

**American College of Radiology
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®**

Clinical Condition: **Imaging for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement**

Variant 1: **Pre-intervention planning at the aortic valve plane.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
CTA chest with IV contrast	9		⊗⊗⊗
US echocardiography transesophageal	8		○
US echocardiography transthoracic resting	7		○
MRI heart function and morphology without IV contrast	6		○
MRI heart function and morphology without and with IV contrast	6		○
CT chest without IV contrast	5		⊗⊗⊗
Aortography thoracic	3		⊗⊗⊗
<u>Rating Scale:</u> 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Variant 2: **Pre-intervention planning in the supraaortic and iliofemoral system.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
CTA abdomen and pelvis with IV contrast	9		⊗⊗⊗⊗⊗
MRA abdomen and pelvis without and with IV contrast	7		○
CT abdomen and pelvis without IV contrast	6		⊗⊗⊗⊗
MRA abdomen and pelvis without IV contrast	5		○
Aortography abdomen and pelvis	3		⊗⊗⊗⊗
US intravascular aorta and iliofemoral system	3		○
<u>Rating Scale:</u> 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

IMAGING FOR TRANSCATHETER AORTIC VALVE REPLACEMENT

Expert Panel on Vascular Imaging and Cardiac Imaging: Karin E. Dill, MD¹; Elizabeth George, MBBS²; Frank J. Rybicki, MD, PhD³; Suhny Abbata, MD⁴; Kristopher Cummings, MD⁵; Christopher J. Francois, MD⁶; Marie D. Gerhard-Herman, MD⁷; Heather L. Gornik, MD⁸; Michael Hanley, MD⁹; Sanjeeva P. Kalva, MD¹⁰; Jacobo Kirsch, MD¹¹; Christopher M. Kramer, MD¹²; Bill S. Majdalany, MD¹³; John M. Moriarty, MB, BCh¹⁴; Isabel B. Oliva, MD¹⁵; Matthew P. Schenker, MD¹⁶; Richard Strax, MD.¹⁷

Summary of Literature Review

Introduction/Background

Aortic stenosis (AS) has become the most frequent type of valvular heart disease in Europe and North America. It primarily presents as calcific AS in adults of advanced age (2%–7% of the population >65 years of age) [1]. This calcific disease progresses from the base of the cusps to the leaflets and eventually causes a reduction in leaflet motion and effective valve area without commissural fusion. A congenital malformation of the valve, most commonly the bicuspid aortic valve, may also result in stenosis and is more common in young adults. AS is a disease continuum with no single value that defines severity, therefore it is graded on the basis of a variety of hemodynamic and natural history data. According to current guidelines, severe AS is defined as an aortic valve area (AVA) <1.0 cm² (or <0.6 cm²/m² body surface area), mean aortic valve pressure gradient >40 mm Hg, or an aortic jet velocity >4 m/s [2]. Two-dimensional transthoracic echocardiography (TTE) is the standard for diagnosis and severity assessment through Doppler quantification of maximum jet velocity, mean transvalvular pressure gradient, and AVA by continuity equation [2,3].

Aortic valve replacement (AVR) is the definitive therapy for severe AS. It is indicated in those patients with severe AS who are symptomatic, undergoing coronary artery bypass graft or other cardiac surgery, have left ventricle (LV) systolic dysfunction defined as an ejection fraction <50%, are asymptomatic with abnormal exercise response, asymptomatic with critical AS (AVA <0.6 cm²), or have a high likelihood of rapid progression [2,4]. However, 32%–48% of these patients do not undergo conventional AVR due to their advanced age, comorbidities, or prohibitive surgical risk [5-7]. Aortic balloon valvuloplasty has been used in selected cases as a palliative measure when conventional surgery is contraindicated or for patients with symptomatic severe AS who require urgent, major noncardiac surgery with severe comorbidities. Treatment of such high surgical risk patients has been modified with the introduction of catheter-based implantation of a bioprosthetic aortic valve, referred to as transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR).

In patients of high surgical risk, TAVR has been feasible using transfemoral, transapical, or, less commonly, subclavian or direct transaortic access. Once the access route is chosen, the transcatheter aortic valve prosthesis is positioned at the aortic annulus, which displaces the native aortic valve leaflets toward the aortic wall. The main procedure-related complications are cerebral vascular accident, heart block requiring new pacemaker, and vascular access-related complications. Trace or mild paravalvular aortic regurgitation (AR) is common in the majority of patients. More severe regurgitation can have impact long-term survival [8,9]. Even a mild degree of AR appears to affect prognosis. Percutaneous AVR provides hemodynamic results that are slightly superior to conventional bioprostheses [8-13]. Most survivors experience significant health and quality of life improvement. The long-term durability of these valves still needs to be addressed.

