily of single-arm prospective cohort and registry studies. Included are the pivotal EVEREST II HRR and EVEREST II REALISM studies and the Transcatheter Valve Therapy Registry studies. These studies have demonstrated that MitraClip implantation is feasible, with procedural success rate greater than 90%, 30-day mortality rates ranging from 2.3% to 6.4% (less than predicted STS mortality score for MR repair or replacement [range, 9.5%-13.2%]), MR severity of 2+ or less in 82% to 93% patients, and clinically meaningful gains in quality of life (5- to 6-point gain in SF-36 scores). However, the one-year mortality or heart failure hospitalization rates remained considerably high (38%) compared with U.S.-based registry data thereby raising uncertainty about the long-term benefits. The randomized cohort of the CLASP IID/IIF trial demonstrated noninferiority of PASCAL to MitraClip for safety and effectiveness in reducing MR severity to 2+ or less, and findings from the single-arm PASCAL IID registry cohort of this study further indicate that PASCAL is safe and effective in patients with complex mitral valve anatomy precluding the use of MitraClip.

## **Heart Failure and Secondary Mitral Valve Regurgitation**

### ***Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose***

The purpose of transcatheter mitral valve repair using MitraClip in individuals who have heart failure, and moderate-to-severe or severe symptomatic secondary mitral regurgitation (SMR) is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The following PICOs were used to select literature to inform this review.

### ***Populations***

The relevant population of interest are individuals with heart failure and moderate-to-severe or severe symptomatic SMR despite the use of maximally tolerated guideline-directed medical therapy.

Symptomatic SMR occurs when coronary disease with myocardial infarction or primary dilated cardiomyopathy causes a combination of LV wall motion abnormalities, mitral annular dilatation, papillary muscle displacement and reduced closing force that prevent the MV from coapting (to bring together) normally. This results in regurgitation, or backflow, of the MV. Symptoms include shortness of breath, fatigue, and swelling. [Abbott] MR severity is classified as mild, moderate, or severe disease on the basis of echocardiographic and/or angiographic findings (1+, 2+, and 3+ to 4+ angiographic grade, respectively).

### ***Intervention***

The therapy being considered is transcatheter mitral valve repair using MitraClip. transcatheter mitral valve repair with MitraClip uses an implanted clip to perform the edge-to-edge repair technique on the MV to reduce MR.

### ***Comparators***

Comparators of interest are medical management. First-line treatment is guideline-directed medical therapy. Resynchronization therapy may provide symptomatic relief, improve LV function, and in some individuals, lessen the severity of MR.

### ***Outcomes***

The general outcomes of interest are OS, morbid events, functional outcomes, and treatment-related morbidity. Function in patients with heart failure is measured by the NYHA Class. The NYHA Class is based on a four-step grading scale from Class I, which is no limitation of physical activity to Class IV, which is unable to carry on any physical activity without discomfort.

### **Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the principles listed above.

### **Review of Evidence**

#### **Systematic Reviews**

A systematic review and meta-analysis by Kumar et al (2020) (48), evaluated the comparison of MitraClip plus medical therapy to medical therapy alone in patients with SMR (N=1130) using data from the Cardiovascular Outcomes Assessment of the MitraClip Percutaneous Therapy for Heart Failure Patients with Functional Mitral Regurgitation (COAPT) and the Percutaneous Repair with the MitraClip Device for Severe Functional/Secondary Mitral Regurgitation (MITRA-FR) RCT's discussed below, as well as two preceding small propensity score-matched observational studies. Pooled analyses that included the RCT's and the observational studies found that compared to medical therapy alone, at two years of follow-up, MitraClip plus medical therapy significantly reduced the risk of all-cause mortality (relative risk, 0.72; 95% CI, 0.55 to 0.95;  $I^2=55\%$ ), readmission events for heart failure (relative risk, 0.62; 95% CI, 0.42-0.92;  $I^2=90\%$ ), but not cardiovascular mortality (relative risk, 0.69; 95% CI, 0.47-1.02;  $I^2=68\%$ ). Further, results of fixed-effect meta-regression suggest that baseline left ventricular end diastolic volume and age are associated with all-cause mortality and cardiovascular mortality outcomes. However, interpretation of these pooled analyses are limited by their considerable heterogeneity and the potential for increased risk of selection bias due to the inclusion of the nonrandomized studies.

#### **Randomized Controlled Trials**

Limited experience using PASCAL in patients with SMR has been reported.(49) This use is being investigated in a randomized cohort of the CLASP IID/IIF trial; analysis of this cohort has not yet been reported.(22)

The evidence for the use of MitraClip in patients with SMR consists of two RCTs, the COAPT.(50,51) and the MITRA-FR.(52,53) (Tables 6 and 7). Both trials compared MitraClip plus medical therapy to medical therapy alone in patients with SMR and heart failure, but they differed in their eligibility criteria, and primary outcome measures. COAPT enrolled 614 patients at 78 centers in the U.S. and Canada.(50) MITRA-FR enrolled 304 patients at 37 centers in France.(52,53)

COAPT found a significant benefit for Mitraclip on the primary efficacy outcome (all HF hospitalizations within 24 months) and the primary safety outcome (freedom from device-related complications at 12 months).(50) Improvements in MR severity, quality of-life measures, and functional capacity persisted to 36 months in patients who received transcatheter mitral valve repair.(51) In the final analysis of COAPT through 5-year follow-up, rates of all-cause death (hazard ratio [HR] 0.72, 95% CI 0.58 to 0.89) and cardiovascular death (HR 0.71, 95% CI 0.56 to 0.90), hospitalization for any reason (HR 0.75, 95% CI 0.63 to 0.89) and for cardiovascular reason (HR 0.64, 95% CI 0.53 to 0.77), death or hospitalization for heart failure (HR 0.53, 95% CI 0.44 to 0.64), and unplanned mitral valve intervention or



surgery (HR 0.09, 95% CI 0.05 to 0.17) were significantly lower in the MitraClip arm.(54) The 5-year rate of freedom from device-related complications was 89.2%; severe mitral stenosis was reported in 7.6% of MitraClip patients, none of whom underwent surgery for severe mitral stenosis. No patients in the control group developed mitral stenosis. Crossover transcatheter mitral valve repair had been performed in 21.5% of patients in the control group at median 26 months after randomization; in a post hoc analysis, crossover transcatheter mitral valve repair was independently associated with lower risk of subsequent death or hospitalization for heart failure (HR 0.53, 95% CI 0.36 to 0.78).

In contrast, the MITRA-FR investigators found no significant differences between Mitra-Clip plus medical therapy and medical therapy alone on the composite primary outcome (death from any cause or unplanned HF hospitalization at 12 months) or any secondary outcome, including all-cause mortality at 12 and 24 months and cardiovascular death at 12 and 24 months (See Table 7).(52,53)

Although the reasons for these discrepant results are not entirely clear, differences in the studies' design and conduct have been proposed as possible explanations.(55-57) The severity of MR and heart failure among the patients in the trials differed. COAPT participants had more severe MR at baseline (effective regurgitant orifice area 41 vs 31 mm<sup>2</sup>) and remained symptomatic despite the use of maximal doses of guideline-directed medical therapy.(7,57,58) In both trials, eligible patients had to be symptomatic despite the use of optimal medical therapy. In COAPT, however, a central eligibility committee confirmed that the patient was using maximal doses of guideline-directed medical therapy prior to enrollment, and patients who improved with medical therapy were excluded. MITRA-FR had less stringent eligibility criteria and patients had more changes in medical therapy during the trial, indicating their treatment might not have been optimized. Additionally, patients in MITRA-FR had further progressed heart failure as indicated by LV dilation and may have been less likely to benefit from MR treatment.

There is some evidence that technical success and procedural safety differed between the trials.(57) Procedural complications were higher in MITRA-FR than in COAPT, and more patients in MITRA-FR experienced residual MR class >3+ post-procedure (both acutely and at 12 months).

**Table 6. Summary of Key RCT Characteristics**

Study; Trial	Countries	Sites	Dates	Participants	Interventions	
					Active	Comparator
Stone et al (2018); COAPT	US and Canada	78	2012-2017	Ischemic or nonischemic cardiomyopathy with LVEF 20% to 50%; moderate-to-severe (grade 3+) or severe (grade 4+) secondary MR; symptomatic (NYHA functional class II, III, or IVa) despite the use of stable maximal doses of guideline-directed medical therapy and cardiac resynchronization therapy	N=302 MitraClip plus medical therapy	N=312 Medical therapy alone
Obadia et al (2018); MITRA-FR	France	37	2013-2017	Severe SMR with a regurgitant volume of greater than 30ml per beat or an EROA ≥20 mm <sup>2</sup> ; NYHA	N=152 MitraClip plus	N=152 Medical therapy alone



functional class II, III, or IV despite optimal standard of care therapy for heart failure according to investigator LVEF between 15% and 40%; not appropriate for MV surgery by local heart team assessment

RCT: randomized controlled trial; COAPT: Cardiovascular Outcomes Assessment of the MitraClip Percutaneous Therapy for Heart Failure Patients with Functional Mitral Regurgitation; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction; MITRA-FR: Percutaneous Repair with the MitraClip Device for Severe Functional/Secondary Mitral Regurgitation LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction; SMR: secondary mitral regurgitation; EROA: effective regurgitant orifice area; NYHA: New York Heart Association; MR: mitral regurgitation; MV: mitral valve.

**Table 7. Summary of Key RCT Results**

Study	Primary Outcome: HF hospitalizations within 24 months	Primary Outcome: Death from any cause or unplanned HF hospitalization at 12 months	All-cause mortality at 12 months	Cardiovascular death at 12 months	All-cause mortality at 24 months	Cardiovascular death at 24 months	MR grade 2+ or lower at 12 months	NYHA functional class I or II at 12 months	Primary Safety Outcome: Freedom from device-related complications at 12 months <sup>1</sup> Kaplan-Meier estimate of event-free rate (lower 95% confidence limit)	Serious Adverse events at 1 year	Periprocedural complications during device implantation
<b>Stone et al (2018); COAPT</b>											
Sample size	612		612		612	612	385	469	302		
Medical therapy alone	283/416.8 (67.9%)		57 (19.1%)		121/312 (46.1%)	97 (38.2%)	82/75 (46.9%)	115/232 (49.6%)			
MitraClip + medical therapy	160/446.5 (35.8%)		70 (23.2%)		80/302 (29.1%)	61 (23.5%)		171/237 (72.2%)	96.6% (94.8%)		
HR (95% CI) ; p-value	0.53 (0.40 to 0.70); p <.001		0.81 (95% CI 0.57 to 1.15); p <.001 for noninferiority		0.62 (0.46 to 0.82); p <.001	0.59 (90.43 to 0.81); p =.001	p <.001	p <.001			
NTT	3.1										
<b>Obadia et al (2018); 12-month results lung et al (2019) 24-month results MITRA-FR</b>											
Sample size	304	304	304	304	304	304				304	
Medical therapy alone	94/152 (62.3%)	78/152 (51.3%)	34/152 (22.4%)	31/152 (20.4%)	52/152 (22.8%)	48/152 (21.1%)				121/152 (79.6%)	
MitraClip + medical therapy	85/152 (55.9%)	83/152 (54.6%)	37/152 (24.3%)	33/152 (21.7%)	53/152 (23.1%)	47/152 (20.5%)				125/152 (82.2%)	21/144 (14.6%)

HR (95% CI); p-value	0.97 (0.72 to 1.30)	1.16 (0.73 to 1.84); p =.53	1.11 (0.69 to 1.77)	1.09 (0.67 to 1.78)	1.02 (0.70 to 1.50)	0.99 (0.66 to 1.48)	p=values not reported because no adjustment was made for multiple testing
----------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---

CI: confidence interval; COAPT: Cardiovascular Outcomes Assessment of the MitraClip Percutaneous Therapy for Heart Failure Patients with Functional Mitral Regurgitation; HF: heart failure; HR: hazard ratio; MITRA-FR: Percutaneous Repair with the MitraClip Device for Severe Functional/Secondary Mitral Regurgitation; MR: mitral regurgitation; NNT: number needed to treat; NYHA: New York Heart Association.

<sup>1</sup> Composite of single leaflet device attachment, device embolization, endocarditis requiring surgery, mitral stenosis requiring surgery, left ventricular assist device implant, heart transplant, or any device related complication requiring non-elective cardiovascular surgery

<sup>2</sup> includes prespecified adverse events heart transplantation or mechanical cardiac assistance, ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke, myocardial infarction, need for renal-replacement therapy, severe hemorrhage, and infections

Tables 8 and 9 display notable gaps identified in COAPT, and MITRA-FR. Patients enrolled in MITRA-FR had less severe MR and more severe heart failure than those who are likely to benefit from MV treatment, and the trial duration may not have been sufficient to show a benefit for the intervention. Design and conduct gaps in both trials include their open-label design and lack of information on allocation concealment. Lack of blinding is less of a concern with objective outcome measures but could impact the validity of measures of symptoms and quality of life. At baseline, more patients in the intervention group in MITRA-FR had a previous myocardial infarction. Otherwise, there were no significant differences between groups at baseline.

**Table 8. Study Relevance Limitations**

Study	Population <sup>a</sup>	Intervention <sup>b</sup>	Comparator <sup>c</sup>	Outcomes <sup>d</sup>	Follow-Up <sup>e</sup>
Stone et al (2018) COAPT					
Obadia et al (2018) MITRA-FR	4		2		1

The evidence gaps stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.

<sup>a</sup> Population key: 1. Intended use population unclear; 2. Clinical context is unclear; 3. Study population is unclear; 4. Study population not representative of intended use.

<sup>b</sup> Intervention key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Version used unclear; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as comparator; 4. Not the intervention of interest.

<sup>c</sup> Comparator key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Not standard or optimal; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as intervention; 4. Not delivered effectively.

<sup>d</sup> Outcomes key: 1. Key health outcomes not addressed; 2. Physiologic measures, not validated surrogates; 3. No CONSORT reporting of harms; 4. Not establish and validated measurements; 5. Clinical significant difference not prespecified; 6. Clinical significant difference not supported.

<sup>e</sup> Follow-Up key: 1. Not sufficient duration for benefit; 2. Not sufficient duration for harms.

**Table 9. Study Design and Conduct Limitations Gaps**

Study	Allocation <sup>a</sup>	Blinding <sup>b</sup>	Selective Reporting <sup>c</sup>	Data Completeness <sup>d</sup>	Power <sup>e</sup>	Statistical <sup>f</sup>
Stone et al (2018) COAPT	3	1,2				
Obadia et al (2018); MITRA-FR	3	1,2				

The evidence gaps stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.

<sup>a</sup> Allocation key: 1. Participants not randomly allocated; 2. Allocation not concealed; 3. Allocation concealment unclear; 4. Inadequate control for selection bias.

<sup>b</sup> Blinding key: 1. Not blinded to treatment assignment; 2. Not blinded outcome assessment; 3. Outcome assessed by treating physician.

<sup>c</sup> Selective Reporting key: 1. Not registered; 2. Evidence of selective reporting; 3. Evidence of selective publication.

<sup>d</sup> Data Completeness key: 1. High loss to follow-up or missing data; 2. Inadequate handling of missing data; 3. High number of crossovers; 4. Inadequate handling of crossovers; 5. Inappropriate exclusions; 6. Not intent to treat analysis (per protocol for noninferiority trials).

<sup>e</sup> Power key: 1. Power calculations not reported; 2. Power not calculated for primary outcome; 3. Power not based on clinically important difference.

<sup>f</sup> Statistical key: 1. Analysis is not appropriate for outcome type: (a) continuous; (b) binary; (c) time to event; 2. Analysis is not appropriate for multiple observations per patient; 3. Confidence intervals and/or p values not reported; 4. Comparative treatment effects not calculated.