Several prosthesis types are available for current clinical use with multiple second-generation devices in development. The self-expandable Medtronic CoreValve (Medtronic Inc, Minneapolis, MN, USA), which is available in 23 mm, 26 mm, 29 mm, and 31 mm sizes, as well as the balloon-expandable Edwards SAPIEN valve

¹Principal Author and Panel Vice-chair (Vascular), University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. ²Research Author, Brigham and Women's Hospital & Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts. ³Panel Chair (Vascular), Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts. ⁴Panel Vice-chair (Cardiac), Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts. ⁵Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology, Washington University School of Medicine, Saint Louis, Missouri. ⁶University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin. ⁷Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, American College of Cardiology. ⁸Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio, American College of Cardiology. ⁹University of Virginia Health System, Charlottesville, Virginia. ¹⁰UT Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, Texas. ¹¹Cleveland Clinic, Weston, Florida. ¹²University of Virginia Health System, Charlottesville, Virginia, American College of Cardiology. ¹³Ohio State University Hospital, Columbus, Ohio. ¹⁴University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California. ¹⁵University of Arizona, College of Medicine, Tucson, Arizona. ¹⁶Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts. ¹⁷Greater Houston Radiology, Houston, Texas.

The American College of Radiology seeks and encourages collaboration with other organizations on the development of the ACR Appropriateness Criteria through society representation on expert panels. Participation by representatives from collaborating societies on the expert panel does not necessarily imply individual or society endorsement of the final document.

Reprint requests to: publications@acr.org

(Edwards Lifesciences Inc, Irvine, CA, USA), which is available in multiple models and sizes of 20 mm, 23 mm, 26 mm and 29 mm, are most commonly used. In the United States as of May 2013 only 23 mm and 26 mm Edwards SAPIEN valve prostheses are available [14].

Because transcatheter valvular procedures are characterized by lack of exposure of the operative field, image guidance is critical for preprocedural planning, intraoperative decision making, and follow-up. Such imaging determines a suitable access route prior to the procedure, appropriate sizing of the prosthetic valve, as well as additional information that is potentially helpful, such as chest wall deformity, intracardiac thrombus, degree of vascular tortuosity, valvular and vascular calcification, and appropriate fluoroscopic projection angles for exact orthogonal angles of the valve. Standard 2-D imaging with conventional angiography and echocardiography are important for patient selection and procedural guidance [15]. In addition, 3-D imaging including computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), 3-D echocardiography, and C-arm CT are increasingly used [16-18].

Planning at the aortic valve plane involves multiple measurements for accurate device sizing. These include measurements of the left ventricular outflow tract (LVOT) and interventricular septum, aortic annulus, sinuses of Valsalva, sinotubular junction, ascending aorta, coronary leaflets, and coronary annular-ostial distance. Preprocedural imaging at the annular plane contributes to outcome prediction through quantification and localization of aortic valve calcification. In addition, imaging for coexistent mitral valve disease, LV function, and coronary artery disease and to determine the best fluoroscopic projection for device deployment are essential data to optimize procedural success.

During TAVR, the prosthesis anchors according to the resistance of the subleaflet tissue. Undersizing the percutaneous valve increases the risk of prosthesis mismatch, transvalvular AR [19], and device migration or embolization. Oversizing can cause procedural difficulty, annular rupture, and underexpansion, which results in redundant leaflet tissue causing regional compressive and tensile stress that may contribute to transvalvular AR and a reduction in valve durability [20]. The length of the aortic leaflet and the distance of the coronary ostia from the annulus should be considered when estimating the risk of ostial coronary occlusion when the native leaflets are crushed to the aortic wall by the valve deployment [20]. The LVOT and septal anatomy must be evaluated for proper seating of the prosthesis to avoid embolization into the ventricle or aorta. Device manufacturer's guidelines recommend that implantation should not be performed if subaortic disease is sufficient to cause stenosis or if septal wall thickness is ≥ 17 mm [21].