## **Non-Randomized Studies**

EXPAND was a prospective, multicenter, post-marketing observational study designed to evaluate safety outcomes (as a composite of major adverse events, including all-cause death, myocardial infarction, stroke, or non-elective surgery for device-related complications, at 30 days) in patients treated with MitraClip.<sup>(59)</sup> A total of 1041 patients from 22 sites in the U.S. and 35 sites in Europe were enrolled in EXPAND, 413 of whom received MitraClip for SMR. Among these patients, mean age was 75 years and most were male (58%) with class III NYHA functional status (66%). The acute procedural success rate was 97%, and 99% had MR  $\leq 2+$  at hospital discharge. At 30-day follow-up, 3.6% of patients had experienced a major adverse event, most of which were cardiovascular deaths (2.7%). At 1-year follow-up, 99.6% of patients had MR maintained at  $\leq 2+$  and 1-year rates of all-cause death and hospitalization for heart failure were 17.7% and 26% (representing a 65% reduction from baseline in annualized heart failure hospitalizations;  $p < .001$ ), respectively; repeat MV intervention and MV replacement each occurred in 1.4% of patients.

## **Section Summary: Heart Failure and Secondary Mitral Regurgitation**

The evidence for the use of MitraClip in patients with SMR consists of a systematic review, two RCTs, and observational studies. The trials had discrepant results, but the larger trial, with a longer duration and patients selected for nonresponse to maximally tolerated therapy, found a significant benefit for MitraClip up to 5 years compared to medical therapy alone, including improvements in OS and hospitalization for heart failure. Improvements in MR severity, quality of life measures, and functional capacity persisted to 36 months in patients who received transcatheter mitral valve repair. The systematic review confirmed the benefit of MitraClip found in the larger RCT but had important methodological limitations.

## **Primary or Secondary Mitral Regurgitation in Surgical Candidates**

### ***Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose***

The purpose of transcatheter mitral valve repair using MitraClip in individuals who have symptomatic primary or SMR and are surgical candidates is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The following PICOs were used to select literature to inform this review.

### ***Populations***

The relevant population of interest are individuals who have symptomatic primary or SMR and are surgical candidates.

### ***Interventions***

The therapy being considered is transcatheter mitral valve repair using MitraClip

### ***Comparators***

Relevant comparators are open MV repair and open MV replacement.

In symptomatic individuals with primary MR, surgery is the main therapy. In most cases, MV repair is preferred over replacement, as long as the valve is suitable for repair and personnel with appropriate surgical expertise are available.

Isolated MV surgery (repair or replacement) for severe chronic SMR is not generally recommended because there is no proven mortality reduction and an uncertain durable effect on symptoms. Recommendations from major societies regarding MV surgery in conjunction with coronary artery bypass graft surgery or surgical aortic valve replacement are weak because the current evidence is inconsistent on whether MV surgery produces a clinical benefit.

## **Outcomes**

The general outcomes of interest are OS, morbid events, functional outcomes, and treatment-related morbidity.

## **Study Selection**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the principles described above.

## **Review of Evidence**

### **Systematic Review**

A systematic review by Takagi et al (2017) identified one RCT and six nonrandomized comparative studies evaluating MitraClip and surgery.(60) The RCT (EVEREST II) is described below. The systematic review conducted several pooled analyses. The meta-analysis did not detect a statistically significant difference in early (30-day or in-hospital) mortality between the MitraClip and surgery groups (pooled odds ratio [OR], 0.54; 95% CI, 0.27 to 1.08; p=0.08). Similarly, a pooled analysis of late survival (≥6 months) did not find a statistically significant difference between the MitraClip and surgery groups (pooled OR/hazard ratio, 1.17; 95% CI, 0.77 to 1.78; p=0.46). However, there was a significantly higher incidence of recurrent MR in the MitraClip than in the surgery group (pooled OR/hazard ratio, 4.80; 95% CI, 2.58 to 8.93; p<0.001).

### **Randomized Controlled Trial**

Feldman et al (2011) reported on the results of EVEREST II, an RCT that evaluated symptomatic or asymptomatic patients with grade 3+ or 4+ chronic MR who had secondary MR or primary MR etiology patients were randomized to MitraClip or open MV repair/replacement (see Table 10).(61,62) Most patients (73%) had primary MR. Patients were excluded if they had an MV orifice area less than 4.0 cm or leaflet anatomy that precluded MitraClip device implantation, proper MitraClip positioning, or sufficient reduction in MR. MitraClip was considered to have acute procedural success if the clip deployed and MR grade reduced to less than 3+.

Trial results are summarized in Table 11. In the intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis, for patients who did not have acute procedural success with MitraClip and subsequently underwent open MV repair, the efficacy end point was considered met for MitraClip group subjects if they were free from death, reoperation for MR, and MR grade greater than 2+ at 12 months. The trial had a predetermined efficacy end point of noninferiority of the MitraClip strategy, with a margin of 25% for the ITT analysis and 31% for prespecified per-protocol analyses. This implies that the MitraClip strategy would be noninferior to surgery at 12 months if the upper bound of difference in the proportion of patients achieving the primary efficacy end point between the 2 groups did not exceed 25 percentage points for the ITT analysis and 31% percentage points for the per-protocol analysis. Results showed that transcatheter mitral valve repair was less effective at reducing MR than conventional surgery before hospital discharge. MitraClip group subjects

were more likely to require surgery for MV dysfunction, either immediately post-MitraClip implantation or in the 12 months following. Twenty percent (37/181) of the MitraClip group and 2% (2/89) of the surgery group required reoperation for MV dysfunction ( $p<0.001$ ). Although in the ITT analysis rates of MR severity grades of 3+ or 4+ at 12 months were similar between groups, in the published per-protocol analysis, patients in the MitraClip group were more likely to have severity grades of 3+ or 4+ (17.2% [23/134] vs 4.1% [3/74],  $p=0.01$ ), which would suggest that a larger proportion of patients with grade 1+ or 2+ MR in the MitraClip group had had surgical repair. As expected, rates of major adverse events at 30 days were lower in the MitraClip group (15% [27/181]) than in the surgery group (48% [45/89];  $p<0.001$ ). Rates of transfusion of more than 2 units of blood were the largest component of major adverse events in both groups, occurring in 13% (24/181) of the MitraClip group and 45% (42/89;  $p<0.001$ ) of the surgery group. Long-term follow-up at 4 years (63) and 5 years (64) showed that significantly more MitraClip patients required surgery for MV dysfunction during the follow-up period.

In the FDA per protocol analysis, MitraClip did not reduce MR as often or as completely as the surgical control, although it could be safely implanted and reduced MR severity in most patients. FDA concluded that the data did not demonstrate an appropriate benefit-risk profile when compared with standard mitral valve surgery and were inadequate to support device approval for the surgical candidate population.

The REPAIR MR RCT is comparing TMVR with MitraClip to surgical MV repair in surgical candidates who are older (age  $\geq 75$  years) or at moderate surgical risk; results have not yet been reported.(65)

**Table 10. Key RCT Characteristics**

Study; Trial	Countries	Sites	Dates	Participants	Interventions	
					Active	Comparator
Feldman et al (2011) EVEREST II	U.S., Canada	37	2005- 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N=279</li> <li>• Grade 3+ or 4+ chronic MR</li> <li>• Symptomatic (LVEF <math>\geq 25\%</math> and LVESD <math>\leq 55</math> mm) or asymptomatic (LVEF 25%-60% or LVESD 40-55 mm or new AF or pulmonary hypertension)</li> </ul>	transcatheter mitral valve repair (n=184)	Open MV repair or replacement (n=95)

AF: atrial fibrillation; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction; LVESD: left ventricular end-systolic diameter; MR: mitral regurgitation; MV: mitral valve; transcatheter mitral valve repair : transcatheter mitral valve repair.

**Table 11. Key RCT Results**

Study; Trial	Freedom From Death, Surgery for MR Dysfunction, and Grade 3+ or 4+ MR	Major AE at 30 Days <sup>a</sup>	Surgery for MV Dysfunction <sup>b</sup>	Death	Grade 3+ or 4+ MR
	270				
Feldman et al (2011) EVEREST II <sup>c</sup> (1 year)	270	274	270	270	270
transcatheter mitral valve repair	100/181 (55%)	27/180 (15%)	37/181 (20%)	11/181 (6%)	38/181 (21%)
Open repair	65/89 (73%)	45/94 (48%)	2/94 (2%)	5/94 (6%)	18/94 (20%)
p	0.007	<0.001	<0.001	1.00	1.00

<b>FDA (2013) EVEREST II (1 year)</b>	Range, 156-208	274	-	-	-
transcatheter mitral valve repair	97/134 (72%) <sup>d</sup> 37/82 (45%) <sup>e</sup>	27/180 (15%)	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Open repair	65/74 (88%) <sup>d</sup> 51/74 (69%) <sup>e</sup>	45/94 (48%)	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
p	0.001 <sup>d,f</sup> 0.169 <sup>e,f</sup>	<0.001	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
<b>Mauri et al (2013) EVEREST II (4 years)</b>	NR	NR	234	234	234
transcatheter mitral valve repair	NR	NR	40/161 (25%)	28/161 (17%)	35/161 (22%)
Open repair	NR	NR	4/73 (6%)	13/73 (18%)	18/73 (25%)
p	NR	NR	<0.001	0.914	0.745
<b>Feldman et al (2015) EVEREST II (5 years)</b>			197	197	197
transcatheter mitral valve repair	NR	NR	43/154 (28%)	32/154 (21%)	19/154 (19%)
Open repair	NR	NR	5/56 (9%)	15/56 (27%)	1/56 (2%)
p	NR	NR	0.003	0.36	0.02

Values are n/N (%) unless otherwise noted.

AE: adverse event; FDA: Food and Drug Administration; MR: mitral regurgitation; MV: mitral valve; NR: not reported; RCT: Randomized controlled trial; transcatheter mitral valve repair : transcatheter mitral valve repair.

<sup>a</sup> The composite primary safety endpoint was major AEs at 30 days, defined as freedom from death, myocardial infarction, nonelective cardiac surgery for AEs, renal failure, transfusion of ≥2 units of blood, reoperation for failed surgery, stroke, gastrointestinal complications requiring surgery, ventilation for ≥48 hours, deep wound infection, septicemia, and new onset of permanent atrial fibrillation.

<sup>b</sup> The rate of the first MV surgery in the percutaneous repair group and the rate of reoperation for MV dysfunction in the surgery group

<sup>c</sup> Crossover to surgery in the immediate postprocedure period if MitraClip failed to adequately reduce MR was considered a successful treatment strategy.

<sup>d</sup> Freedom from death, MV surgery, or reoperation and MR severity grade of >2+.

<sup>e</sup> Freedom from death, MV surgery, or reoperation and MR severity grade of >1+.

<sup>f</sup> As per FDA, noninferiority statistical methods were used to calculate this p value, however, noninferiority was not implied due to the large margin. Therefore, this test shows whether the results show decreased effectiveness by the margin specified of - 31%.

## Observational Studies

Buzzatti et al (2019) reported on the results of a retrospective, propensity-weighted analysis that compared five-year outcomes between low-intermediate risk individuals aged ≥ 75 years with degenerative MR who underwent treatment with MitraClip or surgical mitral repair (see Tables 12 and 13).<sup>(66)</sup> Preoperative variables included in the model were age at operation, sex, body mass index categorized as normal (20-30) or not normal (<20 or >30), serum creatinine, atrial fibrillation, New York Heart Association class III, ejection fraction, systolic pulmonary artery pressure, isolate P2 prolapse, and Society of Thoracic Surgeons Predicted Risk of Mortality (STS-PROM). Although MitraClip was associated with improved 1-year survival and a lower rate of all acute complications, longer-term survival and MR recurrence was significant worse with MitraClip.

**Table 12. Summary of Observational Comparative Study Characteristics**

Study	Study Type	Country	Dates	Participants	Treatment	Treatment	Follow-Up
Buzzatti et al (2019)	Retrospective Cohort	Italy, Switzerland	2005-2017	Individuals aged 75 years and older with degenerative mitral regurgitation and STS-PROM < 8%	MitraClip (N=100)	Surgical repair (N=206)	5 years

STS-PROM: Society of Thoracic Surgeons Predicted Risk of Mortality

**Table 13. Summary of Observational Comparative Study Results**

Study	Survival at 1 year	Survival at 5 years	All Postoperative complications	MR > 3+ recurrence at 5 years
Buzzatti et al (2019)				
MitraClip	97.6%	34.5%	NR	36.9%
Surgical Repair	95.3%	82.2%	NR	3.9%
HR or OR (95% CI)	HR 0.09 (0.02-0.37)	HR 4.12 (2.31-7.34)	"Risk significantly reduced, but data NR"	OR 11.4 (4.40-29.68)

CI: confidence interval; HR: hazard ratio; OR: Odds Ratio; MR: Mitral Regurgitation; NR: Not Reported

### Section Summary: MitraClip in Surgical Candidates

The evidence for the use of MitraClip in patients considered candidates for open MV repair surgery includes an RCT (EVEREST II) and a systematic review. The RCT found that MitraClip did not reduce MR as often or as completely as the surgical control, although it could be safely implanted and was associated with fewer adverse events at 1 year. Long-term follow-up of the RCT showed that significantly more MitraClip patients required surgery for MV dysfunction than conventional surgery. EVEREST II had some methodologic limitations. The noninferiority margin of 25% (ITT) or 31% (per-protocol) was large, indicating that MitraClip could be somewhat inferior to surgery and, yet the test for noninferiority margin would be met. Crossover to surgery was allowed for patients who had an MR severity grade of 3+ or higher prior to discharge, and 23% of patients assigned to MitraClip met this criterion. This large crossover rate would bias results toward the null on ITT analysis, thus increasing the likelihood of meeting the noninferiority margin. In an analysis by treatment received, this crossover would result in a less severely ill population in the MitraClip group and bias the results in favor of MitraClip. A high proportion of patients required open MV replacement or repair during the first-year post-procedure, thus limiting the number of patients who had long-term success without surgical intervention. For these reasons, this single trial is not definitive in demonstrating improved clinical outcomes using MitraClip compared with surgery. Further RCTs are needed to corroborate these results. Similarly, in the retrospective study that compared five-year propensity-weighted outcomes between low-intermediate risk individuals aged  $\geq 75$  years with degenerative MR who underwent treatment with MitraClip or surgical mitral repair, although MitraClip was associated with improved one-year survival and a lower rate of all acute complications, it had lower longer-term survival and greater MR recurrence.

## OTHER TRANSCATHETER MITRAL VALVE REPAIR DEVICES

### Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of transcatheter mitral valve repair using devices other than MitraClip and PASCAL in individuals with symptomatic primary or SMR is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The following PICO's were used to select literature to inform this review.

### **Populations**

The relevant population of interest are individuals with symptomatic primary or SMR.

### **Interventions**

The therapy being considered is transcatheter mitral valve repair with devices other than MitraClip and PASCAL.

### **Comparators**

Relevant comparators are open MV repair, open MV replacement, and medical management.

### **Outcomes**

The general outcomes of interest are OS, morbid events, functional outcomes, and treatment-related morbidity.

### **Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the principles listed above.

### **Review of Evidence**

Several devices other than MitraClip are being investigated for transcatheter mitral valve repair, although none is FDA approved for use in the United States.