Echocardiography and catheter-based angiography have been the standards for measuring the aortic annulus, and current device manufacturer's guidelines are based on transesophageal echocardiography (TEE) or TTE measurements. However, there is growing consensus that these 2-D measurements underestimate the aortic annular dimension because of its complex oval shape [19,22-26] and the fact that these measurements might not always measure the maximum diameter passing through the center of the annulus but instead measure its tangent [27]. Volumetric imaging can then be assessed in any plane, enabling accurate measurements of maximum, minimum, and mean diameters and circumference and area-derived diameter, though the latter has been proposed as more relevant [28-30], considering that the oval-shaped annulus assumes a circular shape post-TAVR [19,26].

It is of paramount importance to assess the minimum lumen diameter of the iliofemoral system for transfemoral access route, the degree and distribution of atherosclerotic plaque and calcification, tortuosity and angulation, coarctation of the aorta, and high-risk features such as dissection, aneurysm, or complex atheroma [31-37]. Presence of a patch in the LV or calcified pericardium, as well as inaccessible LV apex are contraindications to transapical approach and should be evaluated during planning [36]. In patients whom trans-subclavian access is planned due to contraindications to transfemoral device delivery or angiography, CT or duplex ultrasound have been used to assess for tortuosity, diameter, and distribution of calcification, though there is no definite data comparing the different modalities [38-40]. Commercially available suture-based vascular closure devices are used to close the arterial access site using the preclosure technique [41].

Pre-intervention Planning at the Aortic Valve Plane

Computed Tomography

Multidetector computed tomography (MDCT) provides high-spatial resolution, 3-D, and isotropic imaging of the aortic valve and aortic root and can contribute to the diagnosis and management of AS in a number of ways.

Noncontrast imaging can be used to evaluate valve calcification. CT has been shown to accurately detect and quantify aortic valve calcification with high reproducibility; however, as with echocardiography, the degree of aortic valve sclerosis can only be visually quantified in rough categories. Accurate characterization is important; it has been shown that the amount of valve calcification predicts the progression and clinical outcome of AS and is a predictor of pacemaker implantation after TAVR [42]. The amount and distribution of calcium (assessed by the Agatston Score, volumetric quantification, or subjective semiquantitative metrics), with that on the aortic wall and valvular commissure being more significant, can predict noncircular deployment of prosthesis [19]. This is important in decreasing the likelihood of paravalvular AR after TAVR [19,43-46] and decreasing the need for additional procedures [46].

CT angiography (CTA) is used to assess valve anatomy, which allows direct visualization of the valve with a high degree of accuracy for direct planimetry of the AVA. In some patients, the aortic valve may be dysmorphic, and the orifice will be oriented in such a way that can deviate from the plane of the aortic annulus. However, with the multiplanar capability of CT it is possible to evaluate a plane that exactly corresponds to the orifice. Without such capability, choosing an incorrect plane for planimetry will result in either an overestimation or underestimation of the orifice area. Imaging methods that use hemodynamic data to estimate AVAs often show deviation from techniques that use anatomic visualization. In this context, CT has been shown to overestimate aortic valve opening areas compared with TTE, which uses the continuity equation to derive valve area. CT correlates well with TEE, which also uses direct visualization and planimetry of the aortic valve [47].

CT can reliably evaluate the distance between the aortic annulus and the inferior aspects of the lowest coronary ostia for subsequent prosthetic aortic valve implantation to avoid coronary obstruction by the implanted prosthesis.

Using retrospective electrocardiography-gating, the CTA acquisition can include a cine evaluation of valve function and size throughout the cardiac cycle. Despite high spatial resolution (0.5 mm), assessment of the valve can be limited secondary to the relatively low temporal resolution (>75 milliseconds). However, measurements from multiplanar reformatted CT data are well correlated with intraoperative measurements [29,48]. The difference of the annular size from that of the prosthesis is predictive of paravalvular AR, with some data showing CT measures as more predictive than echocardiography [44,49].

Although a CT-based sizing approach would alter the echocardiography-derived sizing decision in 10%–68% of cases [23,24,30,44,50] depending on the diameter used, a pilot study [44] demonstrated reduced incidence of paravalvular AR using a CT-based approach. The method of incorporating CT measurements into manufacturer-defined, echocardiography-based cutoffs for prosthesis sizing is unclear, and its effect on clinical outcomes should be further assessed.

Volumetric assessment of the aortic root from multiplanar reformatting and volume rendering assists in determining the optimal fluoroscopic projection orthogonal to the native valve plane for prosthesis deployment [51,52]. In one study, MDCT predicted an excellent or satisfactory angle when correlated to angiographic images in 75% of cases. Software that integrates CT and catheter-based angiography data to help determine valve plane orientation is currently available [51]. At experienced centers, 3-D MDCT aortic root reconstructions have become first-line methods to predict optimal implant projection [53]. Eventually, 4-D-coregistered CT could reduce the need for data derived from catheterization [51].

Contrast agents can often cause problems in TAVR candidates who have impaired renal function. High-pitch spiral CT imaging as well as wide-area detector axial CT with temporal uniformity [37,54,55] are available with newer generation CT systems [56], allowing high-resolution imaging of large anatomical volumes in a short time, which reduces radiation exposure and contrast volume (total dose reported as low as 40 cc for an entire examination) [57].

Echocardiography

Echocardiography is essential in identifying patients suitable for TAVR and in providing intraprocedural monitoring. Moreover, echocardiography is the primary modality for postprocedure follow-up. It is the most widely used method to measure the annulus and was considered as the reference method in the PARTNER Trial [11]. Aortic annular measurements are typically performed in systole using the parasternal long axis view on TTE [20]. Commissural and leaflet cusp calcification as detected on TEE correlates with postsurgical paravalvular AR [58].

Because the geometry of the annulus is ellipsoid, it results in a larger diameter in the coronal direction and a smaller diameter in the sagittal direction. Using a 2-D imaging technique can underestimate the maximal valve diameter, an observation shown with 2-D TTE and TEE in several studies [19,22]. Two-dimensional TTE and TEE provided similar results for the aortic annulus diameter and morphologically similar measurements when compared to the sagittal diameter measured by MDCT [22,24]. Several studies have demonstrated that TEE results in larger diameter measurements than TTE [26,30,59,60]. Cut planes of the aortic annulus may explain this phenomenon; transthoracic parasternal and mid-esophageal acoustic windows do not necessarily oppose each other exactly. Although most measurements at the valve level can be made with the transthoracic approach, TEE is recommended when there is concern regarding the assessment of aortic root by TTE [20]. Though there is high correlation between CT and 2-D echocardiographic annular measurements on corresponding planes [23], multiplanar reformatted CT measurements are significantly greater than those derived from 2-D TTE or TEE [24]. Both TTE and TEE aortic annulus measurements can underestimate perioperative calibration [29,61], although this may be clinically insignificant as prostheses are routinely oversized [26].

Although the determination of the right coronary annular-ostial distance should be possible with 2-D TEE, measurement of the left coronary annular-ostial distance requires 3-D TEE or MDCT, since the right coronary artery ostium lies in a coronal plane that cannot be acquired by standard 2-D echocardiography.

TTE is the clinical reference standard to evaluate AS, although there is evidence that determination of the AVA as performed by TTE may underestimate orifice area and overestimate stenosis severity. According to the 2011 European Association of Echocardiography/American Society of Echocardiography recommendations for the use of echocardiography in new transcatheter interventions for valvular heart disease, there is no consensus regarding the reference standard imaging technique for annular sizing; although, from a practical perspective, TTE performs this task adequately in most patients.

Three-dimensional TTE and TEE enable short axis views of the annulus. However, the spatial resolution of 3-D TTE limits its use for annular measurements in the majority of cases. Initial studies with 3-D TEE demonstrate low variability and good correlation with corresponding views on CT [22,62]. Three-dimensional TEE is probably most useful immediately following valve deployment, when the echocardiographer must rapidly and accurately assess the position and function of the valve including identifying the presence/severity of AR [20].

Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Cardiovascular magnetic resonance (CMR) provides highly accurate, low variability measurements of the aortic annulus for patients undergoing surgical AVR [48]. Although there is a paucity of MR data for TAVR planning in comparison to that for CT, noncontrast MR demonstrates excellent correlation with CT-based TAVR measurements related to annular dimension with excellent intra- and interobserver correlation [23]. A study with 24 patients showed no difference in the AVA for MRI planimetry, Doppler echocardiography, 3-D TTE, and catheterization [60]. It has been suggested that CMR could be considered an alternative to CT in patients who cannot receive iodinated contrast agents, particularly for patients with renal insufficiency or in situations where detailed hemodynamic assessment of valvular regurgitation is required. CMR and CT in a recent study provided the necessary aortic and cardiac anatomical information for valve-in-valve TAVR planning [63].