## **Indirect Annuloplasty Devices**

### **Randomized Controlled Trial**

Several indirect annuloplasty devices, including the Carillon Mitral Contour System (Cardiac Dimension) and the Monarc device (Edwards Lifesciences), have been evaluated. The Carillon Mitral Contour System for Reducing Functional Mitral Regurgitation (REDUCE-FMR) study by Witte et al (2019) was a multicenter, double-blind, sham-controlled randomized trial to report outcomes with the Carillon device in patients with functional SMR.(67) Patients included were taking optimally tolerated doses of guideline-directed medication therapy. Of note, 29.7% of patients included were classified as having mild MR (severity class 1+) based on echocardiographic evaluation. Patients were randomized to Carillon device (n=87) or sham (n=33). In the treatment group, 73 (84%) of patients had the device implanted. At 1 year, patients with the Carillon device had a statistically significant reduction in MR volume (decrease of 7.1 mL/beat; 95% CI, -11.7 to -2.5) compared to the sham group (decrease of 3.3 mL/beat; 95% CI, -6.0 to 12.6; p=.049). Additionally, the Carillon device significantly reduced LV volumes in symptomatic patients with MR receiving optimal medical therapy (LV end-diastolic volume decrease of 10.4 mL; 95% CI, -18.5 to -2.4; LV end-systolic volume decrease of 6.2 mL; 95% CI, -12.8 to 0.4) compared to sham (LV end-diastolic volume increase of 6.5 mL; 95% CI, -5.1 to 18.2; p=.03; LV end-systolic volume increase of 6.1 mL; 95% CI, -1.42 to 13.6; p=.04). Patient-centered outcomes, including 6-minute walk test and quality of life scores, did not differ between groups. A post-hoc analysis by Khan et al (2021) assessed patient-centered outcomes only in patients with SMR severity 2+ to 4+.(68) Of the 83 patients included in this analysis, 62 (75%) were randomized to the Carillon device group and 21 (25%) were randomized to sham procedure. A minimally clinically important difference for the outcomes was defined as a >30 m increase in 6-minute walk test, an NYHA decrease in >1 class, and a >3 point increase in KCCQ score at 1 year follow-up. All outcomes at 1 year favored the



Carillon group over sham, but the only significant difference was in the 6-minute walk test scores (59% vs. 23%;  $p=.029$ ; number needed to treat, 2.8). This analysis was not adequately powered to evaluate clinical endpoints. Further studies are needed to determine actual benefit and long-term outcomes beyond 1 year.

### **Case Series**

A case series evaluating use of the Carillon device in 53 patients with a secondary MR severity grade of 2+ at 7 European centers was reported by Siminiak et al (2012).<sup>(17)</sup> Of the 53 patients who underwent attempted device implantation, 36 underwent permanent implantation and 17 had the device removed due to transient coronary compromise in 8 patients and less than 1 severity grade reduction in secondary MR in 9 patients. Echocardiographic measures of secondary MR improved in the implanted groups through 12-month follow-up, along with improvements in SIX-minute walk distance. An earlier feasibility study of the Carillon device reported by Schoder et al (2009) who evaluated 48 patients with moderate-to-severe secondary MR; it demonstrated successful device placement in 30 patients, with 18 patients unable to be implanted due to access issues, insufficient acute secondary MR reduction, or coronary artery compromise.<sup>(69)</sup> The Monarc device has been evaluated in a phase I safety trial at 8 European centers, as reported by Harnek et al (2011).<sup>(18)</sup> Among 72 patients enrolled, the device was successfully implanted in 59 (82%) patients. The primary safety end point (freedom from death, tamponade, or myocardial infarction at 30 days) was met by 91% of patients at 30 days and by 82% at 1 year.

The CINCH post-market registry evaluated the outcomes of percutaneous mitral valve repair using the Carillon Mitral Contour System in patients with functional mitral regurgitation and symptomatic heart failure from 2012 to 2022.<sup>(70)</sup> The single-arm study enrolled 101 patients at 13 sites in Germany, with a mean age of 75 years and primarily NYHA class III (69%) and MR grade 3 (68%). Over 5 years, all-cause mortality was 40.1%, heart failure hospitalization incidence was 53.9%, and the composite outcome of hospitalization or death was 66.4%. The annualized rate of cumulative heart failure hospitalization through 2 years was 28.8%. Statistically significant reductions in NYHA class and MR grade were reported at each follow-up interval through 5 years; at the 5-year follow-up, 100% of participants had an improvement or maintained their NYHA class, and none had a mitral regurgitation score of 3+ or greater. There were no device-related serious adverse events reported, and 2 (2%) procedure-related serious adverse events, both of which were minor vascular access complications.

The retrospective TENDER (Tendyne European Experience) registry evaluated the Tendyne transcatheter mitral valve replacement (TMVR) system at 31 high-volume heart valve centers (Germany, Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom).<sup>(71)</sup> The study included 195 patients eligible for 1-year follow-up, with a median age of 77 years and a median Society of Thoracic Surgeons Predicted Risk of Mortality of 5.6%. Technical success was achieved in 94.9% of patients. Cardiovascular mortality rates were 6.7% at 30 days and 16.9% at 1 year, while all-cause mortality rates were 9.3% at 30 days and 28.6% at 1 year. The rate of heart failure hospitalization significantly decreased from 68.1% in the year prior to the procedure to 25.4% in the 1-year post-procedure period. At 1-year follow-up, a reduction of mitral regurgitation to mild or less ( $\leq 1+$ ) was achieved in 97.9% of patients, and 82.5% of patients were in NYHA functional class I or II, compared to 22.6% at baseline. Within the 1-year post-discharge follow-up, major adverse events included disabling stroke (2.4%), myocardial infarction (1.3%), new-onset atrial fibrillation (5.4%), and new conduction disturbances (1.2%). Device-specific events comprised valve thrombosis (3.0%), valve migration (0.6%), and paravalvular leak  $>1+$  inch (5.2%).

### **Section Summary: Other Transcatheter MV Repair Devices**

The evidence for the use of transcatheter mitral valve repair devices other than MitraClip and PASCAL for patients with MR includes an RCT, nonrandomized prospective studies, and small case series and case reports. The randomized, sham-controlled trial for the indirect annuloplasty device Carillon offers promising safety data, however further studies are needed to determine efficacy and long-term outcomes.

## **TRANSCATHETER MITRAL VALVE-IN-VALVE REPLACEMENT**

### **Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose**

The purpose of transcatheter mitral valve-in-valve replacement (TMViVR) implantation is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies, such as surgical mitral valve repair and medical management, in individuals with a degenerated mitral valve bioprosthesis who are at a high or prohibitive risk for redo surgical mitral valve replacement (rSMVR).

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

### **Populations**

The relevant population of interest is individuals with a previously implanted bioprosthetic mitral valve who experience valve stenosis or mitral regurgitation and are determined to be at high surgical risk.

### **Interventions**

The therapy being considered is TMViVR, a minimally invasive surgical procedure that repairs the mitral valve without removing the old, damaged valve by wedging a replacement valve into the place of the mitral valve.

### **Comparators**

The first comparator of interest is surgical mitral valve repair, performed through sternotomy. The decision to repair a damaged mitral valve depends on the severity of the symptomatic mitral stenosis or regurgitation, the patient's age, and overall health. Medical management, including lipid-lowering therapy, anti-hypertensive drugs, and anti-calcific therapy, is the second comparator of interest in this review.

### **Outcomes**

The general outcomes of interest are OS, symptoms, morbid events, treatment-related mortality, and treatment-related morbidity. Symptoms may include heart murmur, angina, dizziness or syncope, shortness of breath, fatigue, and heart palpitations. Morbid events may include stroke, coronary obstruction, vascular complications, conduction disturbance, valve malpositioning and sizing, mitral valve injury, annular rupture, myocardial trauma, low cardiac output, cardiogenic shock, and cardiac arrest.

### **Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.

- To assess longer-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

## Review of Evidence

### Systematic Reviews

Zhou et al (2023) conducted a meta-analysis of TMViVR (n=1464) versus rSMVR (n=1574) for patients who have had mitral bioprosthesis failure.(72) Nine retrospective cohort studies were included in the analysis from a literature search through September 2022. TMViVR was associated with a lower reported in-hospital mortality than rSMVR (3.2% vs. 6.8%; OR, 0.44; 95% CI, 0.30 to 0.64;  $p<.001$ ;  $I^2=0\%$ ) with no observed heterogeneity. However, 30-day (OR, 0.65; 95% CI, 0.36 to 1.17;  $p=.15$ ) and 1-year mortality (OR, 0.96; 95% CI, 0.63 to 1.45;  $p=.84$ ) did not differ significantly between treatment groups. The TMViVR group had a lower rate of reported stroke (OR, 0.44; 95% CI, 0.29 to 0.67), renal dysfunction (OR, 0.52; 95% CI, 0.37 to 0.75), vascular complications (OR, 0.58; 95% CI, 0.43 to 0.78), pacemaker implantation (OR, 0.23; 95% CI, 0.15 to 0.36), and exploration for bleeding (OR, 0.24; 95% CI, 0.06 to 0.96) than the rSMVR group.

Ismayl et al (2023) published a meta-analysis comparing TMViVR (n=338) to rSMVR (n=369) for individuals with degenerated bioprosthetic mitral valves.(73) A total of 6 observational studies with a median follow-up of 2.7 years were included based on a literature search through September 2022; studies with potential overlap from the Nationwide Inpatient Sample and National Readmission Database were excluded from the analysis. Thirty-four patients (9.2%) in the TMViVR group received valve-in-ring rather than TMViVR and could not be separated for outcome assessment. The pooled risk of in-hospital mortality (OR, 0.52; 95% CI, 0.22 to 1.23;  $p=.14$ ), 30-day mortality (OR 0.65; 95% CI, 0.36 to 1.17;  $p=.15$ ), 1-year mortality (OR, 0.97, 95% CI, 0.63 to 1.49,  $p=.89$ ), 2-year mortality (OR, 1.17; 95% CI, 0.65 to 2.13;  $p=.6$ ) was similar between groups with low heterogeneity ( $I^2=0\%$ ). TMViVR had a lower risk of stroke (OR, 0.31; 95% CI, 0.11 to 0.88;  $p=.03$ ), bleeding (OR, 0.21; 95% CI, 0.12 to 0.39;  $p<.00001$ ), acute kidney injury (OR, 0.43; 95% CI, 0.22 to 0.84;  $p=.01$ ), arrhythmias (OR, 0.17; 95% CI, 0.04 to 0.64;  $p=.009$ ), and permanent pacemaker insertion (OR, 0.18; 95% CI, 0.05 to 0.60;  $p=.005$ ).

### Comparative Studies

Eight retrospective cohort or registry-based studies were identified, which provided indirect comparisons of TMViVR and rSMVR with follow-up periods from 1 to 5 years (Table 14).(68, 74-80) Patients included in the TMViVR groups had higher mean ages (range: 74 to 77) compared to rSMVR (range: 63 to 72) as well as worse Society of Thoracic Surgeons Predicted Risk of Mortality (STS-PROM) (range: 11.9% to 12.7% vs. 8.7% to 10.2%) and EuroScore (range: 15.7% to 39% vs. 15% to 23%). Due to this imbalance of patient characteristics between groups, propensity matching was performed in 4 studies.(68,74,76) However, despite efforts to make the treatment groups comparable, 2 of these studies still had baseline imbalances.(74,80) Five of 8 studies reported the device used for valve-in-valve replacement, all of which used either SAPIEN, SAPIEN 3, SAPIEN 3 Ultra or SAPIEN XT; 2 studies included a minority of patients with valve-in-ring procedures and did not report outcomes separately for valve-in-valve (ViV).(74,75) Several studies were based on registry data and may have recounted participants from other studies with overlapping enrollment periods.(68,76,80)

Outcomes for studies comparing TMViVR to rSMVR are reported in Table 15. In-hospital mortality was reported by 4 studies (TMViVR range: 2 to 7.3; rSMVR range: 3.2 to 15.2), with 3 finding equivalent in-hospital mortality and 1 finding that TMViVR was favored over rSMVR.(80) At 30 days post-implantation, 1 of 5 studies (TMViVR range: 2.4% to 14%; rSMVR range: 1.3% to 15.2%) found a significant difference in mortality favoring TMViVR over rSMVR.75, Mortality at 1-year follow-up was reported by 6 studies (TMViVR range: <2.8% to 16.7%; rSMVR range: 4.8% to 18.3%), which found a significantly lower rate in TMViVR when compared to rSMVR in 1.(68) Longer-term follow-up was reported by 3 studies, all of which found numerically higher mortality in the TMViVR group, but statistical tests were provided for only 1 study, which found that rates were comparable with rSMVR.(75,77,79) The change in the direction of survival benefit may be due to TMViVR participants having a higher surgical risk and more advanced age, which, despite attempts to control statistically, remained unbalanced in 2 studies or the ability to treat concomitant conditions (e.g. tricuspid regurgitation or atrial fibrillation) during rSMVR which may confer a survival benefit. The length of hospital or intensive care unit (ICU) stay was reported in 6 studies (TMViVR range: 2 to 9.7 days; rSMVR range: 3 to 13 days) 4 of which found fewer in-hospital days amongst valve-in-valve repair patients compared to rSMVR. Complications of acute kidney injury, cardiac arrest, cardiogenic shock, major bleeding, pacemaker implantation, pneumonia, sepsis, stroke, and vascular complications were greater in the rSMVR group; participants treated with TMViVR were more likely to report a residual defect needing closure or an increased likelihood of paravalvular regurgitation.

**Table 14. Summary of Observational Comparative Study Characteristics**

Study	Study Type	Country	Dates	Participants (TMViVR; rSMVR)	Treatment	Comparator	Follow -Up
Szlapka et al (2022)	Retrospective cohort, propensity-matched	Multicenter (10 sites), Germany	2014-2019	Degenerated mitral valve prosthesis or ring who underwent TMViVR or rSMVR without prosthetic endocarditis and failing mechanical prostheses.	TMViVR (n=79)  SAPIEN, SAPIEN 3, or SAPIEN XT  *7 pts were valve in ring	rSMVR (n=194)  PS Matched (n=79)	1-year
				EuroSCORE II risk: 15.7%; 15.0%; p=.5336 Mean age, years: 74.73; 72.2 years; p=.0030 Incidence of AF: 68%; 21%; p=.0233 Previous aortic valve replacement: 25%; 12%; p=.042 Moderate or greater regurgitation: 40%; 37%			

				<p>TMViVR approach: Transapical: 92% Transseptal: 8%</p> <p>After PS matching, SS differences remained in several BL characteristics (age, creatinine [mg/dL], GFR [mL/min], previous aortic valve replacement, and AF).</p>			
Simard et al (2022)	Retrospective cohort	Single center, United States	2014-2020	<p>Degenerated mitral valve prosthesis or ring with mitral regurgitation, mitral stenosis or mixed dysfunction who underwent TMViVR or rSMVR</p> <p>Mean age, years: 74.9; 64.5; p&lt;.0001 Chronic lung disease: 35%; 26%; p=.02 Tricuspid regurgitation ≥moderate: 47%; 60%; p=.07</p> <p>NYHA class: I: 0%; 3.1%; p=.15 II: 1.2%; 10.1%; p=.01 III: 72.1%; 51.2%; p=.003 IV: 26.7%; 23%; p=.13</p> <p>TMViVR approach: Transapical: 2% Transseptal: 98%</p>	<p>TMViVR (n=86)</p> <p>SAPIEN, SAPIEN 3, SAPIEN 3 Ultra, or SAPIEN XT</p> <p>*11 pts were valve in ring</p>	rSMVR (n=129)	5 years
Gill et al (2022)	Retrospective cohort	Multicenter (National Inpatient)	2016-2018	Degenerated mitral valve prosthesis who	TMViVR (n=416)	rSMVR (n=1474)	1-year

	propensity-matched	Sample data)		underwent TMViVR or rSMVR, excluding those with endocarditis, undergoing other concurrent valvular procedures or CABG, and less than 50 years of age  Mean age, years: 76; 67; p<.001 AF: 61%; 71%; p=.05 CHF: 85%; 66%; p<.001 CAD: 69%; 49%; p<.001  After PS matching NS differences in BL characteristics were observed.	PS Matched (n=310)  Device NR	PS Matched (n=310)	
<b>Khan et al (2021)</b>	Retrospective cohort, propensity-matched	Multicenter (National Inpatient Sample data)	2015-2018	Patients undergoing rSMVR were identified by ICD-10-CM codes. Excluding those with infective endocarditis, undergoing CABG, and less than 50 years of age  Mean age, years: 77; 68; p<.01 AF: 62%; 70%; p<.01 CAD: 70%; 42.2%; p<.01 HTN: 82%; 76%; p=.004 PVD: 18%; 11%; p<.01 Median Charlson score: 6; 5; p<.01  After PS matching NS differences in BL characteristics were observed.	TMViVR (n=490)  PS Matched (n=395)  Device NR	rSMVR (n=2250)  PS Matched (n=395)	1-year
<b>Zahid et al (2021)</b>	Retrospective cohort,	Multicenter (Nationwide	2015-2019	Patients undergoing redo	TMViVR (n=1144)	rSMVR (n=6521)	1 year

	propensity- matched	Readmission Database)		mitral valve replacement in adults over 18 with ICD-10-CM codes for TMViVR or rSMVR. Excluding those with infective endocarditis, aortic valve disease, pulmonic valve disease, tricuspid valve disease, CABG, SAVR, TAVR, tricuspid valve surgery, pulmonic valve surgery, ASD, or VSD repairs  Median age, years: 76; 69; p<.01 CHF: 84%; 73%; p<.01  After PS matching SS differences remained in several BL characteristics (age, CHF, hospital type, and insurance type).	PS Matched (n=403)  Device NR	PS Matched (n=411)	
Zubarevich et al (2021)	Retrospective cohort	Single center, Italy	2012- 2020	Consecutive patients at a single center who underwent either rSMVR or TMViVR, excluding those with infective endocarditis of the mitral valve and those who needed concomitant CABG.  Mean age, years: 73.6; 63.7; p=.001 NYHA Class III: 71%; 42% p=.02 NYHA Class IV: 29%; 30%; p=1	TMViVR (n=41)  SAPIEN 3, SAPIEN XT	rSMVR (n=33)	1 year

				Pulmonary HTN: 100%; 67%; p<.001 Diabetes: 34%; 12%; p<.03 Chronic obstructive lung disease: 42%; 15%; p=.02 CAD: 22; 6; p=.1 Prior CABG: 61%; 15%; p<.001 Prior aortic valve replacement: 27%; 9%; p=.05 EuroScore II: 21.2%; 18.2%; p=.024 STS Score: 11.9; 10.2; p=.003  TMViVR approach: Transapical: 100% Transseptal: 0%			
Kamioka et al (2018).	Retrospective cohort	Multicenter (3 sites), U.S.	2007- 2017	Patients with severely degenerated mitral valve prostheses, excluding active cases of endocarditis, those who required concomitant procedures for CAD or aortic disease, or patients who underwent additional valve replacement.  Mean age, years: 74.9; 63.7; p<.001 NYHA Class IV: 31%; 32%; p=.85 HTN: 86%; 80%; p=.4 Dyslipidemia: 81%; 64%; p=.05 Diabetes: 24%; 12%; p=.08 Lung disease ≥moderate: 34%; 14%; p=.01	TMViVR (n=62)  SAPIEN, SAPIEN 3, SAPIEN XT	rSMVR (n=59)	1 year



				<p>CAD: 53%; 31%; p=.01 History of CABG: 47%; 25%; p=.02 History of aortic valve replacement: 26%; 7%; p=.01 AF: 76%; 27%; p&lt;.001 History of pacing device: 27%; 12%; p=.03 STS PROM: 12.7; 8.7; p&lt;.001 Time from previous procedure, yrs: 10.3; 8.2; p=.02</p> <p>TMViVR approach: Transapical: 23% Transseptal: 77%</p>			
Murzi et al (2017)	Retrospective cohort	Single center, Italy	2005- 2015	<p>Patients with failed mitral bioprostheses treated with TMViVR or rSMVR at a single center; no patients were reported as excluded.</p> <p>Mean age, years: 77; 67; p=.001; NYHA Class III or IV: 86%; 71%; p=.26 Diabetes: 24%; 10%; p=.153 AF: 43%; 10%; p=.006 Chronic kidney failure: 19%; 12.2%; p=.03 Severe pulmonary HTN: 90%; 34%; p=.001 EuroSCORE logistic: 39%; 23%; p=.005</p> <p>TMViVR approach: Transapical: 100%</p>	TMViVR (n=21)	rSMVR (n=40)	2 years
				SAPIEN 3, SAPIEN XT			

AF: atrial fibrillation; ASD: atrial septal defect; BL: baseline; CABG: coronary artery bypass graft; CAD: coronary artery disease; CHF: congestive heart failure; GFR: glomerular filtration rate; HTN: hypertension; NR: not reported; NS: non-significant; NYHA: New York Heart Association; PROM: predicted risk of mortality; PS: propensity score; PVD: peripheral vascular disease; rSMVR: redo-surgical mitral valve replacement; SAVR: surgical aortic valve replacement SS: statistically significant; STS: Society of Thoracic Surgeons; TAVR: transcatheter aortic valve replacement; TMViVR: transcatheter mitral valve-in-valve replacement; VSD: ventricular septal defect.

**Table 15. Summary of Observational Comparative Study Results**

Study	Mortality	Length of ICU stay, days (IQR)	Complications
<b>Szlapka et al (2024)<sup>74</sup>,</b>			
TMViVR (n=79)	30 days: 11 (14.1%) 1 year: 13 (16.7%)	2 (3)	Stroke: 2 (2.5%) Postoperative MI: 1 (1.3%) Life-threatening bleeding: 2 (2.5%) Renal replacement surgery: 10 (12.7%) Atrial fibrillation: 19 (24.1%) Pacemaker implantation: 3 (3.8%) Paravalvular regurgitation: 5 (6.3%) Prosthesis dysfunction: 2 (2.5%)
rSMVR (n=79)	30 days: 10 (12.7%) 1 year: 13 (16.7%)	3 (5)	Stroke: 4 (5.2%) Postoperative MI: 3 (3.8%) Life-threatening bleeding: 12 (15.2%) Renal replacement surgery: 16 (20.3%) Atrial fibrillation: 29 (37.7%) Pacemaker implantation: 13 (16.5%) Paravalvular regurgitation: 0 Prosthesis dysfunction: 0
p-value	30 days: .81 1 year: 1	0.2	Stroke: .44 Postoperative MI: .37 Life-threatening bleeding: .01 Renal replacement surgery: .2 Atrial fibrillation: .07 Pacemaker implantation: .02 Paravalvular regurgitation: .03 Prosthesis dysfunction: .25
<b>Simard et al (2022)<sup>75</sup>,</b>		NYHA I/II class:	
TMViVR (n=86)	30-days: 2.4% 1 year: 14.7% 2 years: 24.5% 5 years: 49.9%	BL: 1.2% 30 days: 80.3% 1 year: 80.8% 2 years: 72.4% 3 years: 82.4%	
rSMVR (n=129)	30-days: 10.2% 1 year: 17.5% 2 years: 20.7% 5 years: 34%	NR	
OR (95% CI)	30-days: 4.69 (1.25 to 30.5; p=.04)	NA	
<b>Gill et al (2022)<sup>76</sup>,</b>		Length of hospitalization, days ± SD	
TMViVR (n=310)	1 year: 3.2%	7.5±0.8	Acute stroke: 5% Acute kidney injury: 18% Cardiac arrest: 0% Cardiogenic shock: 6.5% Peri-operative hemorrhage: 11% Sepsis: 5%
rSMVR (n=310)	1 year: 4.8%	13±0.5	Acute stroke: 8% Acute kidney injury: 27%

			Cardiac arrest: 16% Cardiogenic shock: 16% Peri-operative hemorrhage: 22% Sepsis: 13%
OR (95% CI)	1 year: 1.53 (0.67 to 3.45; p=.31)	p-value: <.001	Acute stroke: 1.73 (0.89 to 3.34; p=.11) Acute kidney injury: 1.75 (1.19 to 2.57; p = 0.004) Cardiac arrest: 16% vs. 0%; p <0.001 Cardiogenic shock: 2.79 (1.62 to 4.81; p <0.001) Peri-operative hemorrhage: 3.12 (1.75 to 8.53; p = 0.02) Sepsis: 3.1 (1.11 to 8.64; p=.03)
<b>Khan et al (2021)<sup>68,</sup></b>		Length of hospital stay, days (IQR):	
TMViVR (n=395)	1 year: <2.8%	3 (1-8)	Acute kidney injury: 13.9% Pneumonia: <2.8% Residual atrial defect needing closure: 8.9%
rSMVR (n=395)	1 year: 7.6%	10 (7-16)	Acute kidney injury: 36.7% Pneumonia: 10.1% Residual atrial defect needing closure: 0%
OR (95% CI)	1 year: 2.2 (1.3 to 3.6; p<.01)	p-value:<.01	p-value:<.001 for each complication
<b>Zahid et al (2021)<sup>80,</sup></b>		Readmission:	
TMViVR (n=403)	In-hospital: 2.6% 30-day: <1.4% 6 months: <1.4%	30-day: 15.1% 6 months: 25.2%	Stroke: 1.6% Vascular complications: 9.2% Blood transfusion: 12.1% Cardiac arrest with CPR: <1.4% Pneumonia: 7.4% Pericardial effusion: 1.6% Permanent pacemaker: 2.9%
rSMVR (n=411)	In-hospital: 7.3% 30-day: <1.3% 6 months: <1.4%	30-day: 14.2% 6 months: 29.8%	Stroke: 4.3% Vascular complications: 15% Blood transfusion: 29.1% Cardiac arrest with CPR: 2.4% Pneumonia: 12.2% Pericardial effusion: 3.1% Permanent pacemaker: 11.1%
p-value	In-hospital: <.01 30-day:.36 6 months:.11	30-day:.57 6 months:.13	p<.05 for all comparisons
<b>Zubarevich et al (2021)<sup>79,</sup></b>		Time in hospital, days	
TMViVR (n=41)	In-hospital: 7.3% 30-day: 9.8% 1 year: 25.4% 3 years: 37.4%	9.7	Postoperative MR > trace: 17.1% New onset AF: 12.2%
rSMVR (n=411)	In-hospital: 15.2% 30-day: 15.2% 1 year: 18.3% 3 years: 27.1%	11	Postoperative MR > trace: 0% New onset AF: 27.3%
p-value	In-hospital:.45 30-day:.50 1 year:.19 3 years: NR	.06	Postoperative MR > trace:.15 New onset AF:.13
<b>Kamioka et al (2018)<sup>78,</sup></b>		Length of stay, days ± SD	

TMViVR (n=62)	In-hospital: 3.2% 30-day: 3.2% 1 year: 11.3%	6.3 (4.8)	Major vascular complications: 1.6% Major bleeding: 8.1% Stroke: 0% New complete heart block: 0% New onset AF: 1.6% LVOT obstruction: 3.2%
rSMVR (n=59)	In-hospital: 3.4% 30-day: 3.4% 1 year: 11.9%	10.6 (6.6)	Major vascular complications: 5.1% Major bleeding: 33.9% Stroke: 3.4% New complete heart block: 5.1% New onset AF: 30.5% LVOT obstruction: 0%
p-value	In-hospital: 1 30-day: 1 1 year: .92	<.001	Major vascular complications: .36 Major bleeding: p<.001 Stroke: .24 New complete heart block: .07 New onset AF: <.001 LVOT obstruction: .16
<b>Murzi et al (2017)<sup>77</sup>,</b>		Length of stay, days ± SD	
TMViVR (n=20)	In-hospital: 4.7% 1 year: ~10% 2 years: 14% 3 years: ~36%	5±4	Stroke: 1 (4.7%) Low cardiac output syndrome: 1 (4.7%) Renal dysfunction: 1 (4.7%) Pulmonary complications: 2 (9.4%) Reoperation for bleeding: 1 (4.7%)
rSMVR (n=40)	In-hospital: 7.5% 1 year: ~9% 2 years: 13% 3 years: ~17%	14±7	Stroke: 5 (12.8%) Low cardiac output syndrome: 2 (4.9%) Renal dysfunction: 4 (10%) Pulmonary complications: 8 (20%) Reoperation for bleeding: 6 (14.6%)
p-value	NS difference at all points	.03	NS difference at all complications

AF: atrial fibrillation; CI: confidence interval; HR: hazard ratio; LVOT: Left ventricular outflow tract; MR: Mitral Regurgitation; NR: Not Reported; NS: non-significant difference; OR: Odds Ratio; rSMVR: redo surgical mitral valve repair; SD: standard deviation; TMViVR: transcatheter mitral valve-in-valve repair.

## Observational Studies

Nine retrospective cohort studies reported outcomes of patients undergoing TMViVR from 30 days to 7 years post-implantation (Table 16).(20, 81-88) Participants ranged in age from a mean of 72.6 years to 77.5 years. Mean STS scores over 8, which indicates a high risk for surgery, were reported for 7 studies (range: 5.9 to 11.1); EuroScore was reported in 4 studies (range 8.9 to 11.5). All studies reported that SAPIEN, SAPIEN 3, SAPIEN 3 Ultra, or SAPIEN XT were used for ViV procedures, but 2 studies included a minority of patients who were treated with non-US FDA-approved valves (Lotus, Direct Flow, and Melody devices).(86,87) Observational study outcomes for TMViVR are reported in Table 17. Technical success during TMViVR was reported by 5 studies and ranged from 73.6% to 96.8%, with device success ranging from 28.6% to 88.2% in 3 studies; however, different definitions of technical and device success were applied, which makes comparisons across studies challenging.(81,85-88) Four studies reported an improvement in NYHA functional class from baseline levels.(83-85,89) Three studies found improvements from baseline on the Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire (KCCQ), with the longest follow-up being 5 years.(84,85,89) Mortality at 30 days post-implantation ranged from 2.5% to 6.8% in 4 studies;(81,82,86,88) at 1 year, this range increased to 3% to 16% in 8 studies.(81-88) Mortality at 2 years follow-up was only reported by 2 studies and had a wide range from 6.7% to 29.4%,(84,88) and at 5 years follow-up, mortality increased to a range of 21.4% to 58.1% in 3 studies.(83-85) A single observational study

reported that at 7 years after TMViVR the mortality rate was 64.3%.(82) Complications reported by more than one author included conversion to open surgery, left ventricular outflow tract obstruction, major vascular complications, new pacemaker implantation, stroke, and transcatheter heart valve thrombosis.

**Table 16. Summary of Observational Study Characteristics**

Study	Study Type	Country	Dates	Participants	Treatment	Follow-Up
Akodad et al (2023)	Retrospective cohort	Single center, Canada	2008-2021	<p>Patients with a degenerated mitral bioprosthesis valve treated with TMViVR.</p> <p>Mean age, years: 76.8 Euroscore: 11.1% STS PROM: 10.7% NYHA Class <math>\geq 3</math>: 90.8%</p> <p>TMViVR approach: Transapical: 64% Transseptal: 36%</p>	SAPIEN 3 or SAPIEN 3 Ultra (N=119)	Mean 3.4 years
Wilbring et al (2023)	Retrospective cohort	Single center, Switzerland	2011-2021	<p>Consecutive patients treated with a failed mitral bioprosthesis valve treated with TMViVR.</p> <p>Mean age, years: 77.4 Euroscore: 11.5% STS PROM: 5.9% NYHA Class <math>\geq 3</math>: 76% Moderate or severe MR: 88% Moderate or severe MS: 64%</p> <p>TMViVR approach: Transapical: 88% Transseptal: 12%</p>	SAPIEN or SAPIEN XT (N=25)	Mean 4.8 years
Pravda et al (2022)	Retrospective cohort	Single center, Israel	2010-2019	<p>Patients with mitral bioprosthesis valve treated with TMViVR.</p> <p>Mean age, years: 77.4 Euroscore: 8.9% STS PROM: 7.7% NYHA Class <math>\geq 3</math>: 75%</p> <p>TMViVR approach: Transapical: 35% Transseptal: 65%</p>	SAPIEN or SAPIEN XT (N=49)	5 years
Gurrero et al (2021 & 2022) & Eleid et al (2022)	Prospective registry (MITRAL trial)	Multicenter (13 sites), U.S.	2016-2017	<p>Patients with symptomatic moderate to severe or severe MR or MS due to failed mitral bioprosthesis valve treated with TMViVR</p> <p>Mean age, years: 77.5 STS PROM: 9.4% NYHA Class <math>\geq 3</math>: 80%</p>	SAPIEN 3 (N=30)	5 years

Whisenant et al (2020)	Prospective registry (Mitral Valve-in-Valve Registry)	Multicenter (295 sites), U.S.	2015-2019	<p>TMViVR approach: Transseptal: 100%</p> <p>Consecutive patients treated with a failed mitral bioprosthetic valve treated with TMViVR at centers participating in the registry.</p> <p>Mean age, years: 73.3 STS PROM: 11.1% NYHA Class <math>\geq 3</math>: 87.1% MR:24.8% MS: 55.4% Combined MR and MS: 19.8%</p> <p>TMViVR approach: Transseptal: 87% Transapical: 13%</p>	SAPIEN 3 (N=1529)	1 year
Simonato et al (2020)	Retrospective registry (Valve-in-Valve International Database)	Multicenter (90 sites worldwide)	2006-2020	<p>Patients with a failed mitral bioprosthetic valve treated with TMViVR at centers participating in the registry.</p> <p>Mean age, years: 74.1 STS PROM: 9% NYHA Class <math>\geq 3</math>: 89% MR:10% MS: 31% Combined MR and MS: 59% Severe MR: 42%</p> <p>TMViVR approach: Transseptal: 65% Transapical: 35%</p>	SAPIEN, SAPIEN XT, SAPIEN 3, Lotus, Direct flow, and Melody devices (N=857)	4 years
Yoon et al (2019)	Retrospective registry (TMVR Registry)	Multicenter (40 sites), U.S. and Europe	2009-2018	<p>Patients with a failed mitral bioprosthetic valve treated with TMViVR at centers participating in the registry.</p> <p>Mean age, years: 72.6 STS PROM: 9.2% NYHA Class <math>\geq 3</math>: 87.6% MR:37% MS: 41% Combined MR and MS: 23%</p> <p>TMViVR approach: Transseptal: 60% Transapical: 40%</p>	SAPIEN, SAPIEN XT, SSAPIEN 3, Lotus, Direct flow, and Melody devices (N=322); 90% Sapien valves	1 year
Urena et al (2018)	Retrospective cohort	Single center, U.S.	2010-2017	<p>Patients with a failed mitral bioprosthetic valve treated with TMViVR at a single-center.</p> <p>Mean age, years: 73 EuroSCORE-II: 10.9%</p>	SAPIEN or SAPIEN XT (N=34)	2 years

				NYHA Class $\geq 3$ : 91.2% Moderate or severe MR: 47%		
				TMViVR approach: Transseptal: 92% Transapical: 8%		
U.S. Food and Drug Administration (2017)	Retrospective registry (TVT Registry)	Multicenter (112 sites), U.S. and Europe	2014-2016	Mean age, years: 73.4 STS PROM: 13% NYHA Class $\geq 3$ : 89.3% Moderate or severe MR: 62.5% Inoperable or extreme risk: 34.5%	SAPIEN 3 or SAPIEN XT (N=290)	1 year
				TMViVR approach: Transseptal: 27% Transapical: 65.3%		

MR: mitral regurgitation; MS: mitral stenosis; NR: not reported; NS: non-significant; NYHA: New York Heart Association; STS-PROM: Society of Thoracic Surgeons Predicted Risk of Mortality; TMVR: transcatheter mitral valve replacement; TMViVR: transcatheter mitral valve-in-valve replacement;

**Table 17. Summary of Observational Study Results**

Study	Mortality	Treatment success or symptom improvement	Complications, n (%)
Akodad et al (2023)	30 day: 2.5% 1 year: 10.1% 3.4 years (median f/u): 46.2%	Technical success (successful access, delivery, deployment, and positioning of a single device in the absence of procedural death, surgical conversion, or emergency reintervention): 97.5%  Device success (Significant mitral stenosis $\geq 5$ mm Hg): 28.6% Device success (Significant mitral stenosis $\geq 10$ mm Hg): 88.2%	Rehospitalization for heart failure: 13 (10.9%) THV thrombosis: 7 (5.9%) Major bleeding: 6 (5%) Mitral valve reintervention: 3 (2.5%) Moderate or greater MR: 1 (1%) Reintervention for THV dysfunction: 2 (1.6%)
Wilbring et al (2023)	Median survival: 4.4 years 30 day: 4% 1 year: ~10% 4.4 years: 50% 5 years: 58.1% 7 years: 64.3%	BL Moderate + Severe MR: ~97% Post- Implant Moderate + Severe MR: 10% 1-year Moderate + Severe MR: 12%	Sepsis: 2 (8%) Stroke: 2 (8%)
Pravda et al (2022)	1 year: 16% 5 years: 35% <i>In a sub-group analysis, there were no differences in mortality between patients who underwent the procedure via transapical or transfemoral/transseptal access</i>	NYHA Functional Class I/II: Baseline: 25% 1 year: 98% 5 years: 91%	
Gurrero et al (2021 & 2022) & Eleid et al (2022);	All-cause mortality: 1 year: 3% 2 years: 6.7% 5 years: 21.4%	MR Severity none/1+: Baseline: 51% 1 year: 100% 5 years: 96%	Rehospitalization for HF: 5 (16.7%) Septostomy closure: 2 (6.7%) Intracranial hemorrhage: 1 (3.3%)
		NYHA Functional Class I/II:	



		BL: 19% 1 year: 86% 2 years: 77% 3 years: 75% 4 years: 78% 5 years: 75% <i>P&lt;.001 for all time points vs BL;          includes valve-in-ring patients</i>  Median KCCQ Score: BL: ~33 1 year: ~55 2 years: ~54 3 years: ~57 4 years: ~58 5 years: ~50 <i>P&lt;.001 for all time points vs BL;          includes valve-in-ring patients</i>	
Whisenant et al (2020)	1 year: 15.8%	Technical success: 96.8%  1 year KCCQ Improvement, mean (SD): 39.4 (27.1)  NYHA Functional Class III/IV: Baseline: 87% 30 days: 14% 1 year: 10%	Device embolization: 3 (0.2%) Cardiac perforation: 14 (1.1%) Conversion to open surgery: 9 (0.7%) ASD closure: 101 (7.6%) Cardiovascular death: 24 (1.8%) Stroke: 9 (0.7%) Mitral valve reintervention: 4 (0.3%) LVOF obstruction: 10 (0.8%) New pacemaker: 15 (1.1%) Periprocedural MI: 4 (0.3%) Device thrombosis: 2 (0.2%) Major vascular complications: 16 (1.2%)
Simonato et al (2020)	30 day: 6.5% 1 year: 13.8% 4 years: 37.5% <i>Sub-group analyses showed no difference in transseptal access vs. other approaches</i>	Technical success (MVARC Criteria: exit from the hybrid suite, patient is alive with successful access, delivery, and retrieval of the device delivery system, successful deployment and correct position of the first intended device, and freedom from emergency surgery): 93.5%  Device success (Reduction of MR to optimal levels): 41.3% Device success (Reduction of MR to acceptable levels): 84%	Major vascular complications: 8.8% Malposition: 21 (2.4%) Required second transcatheter valve implantation: 24 (2.8%) LVOT obstruction: 15 (1.8%) MR ≥ moderate: 3.1% Rate of repeat MVR at 4 years: 16 (1.9%)
Yoon et al (2019)	1 year: 14%	Technical success (MVARC Criteria: exit from the hybrid suite, patient is alive with successful access, delivery, and retrieval of the device delivery system, successful deployment and correct position of the first intended device, and freedom from emergency	Conversion to open surgery: 3 (0.9%) Valve embolization: 3 (0.9%) Cardiac perforation: 4 (1.2%) Need for second valve



		surgery): 73.6% Device success (Reduction of MR to acceptable levels): 84.8%	implantation: 8 (2.5%) LVOT obstruction: 7 (2.2%) Re-intervention: 73 (14%) Stroke: 7 (2.3%) Bleeding (major or extensive): 14 (4.6%) Bleeding (life-threatening or fatal): 7 (2.3) Major vascular complication: 5 (1.6%) Acute kidney injury: 14 (4.6%)
Urena et al (2018)	30 day: 5.9% 1 year: 13.2% 2 years: 29.4%	Technical success: 94.1%	Stroke: 2 (5.9%) Life-threatening or fatal bleeding: 2 (5.9%) Major vascular complications: 2 (5.9%) LVOT obstruction: 2 (5.9%) THV thrombosis: 3 (8.8%)
U.S. Food and Drug Administration (2017)	All-cause mortality: 30 day: 6.8%  Cardiac death: 30 day: 4.3%	NYHA Class Change at 30 days f/u: Improved, %: 85.6% Same: 13.4% Worsened: 1%  Mitral Regurgitation Severity (Moderate-severe to severe, %): Baseline: 48.2% 30 days: 0.6%  Mean change in 6-minute walk test (BL to 30 days): 474.7±442.9  Mean change in KCCQ summary score (BL to 30 days): 36.6	Stroke: 2 (0.7%) Readmission for heart failure: 4 (1.6%) Readmission cardiac: 2 (0.8%) Readmission non-cardiac: 12 (4.6%) Mitral valve intervention: 1 (0.4%) Bleeding at access site: 7 (2.3%) Other bleeding: 17 (5.8%) Atrial septal defect closure: 15 (4.9%) Cardiac arrest: 12 (4%) Unplanned vascular surgery or intervention: 8 (2.6%) Major vascular complication: 2 (0.6%) Device embolization: 1 (0.4%) Device migration: 2 (0.7%)

ASD: atrial septal defect; BL: baseline; CI: confidence interval; HF: heart failure; HR: hazard ratio; KCCQ: Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire; LVOT: Left ventricular outflow tract; MR: Mitral Regurgitation; MVARC: Mitral Valve Academic Research Consortium; NR: Not Reported; NYHA: New York Heart Association; OR: Odds Ratio; THV: transcatheter heart valve.

### Section Summary: Transeptal Mitral Valve-in-Valve Replacement

The evidence for the use of TMViVR in patients who are at a high risk for open surgery includes 8 retrospective cohort or registry studies that compared TMViVR to rSMVR as well as 9 observational studies and 2 meta-analyses. The meta-analyses had mixed early-term findings, with one observing a benefit for in-hospital mortality favoring TMViVR, but at 30 days, 1 year, and 2 year follow-up, no difference between groups was observed in either review. Both analyses found that complications of stroke, renal dysfunction, vascular complications, pacemaker implantation, and bleeding were more common in the rSMVR group. The comparative studies generally found that mortality was equivalent or favored TMViVR through

1-year follow-up; however, several studies observed that at longer durations of follow-up, the trend in mortality was reversed with numerically higher mortality in the TMViVR group. TMViVR was associated with a shorter length of hospital or ICU stay than rSMVR. Several adverse events (acute kidney injury, cardiac arrest, cardiogenic shock, major bleeding, pacemaker implantation, pneumonia, sepsis, stroke, and vascular complications) were more commonly reported in the rSMVR group compared to TMViVR. These results were supported by observational studies which provided data on mortality, functional outcomes and complications through up to 7 years post-implantation. A high level of technical success for TMViVR was also observed in these studies, although the rate of device success, which had multiple definitions across studies, varied. Benefits to NYHA functional class and improvements in Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire outcomes were observed in 3 studies with maximum follow-up of 5 years. Despite the potential early benefits in mortality, duration of hospital stay, functional outcomes, and complications, there is uncertainty due to the lack of direct comparisons, imbalanced patient groups, different valve-in-valve approaches used, and concerns that at longer-term follow-up mortality may favor rSMVR. Given that no RCTs are available, selection bias cannot be ruled out. However, randomizing patients who are at high or prohibitive risk for open surgery to rSMVR is ethically prohibitive so retrospective comparisons will likely continue to represent the best available evidence for this intervention. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

### **Summary of Evidence**

For individuals who have symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation (MR) and are at prohibitive risk for open surgery who receive transcatheter mitral valve repair using MitraClip or PASCAL, the evidence includes a noninferiority randomized controlled trial and single-arm prospective cohort with historical cohort and registry studies. The relevant outcomes are overall survival, morbid events, functional outcomes, and treatment-related morbidity. The primary evidence includes the pivotal EVEREST II HRR and EVEREST II REALISM studies, the Transcatheter Valve Therapy Registry study and the CLASP IID/IIF study. Studies evaluating MitraClip have demonstrated that MitraClip implantation is feasible with a procedural success rate greater than 90%, 30-day mortality ranging from 2.3% to 6.4% (less than predicted Society of Thoracic Surgeons [STS] mortality risk score for MR repair or replacement; range, 9.5%-13.2%), post implantation MR severity grade of 2+ or less in 82% to 93% of patients, and a clinically meaningful gain in quality of life (5- to 6-point gains in 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey scores). At 1 year, freedom from death and MR more than 2+ was achieved in 61% of patients but the 1-year mortality or heart failure hospitalization rates remain considerably high (38%). Conclusions related to the treatment effect on mortality based on historical controls cannot be made because the control groups did not provide unbiased or precise estimates of the natural history of patients eligible to receive MitraClip. Given that primary MR is a mechanical problem and there is no effective medical therapy, a randomized controlled trial (RCT) comparing MitraClip with medical management is not feasible or ethical. The post marketing data from the United States is supportive that MitraClip surgery is being performed with short-term effectiveness and safety in select patient population. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome. The CLASP IID/IIF randomized cohort demonstrated that PASCAL is noninferior to MitraClip in safety and effectiveness for patients with primary MR at prohibitive surgical risk, and the single-arm registry cohort demonstrated that PASCAL is safe and effective in patients with complex mitral valve (MV) anatomy precluding the use of MitraClip.

For individuals who have heart failure and symptomatic secondary MR despite the use of maximally tolerated guideline-directed medical therapy who receive transcatheter mitral valve

repair using MitraClip, the evidence includes a systematic review, 2 RCTs and multiple observational studies. Relevant outcomes are OS, morbid events, functional outcomes, and treatment-related morbidity. The trials had conflicting results, but the larger trial, with a longer duration and patients selected for nonresponse to maximally tolerated therapy, found a significant benefit for MitraClip up to 5 years compared to medical therapy alone, including benefits in overall survival and hospitalization for heart failure. Improvements in MR severity, quality of life measures, and functional capacity persisted to 36 months in patients who received transcatheter mitral valve repair. The systematic review confirmed the benefit of MitraClip found in the larger RCT but had important methodological limitations. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have symptomatic primary or secondary MR and are surgical candidates who receive transcatheter mitral valve repair using MitraClip, the evidence includes 1 RCT and a retrospective comparative observational study in individuals aged  $\geq 75$  years. Relevant outcomes are OS, morbid events, functional outcomes, and treatment-related morbidity. The RCT found that MitraClip did not reduce MR as often or as completely as the surgical control, although it could be safely implanted and was associated with fewer adverse events at one year. Long-term follow-up from the RCT showed that significantly more MitraClip patients required surgery for MV dysfunction than conventional surgery patients. For these reasons, this single trial is not definitive in demonstrating improved clinical outcomes with MitraClip compared with surgery. Additional RCTs are needed to corroborate these results. The observational study in individuals aged  $\geq 75$  years found that although MitraClip was associated with improved 1-year survival and a lower rate of all acute complications compared with surgical repair, it had lower 5-year survival and greater MR recurrence. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have symptomatic primary or secondary MR who receive transcatheter mitral valve repair using devices other than MitraClip or PASCAL, the evidence includes 1 RCT, nonrandomized prospective studies, and noncomparative feasibility studies. Relevant outcomes are OS, morbid events, functional outcomes, and treatment-related morbidity. The randomized, sham-controlled trial for the indirect annuloplasty device Carillon offers promising safety data, however further studies are needed to determine efficacy and long-term outcomes.

For individuals who have valve dysfunction and mitral stenosis or regurgitation after prior bioprosthetic mitral valve replacement, who are at a high or prohibitive risk for redo surgical mitral valve replacement (rSMVR), and who receive a transcatheter mitral valve-in-valve replacement (TMViVR) using an FDA-approved device, the evidence includes 2 meta-analyses, 8 comparative retrospective cohort studies, and 9 observational studies. Relevant outcomes are OS, morbid events, functional outcomes, and treatment-related morbidity. The meta-analyses had mixed early-term findings, with one observing a benefit for in-hospital mortality favoring TMViVR over rSMVR, but at 30 days, 1-year, and 2-year follow-up, no difference between groups in OS was observed in either review. Both analyses found that complications of stroke, renal dysfunction, vascular complications, pacemaker implantation, and bleeding were more common in the rSMVR group. The comparative studies generally found that mortality was equivalent or favored TMViVR through 1-year follow-up; however, several studies that reported longer-term outcomes observed that the trend in mortality was reversed with numerically higher rates in the TMViVR group. TMViVR was associated with a

shorter hospital or ICU stay than rSMVR. Several adverse events (acute kidney injury, cardiac arrest, cardiogenic shock, major bleeding, pacemaker implantation, pneumonia, sepsis, stroke, and vascular complications) were more commonly reported in the rSMVR group compared to TMViVR. These results were supported by observational data, which provided data on mortality, functional outcomes, and complications through up to 7 years post-implantation. The evidence base is limited primarily by the lack of experimental studies but assigning patients who are at high or prohibitive risk for open surgery to rSMVR is ethically prohibitive so retrospective comparisons will likely continue to represent the best available evidence for this intervention. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

---

## Supplemental Information

### CLINICAL INPUT RECEIVED FROM PHYSICIAN SPECIALTY SOCIETIES AND ACADEMIC MEDICAL CENTERS

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

### PRACTICE GUIDELINES AND POSITION STATEMENTS

#### American College of Cardiology and American Heart Association

In 2020, the American College of Cardiology and American Heart Association presented updated expert consensus on the management of mitral regurgitation (MR).(70) The recommendations are as follows: "At present, transcatheter mitral repair using an edge-to-edge clip device can be considered for the treatment of patients with primary MR and severe symptoms who are felt to be poor surgical candidates. Surgical or transcatheter treatment for secondary MR is undertaken only after appropriate medical and device therapies have been instituted and optimized, as judged by the multidisciplinary team with input from a cardiologist with experience managing heart failure and MR."

Also in 2020, the American College of Cardiology and American Heart Association released updated guidelines on the management of valvular heart disease.(5) The guidelines state that transcatheter mitral valve repair is of benefit to patients with severely symptomatic primary mitral regurgitation who are at high or prohibitive risk for surgery, and to a subset of patients with secondary mitral regurgitation who remain severely symptomatic despite guideline-directed management and therapy for heart failure. Individuals who have prosthetic valve stenosis are recommended to be offered revision surgery, but for severely symptomatic patients who are at high risk for surgery, a transcatheter aortic valve-in-valve procedure may be reasonable (B level of evidence, moderate class of recommendation); no recommendation is given regarding mitral valve-in-valve procedures. Relevant recommendations on interventions for primary and secondary MR, and prosthetic valve stenosis are shown in Table 18.

**Table 18. Recommendations on Interventions for Primary and Secondary Mitral Regurgitation**

Recommendation	COR	LOE
<b>Primary MR</b>		
In symptomatic patients with severe primary MR (Stage D), mitral valve intervention is recommended irrespective of LV systolic function	1 (Strong)	B-NR <sup>1</sup>

In asymptomatic patients with severe primary MR and LV systolic dysfunction (LVEF $\leq$ 60%, LVESD $\geq$ 40 mm) (Stage C2), mitral valve surgery is recommended	1 (Strong)	B-NR <sup>1</sup>
In patients with severe primary MR for whom surgery is indicated, mitral valve repair is recommended in preference to mitral valve replacement when the anatomic cause of MR is a degenerative disease, if a successful and durable repair is possible	1 (Strong)	B-NR <sup>1</sup>
In asymptomatic patients with severe primary MR and normal LV systolic function (LVEF $\geq$ 60% and LVESD $\geq$ 40 mm) (Stage C1), mitral valve repair is reasonable when the likelihood of a successful and durable repair without residual MR is $>$ 95% with an expected mortality rate of $<$ 1% when it can be performed at a Primary or Comprehensive Valve Center	2a (Moderate)	B-NR <sup>1</sup>
In asymptomatic patients with severe primary MR and normal LV systolic function (LVEF $>$ 60% and LVESD $<$ 40 mm) (Stage C1) but with a progressive increase in LV size or decrease in EF on $\geq$ 3 serial imaging studies, mitral valve surgery may be considered irrespective of the probability of a successful and durable repair	2b (Weak)	C-LD <sup>2</sup>
In severely symptomatic patients (NYHA class III or IV) with primary severe MR and high or prohibitive surgical risk, TEER is reasonable if mitral valve anatomy is favorable for the repair procedure and patient life expectancy is at least 1 year	2a (Moderate)	B-NR <sup>1</sup>
In symptomatic patients with severe primary MR attributable to rheumatic valve disease, mitral valve repair may be considered at a Comprehensive Valve Center by an experienced team when surgical treatment is indicated, if a durable and successful repair is likely	2b (Weak)	B-NR <sup>1</sup>
In patients with severe primary MR where leaflet pathology is limited to less than one half the posterior leaflet, mitral valve replacement should not be performed unless mitral valve repair has been attempted at a Primary or Comprehensive Valve Center and was unsuccessful	3:Harm (Strong)	B-NR <sup>1</sup>
<b>Secondary MR</b>		
In patients with chronic severe secondary MR related to LV systolic dysfunction (LVEF $<$ 50%) who have persistent symptoms (NYHA class II, III, or IV) while on optimal GDMT for HF (Stage D), TEER is reasonable in patients with appropriate anatomy as defined on TEE and with LVEF between 20% and 50%, LVESD $\leq$ 70 mm, and pulmonary artery systolic pressure $\leq$ 70 mmHg	2a (Moderate)	B-R <sup>3</sup>
In patients with severe secondary MR (Stages C and D), mitral valve surgery is reasonable when CABG is undertaken for the treatment of myocardial ischemia	2a (Moderate)	B-NR <sup>1</sup>
In patients with chronic severe secondary MR from atrial annular dilation with preserved LV systolic function (LVEF $\geq$ 50%) who have severe persistent symptoms (NYHA class III or IV) despite therapy for HF and therapy for associated AF or other comorbidities (Stage D), mitral valve surgery may be considered	2b (Weak)	B-NR <sup>1</sup>
In patients with chronic severe secondary MR related to LV systolic dysfunction (LVEF $<$ 50%) who have persistent severe symptoms (NYHA class III or IV) while on optimal GDMT for HF (Stage D), mitral valve surgery may be considered	2b (Weak)	B-NR <sup>1</sup>
In patients with CAD and chronic severe secondary MR related to LV systolic dysfunction (LVEF $<$ 50%) (Stage D) who are undergoing mitral valve surgery because of severe symptoms (NYHA class III or IV) that persist despite GDMT for HF, chordal-sparing mitral valve replacement may be reasonable to choose over downsized annuloplasty repair	2b (Weak)	B-R <sup>3</sup>
<b>Intervention for Prosthetic Valve Stenosis</b>		
In patients with symptomatic severe stenosis of a bioprosthetic or mechanical prosthetic valve, repeat surgical intervention is indicated unless the surgical risk is high or prohibitive	1 (Strong)	B-NR <sup>1</sup>
For severely symptomatic patients with bioprosthetic aortic valve stenosis and high or prohibitive surgical risk, a transcatheter ViV procedure is reasonable when performed at a comprehensive valve center	2a (Moderate)	B-NR <sup>1</sup>
For patients with significant bioprosthetic valve stenosis attributable to suspected or documented valve thrombosis, oral anticoagulation with a VKA is reasonable	2a (Moderate)	B-NR <sup>1</sup>

Source: Adapted from Otto et al (2020)<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>Moderate, nonrandomized; <sup>2</sup>Limited data; <sup>3</sup>Moderate, randomized. AF: atrial fibrillation; CABG: coronary artery bypass graft; CAD: coronary artery disease; COR: class of recommendation; EF: ejection fraction; GDMT: guideline-directed medical therapy; HF: heart failure; LOE: level of evidence; LV: left ventricular; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction; LVESD: left ventricular end-systolic diameters; MR: mitral regurgitation; MV: mitral valve; NYHA: New York Heart Association; TEE: transesophageal echocardiogram; TEER: transcatheter edge-to-edge repair. ViV: valve-in-valve; VKA, vitamin K antagonist.

**American College of Cardiology, American Association for Thoracic Surgery, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, and Society of Thoracic Surgeons**  
The American College of Cardiology, American Association for Thoracic Surgery, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, and the Society of Thoracic Surgeons (2014) released a position statement on transcatheter therapies for MR.(93) This statement outlined critical components for successful transcatheter MR therapies and recommended ongoing research and inclusion of all patients treated with transcatheter MR therapies in a disease registry.

### **The European Society of Cardiology and the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery**

The European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS) issued guidelines on the management of valvular heart disease in 2022.(8) A new position on the management of prosthetic valve dysfunction was issued, stating, "Transcatheter valve-in-valve implantation in the mitral and tricuspid position may be considered in selected patients at high risk for surgical intervention." This recommendation was given a class IIb recommendation, indicating that there is conflicting evidence about the usefulness or efficacy of this treatment, with the opinion being supported by less well-established evidence.

### **National Institute for Health and Care Excellence**

The NICE guideline on heart valve disease management (2021) makes the following recommendations related to TMVR:(94)

- "1.5.10 - Consider transcatheter edge-to-edge repair, if suitable, for adults with severe primary mitral regurgitation and symptoms, if surgery is unsuitable.
- 1.5.14 - Consider transcatheter mitral edge-to-edge repair for adults with heart failure and severe secondary mitral regurgitation, if surgery is unsuitable and they remain symptomatic on medical management."

Another NICE guideline was issued in 2021 on the use of transapical transcatheter mitral valve-in-valve implantation for a failed surgically implanted mitral valve bioprosthesis:(95)

- "1.1 - Evidence on the safety of transapical transcatheter mitral valve-in-valve implantation for a failed surgically implanted mitral valve bioprosthesis is adequate and shows some serious but well-recognised complications. Evidence on its efficacy is limited in quality. So, this procedure should only be used with special arrangements for clinical governance, consent, and audit or research."
- "1.4 - Patient selection should be done by a multidisciplinary team which must include interventional cardiologists experienced in the procedure, cardiac surgeons, an expert in cardiac imaging, and where appropriate, a cardiac anaesthetist and a specialist in medicine for older people. The multidisciplinary team should determine the risk level for each patient and the device most suitable for them."
- "1.6 - The procedure is technically challenging and should only be done in specialised centres, and only by clinical teams with special training and experience in complex endovascular cardiac interventions, including regular experience in transcatheter valve implantation procedures. Centres doing these procedures should have cardiac surgical support for emergency treatment of complications and subsequent patient care."
- "1.7 - NICE encourages further research into transapical transcatheter mitral valve-in-valve implantation for a failed surgically implanted mitral valve bioprosthesis. Studies should include details on patient selection, type and size of valve used, functional outcomes (New

York Heart Association functional class, mitral valve regurgitation), quality of life, patient-reported outcome measures, survival and complications. Studies should report long-term follow up of clinical outcomes and valve durability. NICE may update this guidance on publication of further evidence."

## U.S. PREVENTIVE SERVICES TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Not applicable.

## ONGOING AND UNPUBLISHED CLINICAL TRIALS

Some currently unpublished trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 15.

**Table 19. Summary of Key Trials**

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
<b>Ongoing</b>			
NCT02444338	A RandomizEd Study of tHe MitrACliP DEvice in Heart Failure Patients With Clinically Significant Functional Mitral Regurgitation (RESHAPE-HF)	650	June 2024
NCT04009434	Treatment of Concomitant Mitral Regurgitation by Mitral Valve Clipping in Patients With Successful Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation	1162	Aug 2023
NCT01626079 <sup>a</sup>	Cardiovascular Outcomes Assessment of the MitraClip Percutaneous Therapy for Heart Failure Patients With Functional Mitral Regurgitation (The COAPT Trial) and COAPT CAS (COAPT)	614 in COAPT and 162 in COAPT CAS	July 2024 (5-year follow-up per protocol) <sup>b</sup>
NCT04198870 <sup>a</sup>	Percutaneous MitraClip Device or Surgical Mitral Valve REpair in PATients With PrlmaRy Mltral Regurgitation Who Are Candidates for Surgery (REPAIR MR)	500	Feb 2032
NCT05090540	Transcatheter Edge to Edge Mitral Valve Repair Versus Standard Surgical Mitral Valve Operation for Secondary Mitral Regurgitation	600	Dec 2023
NCT05051033	Percutaneous or Surgical Repair In Mitral Prolapse And Regurgitation for >65 Year-Olds (PRIMARY)	450	Jan 2032
NCT05021614 <sup>a</sup>	Evaluation of the Efficacy and Safety of the Transcatheter Mitral Valve Repair System in Patients With Moderate and Above Degenerative Mitral Regurgitation at High Surgical Risk	150	Sep 2027
NCT04734756 <sup>a</sup>	A Prospective, Multicenter, Objective Performance Criteria Study to Evaluate the Safety and Effectiveness of Dragonfly Transcatheter Mitral Valve Repair System for the Treatment of Degenerative Mitral Regurgitation (DMR) Subjects	120	May 2027
NCT04733404 <sup>a</sup>	A Prospective, Multicenter, Objective Performance Criteria Study to Evaluate the Safety and Effectiveness of Dragonfly Transcatheter Mitral Valve Repair System for the Treatment of Functional Mitral Regurgitation (FMR) Subjects	120	Sep 2027
NCT04430075 <sup>a</sup>	Transcatheter Repair of Mitral Regurgitation With Edwards PASCAL Transcatheter Valve Repair System: A European Prospective, Multicenter Post Market Clinical Follow-Up (PMFC)	500	Jun 2028
NCT03706833 <sup>a</sup>	Edwards PASCAL TrAnScatheter Valve RePair System Pivotal Clinical Trial (CLASP IID/IIF): A Prospective, Multicenter, Randomized, Controlled Pivotal Trial to Evaluate the Safety and Effectiveness of Transcatheter Mitral Valve Repair With the Edwards PASCAL	1275	Jan 2028



NCT05332782	Transcatheter Valve Repair System Compared to Abbott MitraClip in Patients With Mitral Regurgitation Outcomes of Patients tReated with Mitral Transcatheter Edge-to-edge Repair for Primary Mitral Regurgitation Registry (PRIME-MR)	2000	Jan 2026
NCT05496998 <sup>a</sup>	Transcatheter Mitral Valve Replacement With the Medtronic Intrepid™ TMVR Transfemoral System in Patients With Severe Symptomatic Mitral Regurgitation - APOLLO-EU Trial	360	Nov 2026
NCT05417945 <sup>a</sup>	A Prospective, Multicenter Study to Evaluate the JensClip Transcatheter Valve Repair System	124	Dec 2024
NCT05455489	GISE Registry of Transcatheter Treatment of Mitral Valve Regurgitation With the MitraClip G4	264	Aug 2029
NCT03271762	Multicentre and Randomized Study of MITRACLIP® Transcatheter Mitral Valve Repair in Patients With Severe Primary Mitral Regurgitation Eligible for High-risk Surgery	330	May 2027
NCT04402931	Randomized Trial of Transcatheter Valve-in-Valve Intervention vs Redo Surgery for the Treatment of Structural Mitral Bioprosthetic Dysfunction	150	Dec 2031
NCT03193801	PARTNER 3 Trial - SAPIEN 3 Transcatheter Heart Valve Implantation in Patients With a Failing Mitral Bioprosthetic Valve	53	Aug 2031

NCT: national clinical trial.

<sup>a</sup>Denotes industry-sponsored or cosponsored trial.

<sup>b</sup>Primary results have been published, long-term follow-up ongoing

## Government Regulations

### National Coverage Determination:

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (2021) issued a National Coverage Determination for the use of transcatheter edge-to-edge repair (TEER) for mitral valve regurgitation; 100-3 Version 1 (20.33).(66) Effective date: 1/19/21; Implementation date: 10/08/21

#### A. General

Transcatheter Edge-to-Edge Repair (TEER) of the mitral valve is used in the treatment of mitral regurgitation. TEER approximates the anterior and posterior mitral valve leaflets by grasping them with a clipping device in an approach similar to a treatment developed in cardiac surgery called the Alfieri stitch.

### Indications and Limitations of Coverage

#### B. Nationally Covered Indications

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) covers *TEER of the mitral valve* under Coverage with Evidence Development (CED) with the following conditions:

- A. For the treatment of symptomatic moderate-to-severe or severe functional mitral regurgitation (MR) when the patient remains symptomatic despite stable doses of maximally tolerated guideline-directed medical therapy (GDMT) plus cardiac resynchronization therapy, if appropriate, or for the treatment of significant symptomatic degenerative MR when furnished according to a Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved indication and when ALL of the following conditions are met:
  1. The procedure is furnished with a mitral valve TEER system that has received FDA premarket approval (PMA).



2. The patient (preoperatively and postoperatively) is under the care of a heart team: a cohesive, multidisciplinary, team of medical professionals. The heart team concept embodies collaboration and dedication across medical specialties to offer optimal patient-centered care... *(See NCD for more information)*
3. Each patient's suitability for surgical mitral valve repair, TEER, or palliative therapy must be evaluated, documented, and made available to other heart team members. Additionally, for patients with functional MR, the heart team heart failure cardiologist must document that the patient has persistent symptoms despite maximally tolerated GDMT and cardiac resynchronization therapy, if appropriate... *(See NCD for more information)*
4. An interventional cardiologist or cardiac surgeon from the heart team must perform the mitral valve TEER and an interventional echocardiographer from the heart team must perform transesophageal echocardiography during the procedure. The interventional echocardiographer may not also furnish anesthesiology during the same procedure. The interventional cardiologist and cardiac surgeon may jointly participate in the intra-operative technical aspects of TEER as appropriate. All physicians who participate in the procedure must have device-specific training as required by the manufacturer.
5. Mitral valve TEERs must be furnished in a hospital with appropriate infrastructure and experience... *(See NCD for more information)*
6. The heart team and hospital are participating in a prospective, national, audited registry that: 1) comprehensively enrolls TEER patients; 2) accepts all manufactured devices; 3) follows the patient for at least one year; and 4) complies with relevant regulations relating to protecting human research subjects, including 45 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 46 and 21 CFR Parts 50 & 56.

The following outcomes must be tracked by the registry, and the registry must be designed to permit identification and analysis of patient, practitioner, and facility level variables that predict each of these outcomes:

- a. Stroke;
- b. All-cause mortality;
- c. Repeat *TEER* or other mitral procedures;
- d. Transient Ischemic *Attacks* (TIAs);
- e. Major vascular events;
- f. Renal complications;
- g. Functional capacity; *and*
- h. Quality of Life (QoL).

(See determination for further information regarding hospital, institutional and operator requirements)

Mitral valve TEERs are covered for uses that are not expressly listed as an FDA-approved indication when performed within a clinical study that fulfills specific criteria. (See determination for more information).

### **Local Coverage Determination:**

There is no local coverage determination for transcatheter mitral valve repair.

*(The above Medicare information is current as of the review date for this policy. However, the coverage issues and policies maintained by the Centers for Medicare & Medicare Services [CMS, formerly HCFA] are updated*

## Related Policies

Closure Devices for Patent Foramen Ovale and Atrial Septal Defects  
Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation for Aortic Stenosis

---

## References

1. Chiam PT, Ruiz CE. Percutaneous transcatheter mitral valve repair: a classification of the technology. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2011; 4(1):1-13.
2. Fedak PWM, McCarthy PM, Bonow RO. Evolving Concepts and Technologies in Mitral Valve Repair. *Circulation* 2008; 117(7):963-74.
3. Carabello BA. The current therapy for mitral regurgitation. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2008; 52(5):319-26.
4. Bonow RO, Carabello BA, Chatterjee K et al. 2008 focused update incorporated into the ACC/AHA 2006 guidelines for the management of patients with valvular heart disease: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Writing Committee to revise the 1998 guidelines for the management of patients with valvular heart disease). Endorsed by the Society of Cardiovascular Anesthesiologists, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, and Society of Thoracic Surgeons. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2008; 52(13):e1-142.
5. Otto CM, Nishimura RA, Bonow RO, et al. 2020 ACC/AHA Guideline for the Management of Patients With Valvular Heart Disease: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Joint Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation*. Feb 02 2021; 143(5): e72-e227. PMID 33332150
6. Goel SS, Bajaj N, Aggarwal B et al. Prevalence and Outcomes of Unoperated Patients with Severe Symptomatic Mitral Regurgitation and Heart Failure: Comprehensive Analysis to Determine Potential Role of MitraClip for this Unmet Need. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2013.
7. Nishimura RA, Otto CM, Bonow RO, et al. 2017 AHA/ACC Focused Update of the 2014 AHA/ACC Guideline for the Management of Patients With Valvular Heart Disease: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jul 11 2017;70(2):252-289. PMID 28315732
8. Vahanian A, Alfieri O, Andreotti F, et al. Guidelines on the management of valvular heart disease (version 2012). *Eur Heart J*. Oct 2012; 33(19): 2451-96. PMID 22922415
9. Diodato MD, Moon MR, Pasque MK, et al. Repair of ischemic mitral regurgitation does not increase mortality or improve long-term survival in patients undergoing coronary artery revascularization: a propensity analysis. *Ann Thorac Surg*. Sep 2004;78(3):794-799; discussion 794-799. PMID 15336993
10. Wong DR, Agnihotri AK, Hung JW, et al. Long-term survival after surgical revascularization for moderate ischemic mitral regurgitation. *Ann Thorac Surg*. Aug 2005;80(2):570-577. PMID 16039207
11. Mihaljevic T, Lam BK, Rajeswaran J, et al. Impact of mitral valve annuloplasty combined with revascularization in patients with functional ischemic mitral regurgitation. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jun 5 2007;49(22):2191-2201. PMID 17543639

12. Smith PK, Puskas JD, Ascheim DD, et al. Surgical treatment of moderate ischemic mitral regurgitation. *N Engl J Med*. Dec 4 2014;371(23):2178-2188. PMID 25405390
13. Young A, Feldman T. Percutaneous mitral valve repair. *Curr Cardiol Rep* 2014; 16(1):443.
14. Minha S, Torguson R, Waksman R. Overview of the 2013 Food and Drug Administration Circulatory System Devices Panel meeting on the MitraClip Delivery System. *Circulation* 2013; 128(8):864-8.
15. Noack T, Kiefer P, Besler C, et al. Transcatheter mitral valve repair: review of current techniques. *Indian J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. Jan 2020; 36(Suppl1): 53-63. PMID 33061185
16. Corpataux N, Winkel MG, Kassab M, et al. The PASCAL Device-Early Experience with a Leaflet Approximation Device: What Are the Benefits/Limitations Compared with the MitraClip?. *Curr Cardiol Rep*. Jun 27 2020; 22(8): 74. PMID 32594261
17. Siminiak T, Wu JC, Haude M et al. Treatment of functional mitral regurgitation by percutaneous annuloplasty: results of the TITAN Trial. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2012; 14(8):931-8.
18. Harnek J, Webb JG, Kuck KH et al. Transcatheter implantation of the MONARC coronary sinus device for mitral regurgitation: 1-year results from the EVOLUTION phase I study (Clinical Evaluation of the Edwards Lifesciences Percutaneous Mitral Annuloplasty System for the Treatment of Mitral Regurgitation). *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2011; 4(1):115-22.
19. Food and Drug Administration. Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data (SSED): Mitral Valve Repair Device. 2013;  
[https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/pdf10/P100009b.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf10/P100009b.pdf). Accessed March 15, 2024.
20. Food and Drug Administration. Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data (SSED): Mitral Valve Repair Device. 2022;  
[https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/pdf22/P220003B.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf22/P220003B.pdf). Accessed March 14, 2024.
21. Lim DS, Smith RL, Gillam LD, et al. Randomized Comparison of Transcatheter Edge-to-Edge Repair for Degenerative Mitral Regurgitation in Prohibitive Surgical Risk Patients. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. Dec 26 2022; 15(24): 2523-2536. PMID 36121247
22. ClinicalTrials.gov. Edwards PASCAL CLASP IID/IIF Pivotal Clinical Trial (CLASP IID/IIF) (NCT03706833). 2023; <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03706833>. Accessed March 15, 2024.
23. Zahr F, Smith RL, Gillam LD, et al. One-Year Outcomes From the CLASP IID Randomized Trial for Degenerative Mitral Regurgitation. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. Oct 26 2023. PMID 37962288
24. Reichenspurner H, Schillinger W, Baldus S et al. Clinical outcomes through 12 months in patients with degenerative mitral regurgitation treated with the MitraClip(R) device in the ACCESS-Europe Phase I trial. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2013; 44(4):e280-8.
25. Lim S, Kar S, Fail P, et al. The EVEREST II high surgical risk cohort: effectiveness of transcatheter reduction of significant mitral regurgitation in high surgical risk patients. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2013;61(10 Suppl):E1958. PMID
26. Lim DS, Reynolds MR, Feldman T, et al. Improved functional status and quality of life in prohibitive surgical risk patients with degenerative mitral regurgitation after transcatheter mitral valve repair. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jul 15 2014;64(2):182-192. PMID 24184254
27. Ware J, Kosinski M, Bjorner JB, et al. *User's Manual for the SF-36v2 Health Survey (2nd Ed)*. Lincoln, RI: Quality Metric; 2007.
28. Sorajja P, Mack M, Vemulapalli S, et al. Initial experience with commercial transcatheter mitral valve repair in the United States. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Mar 15 2016;67(10):1129-1140. PMID 26965532

29. Sorajja P, Vemulapalli S, Feldman T, et al. Outcomes With transcatheter mitral valve repair in the United States: An STS/ACC TVT Registry Report. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Nov 7 2017;70(19):2315-2327. PMID 29096801
30. Glower DD, Kar S, Trento A, et al. Percutaneous mitral valve repair for mitral regurgitation in high-risk patients: results of the EVEREST II study. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jul 15 2014;64(2):172-181. PMID 25011722
31. Gerçek M, Roder F, Rudolph TK, et al. PASCAL mitral valve repair system versus MitraClip: comparison of transcatheter edge-to-edge strategies in complex primary mitral regurgitation. *Clin Res Cardiol*. Dec 2021; 110(12): 1890-1899. PMID 33837469
32. Hausleiter J, Lim DS, Gillam LD, et al. Transcatheter Edge-to-Edge Repair in Patients With Anatomically Complex Degenerative Mitral Regurgitation. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Feb 07 2023; 81(5): 431-442. PMID 36725171
33. Feldman T, Kar S, Rinaldi M, et al. Percutaneous mitral repair with the MitraClip system: safety and midterm durability in the initial EVEREST (Endovascular Valve Edge-to-Edge REpair Study) cohort. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Aug 18 2009;54(8):686-694. PMID 19679246
34. Chan PH, She HL, Alegria-Barrero E, et al. Real-world experience of MitraClip for treatment of severe mitral regurgitation. *Circ J*. Jul 2012;76(10):2488-2493. PMID 22785461
35. Whitlow PL, Feldman T, Pedersen WR, et al. Acute and 12-month results with catheter-based mitral valve leaflet repair: the EVEREST II (Endovascular Valve Edge-to-Edge Repair) High Risk Study. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jan 10 2012;59(2):130-139. PMID 22222076
36. Wan B, Rahnavardi M, Tian DH, et al. A meta-analysis of MitraClip system versus surgery for treatment of severe mitral regurgitation. *Ann Cardiothorac Surg*. Nov 2013;2(6):683-692. PMID 24349969
37. Bail DH, Doeblner K. The MitraClip System: a systematic review of indications, procedural requirements, and guidelines. *Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. Feb 2014;62(1):18-25. PMID 24297637
38. Estévez-Loureiro R, Franzen O, Winter R et al. Echocardiographic and Clinical Outcomes of Central Versus Noncentral Percutaneous Edge-to-Edge Repair of Degenerative Mitral Regurgitation. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2013; 62(25):2370-7.
39. Grasso C, Ohno Y, Attizzani GF, et al. Percutaneous mitral valve repair with the MitraClip system for severe mitral regurgitation in patients with surgical mitral valve repair failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Mar 4 2014;63(8):836-838.
40. Munkholm-Larsen S, Wan B, Tian DH et al. A systematic review on the safety and efficacy of percutaneous edge-to-edge mitral valve repair with the MitraClip system for high surgical risk candidates. *Heart* 2013.
41. Swaans MJ, Bakker AL, Alipour A, et al. Survival of transcatheter mitral valve repair compared with surgical and conservative treatment in high-surgical-risk patients. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. Aug 2014;7(8):875-881. PMID 25147032
42. Philip F, Athappan G, Tuzcu EM, et al. MitraClip for severe symptomatic mitral regurgitation in patients at high surgical risk: a comprehensive systematic review. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. Oct 1 2014;84(4):581-590. PMID 24905665
43. Vakil K, Roukoz H, Sarraf M, et al. Safety and efficacy of the MitraClip(R) system for severe mitral regurgitation: a systematic review. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. Jul 1 2014;84(1):129-136. PMID 24323764
44. Bail DH. (Meta)-analysis of safety and efficacy following edge-to-edge mitral valve repair using the MitraClip system. *J Interv Cardiol*. Feb 2015;28(1):69-75. PMID 25689550
45. Velazquez EJ, Samad Z, Al-Khalidi HR, et al. The MitraClip and survival in patients with mitral regurgitation at high risk for surgery: A propensity-matched comparison. *Am Heart J*. Nov 2015;170(5):1050-1059 e1053. PMID 26542516

46. Hayashida K, Yasuda S, Matsumoto T, et al. AVJ-514 Trial- baseline characteristics and 30-day outcomes following MitraClip((R)) Treatment in a Japanese cohort. *Circ J*. Jul 25 2017;81(8):1116-1122. PMID 28321004
47. Srinivasan A, Brown J, Ahmed H, et al. PASCAL repair system for patients with mitral regurgitation: A systematic review. *Int J Cardiol*. Apr 01 2023;376: 108-114. PMID 36681242
48. Kumar A, Al-Khafaji J, Shariff M, et al. Percutaneous mitral valve repair for secondary mitral valve regurgitation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Intern Med*. Feb 21 2020. PMID 32094019
49. Szerlip M, Spargias KS, Makkar R, et al. 2-Year Outcomes for Transcatheter Repair in Patients With Mitral Regurgitation From the CLASP Study. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. Jul 26 2021; 14(14): 1538-1548. PMID 34020928
50. Stone GW, Lindenfeld J, Abraham WT, et al. Transcatheter Mitral-Valve Repair in Patients with Heart Failure. *N Engl J Med*. Dec 13 2018; 379(24): 2307-2318. PMID 30280640
51. Mack MJ, Lindenfeld J, Abraham WT, et al. 3-Year Outcomes of Transcatheter Mitral Valve Repair in Patients With Heart Failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Mar 02 2021; 77(8): 1029-1040. PMID 33632476
52. Obadia, JJ, Messika-Zeitoun, DD, Leurent, GG, et al. Percutaneous Repair or Medical Treatment for Secondary Mitral Regurgitation. *N. Engl. J. Med.*, 2018 Aug 28;379(24). PMID 30145927.
53. lung B, Armoiry X, Vahanian A, et al. Percutaneous repair or medical treatment for secondary mitral regurgitation: outcomes at 2 years. *Eur J Heart Fail*. Dec 2019; 21(12): 1619-1627. PMID 31476260
54. Stone GW, Abraham WT, Lindenfeld J, et al. Five-Year Follow-up after Transcatheter Repair of Secondary Mitral Regurgitation. *N Engl J Med*. Mar05 2023. PMID 36876756
55. Atianzar, KK, Zhang, MM, Newhart, ZZ, Gafoor, SS. Why Did COAPT Win While MITRA-FR Failed? Defining the Appropriate Patient Population for MitraClip. *Interv Cardiol*, 2019 Mar 13;14(1). PMID 30858892.
56. Nishimura, RR, Bonow, RR. Percutaneous Repair of Secondary Mitral Regurgitation - A Tale of Two Trials. *N. Engl. J. Med.*, 2018 Dec 24;379(24). PMID 30575469.
57. Yancy, CC, Jessup, MM, Bozkurt, BB, Butler, JJ, et al. 2017 ACC/AHA/HFSA Focused Update of the 2013 ACCF/AHA Guideline for the Management of Heart Failure: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Failure Society of America. *J. Card. Fail.*, 2017 May 4;23(8). PMID 28461259.
58. Baumgartner H, Falk V, Bax JJ, et al. 2017 ESC/EACTS Guidelines for the management of valvular heart disease. *Eur Heart J*. Sep 21 2017;38(36):2739-2791. PMID 28886619
59. Orban M, Rottbauer W, Williams M, et al. Transcatheter edge-to-edge repair for secondary mitral regurgitation with third-generation devices in heart failure patients - results from the Global EXPAND Post-Market study. *Eur J Heart Fail*. Mar 2023; 25(3): 411-421. PMID 36597850
60. Takagi H, Ando T, Umemoto T. A review of comparative studies of MitraClip versus surgical repair for mitral regurgitation. *Int J Cardiol*. Feb 01 2017;228:289-294. PMID 27865200
61. Feldman T, Foster E, Glower DD, et al. Percutaneous repair or surgery for mitral regurgitation. *N Engl J Med*. Apr 14 2011;364(15):1395-1406. PMID 21463154
62. Mauri L, Garg P, Massaro JM, et al. The EVEREST II Trial: design and rationale for a randomized study of the evalve mitraclip system compared with mitral valve surgery for mitral regurgitation. *Am Heart J*. Jul 2010;160(1):23-29. PMID 20598968

63. Mauri L, Foster E, Glower DD, et al. 4-year results of a randomized controlled trial of percutaneous repair versus surgery for mitral regurgitation. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Jul 23 2013;62(4):317-328. PMID 23665364
64. Feldman T, Kar S, Elmariah S, et al. Randomized comparison of percutaneous repair and surgery for mitral regurgitation: 5-year results of EVEREST II. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Dec 29 2015;66(25):2844-2854. PMID 26718672
65. McCarthy PM, Whisenant B, Asgar AW, et al. Percutaneous MitraClip Device or Surgical Mitral Valve Repair in Patients With Primary Mitral Regurgitation Who Are Candidates for Surgery: Design and Rationale of the REPAIR MR Trial. *J Am Heart Assoc.* Feb 21 2023; 12(4): e027504. PMID 36752231
66. Buzzatti N, Van Hemelrijck M, Denti P, et al. Transcatheter or surgical repair for degenerative mitral regurgitation in elderly patients: A propensity-weighted analysis. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* Jul 2019; 158(1): 86-94.e1. PMID 30797588
67. Witte KK, Lipiecki J, Siminiak T, et al. The REDUCE FMR Trial: A Randomized Sham-Controlled Study of Percutaneous Mitral Annuloplasty in Functional Mitral Regurgitation. *JACC Heart Fail.* Nov 2019; 7(11): 945-955. PMID 31521683
68. Khan MS, Siddiqi TJ, Butler J, et al. Functional outcomes with Carillon device over 1 year in patients with functional mitral regurgitation of Grades 2+ to 4+: results from the REDUCE-FMR trial. *ESC Heart Fail.* Apr 2021; 8(2): 872-878. PMID 33619896
69. Schofer J, Siminiak T, Haude M, et al. Percutaneous mitral annuloplasty for functional mitral regurgitation: results of the CARILLON Mitral Annuloplasty Device European Union Study. *Circulation.* Jul 28 2009;120(4):326-333. PMID 19597051
70. Yildiz M, Haude M, Sievert H, et al. The CINCH-FMR post market registry: Real-world long-term outcomes with percutaneous mitral valve repair with the Carillon Mitral Contour System®. *Cardiovasc Revasc Med.* Mar 2024; 60: 35-40. PMID 37838620
71. Hell MM, Wild MG, Baldus S, et al. Transapical Mitral Valve Replacement: 1-Year Results of the Real-World Tendyne European Experience Registry. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* Mar 11 2024; 17(5): 648-661. PMID 38385922
72. Zhou J, Li Y, Chen Z, et al. Transcatheter mitral valve replacement versus redo surgery for mitral prosthesis failure: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* 2022; 9: 1058576. PMID 36741847
73. Ismayl M, Abbasi MA, Mostafa MR, et al. Meta-Analysis Comparing Valve-in-Valve Transcatheter Mitral Valve Replacement Versus Redo Surgical Mitral Valve Replacement in Degenerated Bioprosthetic Mitral Valve. *Am J Cardiol.* Feb 15 2023; 189: 98-107. PMID 36521415
74. Szlapka M, Hausmann H, Timm J, et al. Transcatheter mitral valve implantation versus conventional redo surgery for degenerated mitral valve prostheses and rings in a multicenter registry. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* Mar 2024; 167(3): 957-964. PMID 36088142
75. Simard T, Lloyd J, Crestanello J, et al. Five-year outcomes of transcatheter mitral valve implantation and redo surgery for mitral prosthesis degeneration. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* Apr 2022; 99(5): 1659-1665. PMID 35019211
76. Gill J, Zahra F, Retzer E. In-Hospital Outcomes and Predictors of Mortality for Redo Surgical Mitral Valve Replacement Versus Transcatheter Mitral Valve-in-Valve Replacement. *Am J Cardiol.* Aug 01 2022; 176: 89-95. PMID 35644696
77. Murzi M, Cerillo AG, Gasbarri T, et al. Antegrade and retrograde perfusion in minimally invasive mitral valve surgery with transthoracic aortic clamping: a single-institution experience with 1632 patients over 12 years. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg.* Mar 01 2017; 24(3): 363-368. PMID 28040754



78. Kamioka N, Babaliaros V, Morse MA, et al. Comparison of Clinical and Echocardiographic Outcomes After Surgical Redo Mitral Valve Replacement and Transcatheter Mitral Valve-in-Valve Therapy. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* Jun 25 2018; 11(12): 1131-1138. PMID 29929633
79. Zubarevich A, Szczechowicz M, Arjomandi Rad A, et al. Mitral surgical redo versus transapical transcatheter mitral valve implantation. *PLoS One.* 2021; 16(8): e0256569. PMID 34432834
80. Zahid S, Ullah W, Hashem AM, et al. Transcatheter valve-in-valve implantation versus redo surgical mitral valve replacement in patients with failed mitral bioprostheses. *Euro Intervention.* Nov 18 2022; 18(10): 824-835. PMID 36106346
81. Akodad M, Trpkov C, Cheung A, et al. Valve-in-Valve Transcatheter Mitral Valve Replacement: A Large First-in-Human 13-Year Experience. *Can J Cardiol.* Dec 2023; 39(12): 1959-1970. PMID 37625668
82. Wilbring M, Petrov A, Arzt S, et al. Long-Term Outcomes after Transcatheter Mitral Valve-in-Valve or Valve-in-Ring Procedures. *J Pers Med.* May 08 2023; 13(5). PMID 37240973
83. Schamroth Pravda N, Mishaev R, Levi A, et al. Five-Year Outcomes of Patients With Mitral Structural Valve Deterioration Treated With Transcatheter Valve in Valve Implantation - A Single Center Prospective Registry. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* 2022; 9: 883242. PMID 35557522
84. Guerrero ME, Eleid MF, Wang DD, et al. 5-Year Prospective Evaluation of Mitral Valve-in-Valve, Valve-in-Ring, and Valve-in-MAC Outcomes: MITRAL Trial Final Results. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* Sep 25 2023; 16(18): 2211-2227. PMID 37758379
85. Whisenant B, Kapadia SR, Eleid MF, et al. One-Year Outcomes of Mitral Valve-in-Valve Using the SAPIEN 3 Transcatheter Heart Valve. *JAMA Cardiol.* Nov 01 2020; 5(11): 1245-1252. PMID 32745164
86. Simonato M, Whisenant B, Ribeiro HB, et al. Transcatheter Mitral Valve Replacement After Surgical Repair or Replacement: Comprehensive Midterm Evaluation of Valve-in-Valve and Valve-in-Ring Implantation From the VIVID Registry. *Circulation.* Jan 12 2021; 143(2): 104-116. PMID 32975133
87. Yoon SH, Whisenant BK, Bleiziffer S, et al. Outcomes of transcatheter mitral valve replacement for degenerated bioprostheses, failed annuloplasty rings, and mitral annular calcification. *Eur Heart J.* Feb 01 2019; 40(5): 441-451. PMID 30357365
88. Urena M, Brochet E, Lecomte M, et al. Clinical and haemodynamic outcomes of balloon-expandable transcatheter mitral valve implantation: a 7-year experience. *Eur Heart J.* Jul 21 2018; 39(28): 2679-2689. PMID 29788044
89. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Edwards Sapien 3 Transcatheter Heart Valve, Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data (SSED). 1997; [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/pdf14/P140031S028B.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf14/P140031S028B.pdf). Accessed March 18, 2024.
90. Eleid MF, Wang DD, Pursnani A, et al. 2-Year Outcomes of Transcatheter Mitral Valve Replacement in Patients With Annular Calcification, Rings, and Bioprostheses. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* Dec 06 2022; 80(23): 2171-2183. PMID 36456047
91. Guerrero M, Pursnani A, Narang A, et al. Prospective Evaluation of Transseptal TMVR for Failed Surgical Bioprostheses: MITRAL Trial Valve-in-Valve Arm 1-Year Outcomes. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* Apr 26 2021; 14(8): 859-872. PMID 33888231
92. Bonow RO, O'Gara PT, Adams DH, et al. 2020 Focused Update of the 2017 ACC Expert Consensus Decision Pathway on the Management of Mitral Regurgitation: A Report of the American College of Cardiology Solution Set Oversight Committee. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* May 05 2020; 75(17): 2236-2270. PMID 32068084

93. O'Gara PT, Calhoun JH, Moon MR, et al. Transcatheter therapies for mitral regurgitation: a professional society overview from the American College of Cardiology, The American Association for Thoracic Surgery, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions Foundation, and The Society of Thoracic Surgeons. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* Mar 2014;147(3):837-849. PMID 24529172
94. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Heart valve disease presenting in adults: investigation and management [NG208]. 2021; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng208/chapter/Recommendations>. Accessed March 15, 2024.
95. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Transapical transcatheter mitral valve-in-valve implantation for a failed surgically implanted mitral valve bioprosthesis [IPG706]. 2021; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg706>. Accessed March 17, 2024.
96. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Transcatheter Mitral Valve Repair (20.33). <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/view/ncd.aspx?ncdid=363&ncdver=2&CoverageSelection=National&Keyword=mitral&KeywordLookUp=Title&KeywordSearchType=And&bc=gAAAAABAAAAAAAAA%3d%3d&=&>. Accessed March 15, 2024.

*The articles reviewed in this research include those obtained in an Internet based literature search for relevant medical references through November 20, 2024, the date the research was completed.*



### Joint BCBSM/BCN Medical Policy History

Policy Effective Date	BCBSM Signature Date	BCN Signature Date	Comments
3/1/11	1/25/11	1/4/11	Joint policy established
7/1/12	4/10/12	5/18/12	Routine maintenance
5/1/14	2/24/14	3/3/14	Routine maintenance
1/1/15	10/21/14	11/3/14	Routine maintenance; title changed from “Percutaneous Mitral Valve Repair” to current title. Added CMS Decision Memo for Transcatheter Mitral Valve Repair dated 8/7/14.
7/1/15	4/21/15	5/11/15	Policy position changed from E/I to “established” for transcatheter mitral valve repair ; new codes for 2015, 33418 and 33419, replace 0343T and 0344T, respectively; CMS information updated to reflect NCD
7/1/16	4/19/16	4/19/16	Routine maintenance
11/1/16	8/16/16	8/16/16	Routine maintenance
11/1/17	8/15/17	8/15/17	Routine maintenance
11/1/18	9/7/18	8/21/18	Permavalve and 0483T and 0484T added as EI (replacement) per code update
11/1/19	9/9/19		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Routine maintenance</li> <li>• 0543T and 0544T added per code update</li> <li>• Added inclusion regarding secondary MVR per FDA update for MitraClip use.</li> </ul>
3/1/20	12/17/19		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Routine maintenance</li> </ul>
5/1/21	2/16/21		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Routine maintenance</li> </ul>
5/1/22	3/11/22		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Routine maintenance</li> <li>• Updated NCD</li> <li>• Title Changed from: Transcatheter Mitral Valve Repair</li> <li>• FDA approved products are covered</li> </ul>

5/1/23	2/21/23		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Routine maintenance (slp)</li> <li>• Vendor Managed: N/A</li> </ul>
5/1/24	2/20/24		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Routine maintenance (slp)</li> <li>• Vendor managed: N/A</li> </ul>
5/1/25	2/18/25		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Routine maintenance (slp)</li> <li>• Vendor managed: N/A</li> </ul>

Next Review Date: 1<sup>st</sup> Qtr, 2026

**BLUE CARE NETWORK BENEFIT COVERAGE**  
**POLICY: TRANSCATHETER MITRAL VALVE PROCEDURES**

**I. Coverage Determination:**

<b>Commercial HMO (includes Self-Funded groups unless otherwise specified)</b>	Covered, criteria apply
<b>BCNA (Medicare Advantage)</b>	Refer to the Medicare information under the Government Regulations section of this policy.
<b>BCN65 (Medicare Complementary)</b>	Coinurance covered if primary Medicare covers the service.

**II. Administrative Guidelines:**

- The member's contract must be active at the time the service is rendered.
- Coverage is based on each member's certificate and is not guaranteed. Please consult the individual member's certificate for details. Additional information regarding coverage or benefits may also be obtained through customer or provider inquiry services at BCN.
- The service must be authorized by the member's PCP except for Self-Referral Option (SRO) members seeking Tier 2 coverage.
- Services must be performed by a BCN-contracted provider, if available, except for Self-Referral Option (SRO) members seeking Tier 2 coverage.
- Payment is based on BCN payment rules, individual certificate and certificate riders.
- Appropriate copayments will apply. Refer to certificate and applicable riders for detailed information.
- CPT - HCPCS codes are used for descriptive purposes only and are not a guarantee of coverage.