MR approaches are limited when there is high-susceptibility artifact, magnetic field-incompatible devices, claustrophobia, and severe arrhythmia [64]. Finally, the MR examination is substantially longer than the CT acquisition, and this can be problematic for patients with a poor clinical condition.

Catheter Arteriography

Invasive catheterization with fluoroscopic guidance estimates the orifice area on the basis of pressure gradients and cardiac output and hence provides a functional aortic orifice area. The reference standard for the orifice area is direct inspection. However, this is not feasible during TAVR.

To achieve accurate device positioning during TAVR, specific angiographic deployment angles perpendicular or orthogonal to the native aortic valve plane need to be used. Because patient anatomy varies, individualized assessment and understanding is necessary, which may require multiple orthogonal aortic root angiograms until a projection angle with the base of all aortic valve cusps/sinuses of Valsalva is on a straight line. Thus, angiography requires meticulous manipulation to avoid geometric distortion of the aortic annulus diameters. Aortography at the time of the procedure is considered necessary and complementary to prior imaging. However, the use of

catheter angiography during the procedure in which the valve is deployed is not within the scope of this document, which evaluates preprocedure planning only.

Arteriography is a 2-D imaging technique with projections that may not adequately reflect the largest diameter and potentially pose calibration difficulties when measuring the annulus size [22]. Limited studies show that angiographic annular dimensions from an AP view underestimate CT-derived measurements [22,26,65] and have high intraobserver and interobserver variability [60,65]. Considering these limitations, catheter arteriography is not considered as a standalone modality for preprocedural planning. Improving the angiographic assessment of aortic annulus diameters can be accomplished with 3-D rotational angiography, which allows 3-D visualization of the aortic valve plane [66].

Traditional fluoroscopy with repeated aortic injections just before valve deployment is time-consuming, carries an increasing risk of nephrotoxicity as iodinated contrast material use increases, and increases radiation exposure. Moreover, this approach is often difficult in patients with unusual anatomy. Three-dimensional angiographic reconstructions from rotational C-arm fluoroscopic images can determine the optimal plane for device deployment faster and with lower contrast volume [53]. Currently available software allows for overlay of the 3-D visualization onto fluoroscopic images to guide the procedure [67].

Pre-intervention Planning in the Supravalvular Aorta and Iliofemoral System

Computed Tomography

TAVR requires the introduction of an 18- to 24-Fr catheter-based system, and the femoral artery is most common approach. Thus, because of size criteria and the potential for vascular injury, the entire aorta plus the iliofemoral system are assessed. When CTA was performed as part of a TAVR research protocol [11], a minimum lumen diameter of 7 mm was required for inclusion to the studies. From a clinical perspective, TAVR can be performed in patients with smaller arteries, particularly when there is no or limited calcium. This target is likely to change with the availability of smaller sheaths. In some instances, when the iliofemoral vessels are inaccessible, retroperitoneally placed Dacron tube grafts can serve as a conduit for the delivery system [68]. Image postprocessing tools can be used to assist in the assessment of lumen diameter, and 3-D volume rendering, maximum-intensity projections, and curved multiplanar reformations are integral to the assessment of tortuosity and minimum luminal diameter.

Concentric or horseshoe calcification is a relative contraindication for TAVR, especially in those with borderline vessel diameter. Incidental findings that affect the indication, approach, or TAVR timing, or findings that require further diagnostic workup (eg, malignancy, aortic dissection, and aneurysm) are detected in a significant proportion of these patients [31,35,69].

CT with ultra-low dose intra-arterial contrast injection has been proposed as an alternative approach for pre-TAVR assessment in those at risk of contrast-induced nephropathy [69-71]. Rapid acquisition CT imaging is available for assessment of the aorta and iliofemoral system, which can significantly reduce radiation exposure and contrast volume.

Catheter Angiography

Though catheter angiography allows assessment of luminal size, it provides limited evaluation of the arterial wall for plaque burden and calcification [32,33].

Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance angiography (MRA) provides an alternative to CT for evaluation of the aorta and iliofemoral arteries. Caution should be exercised in patients with severe renal dysfunction due to increased risk of nephrogenic systemic fibrosis [72].

Intravascular Ultrasound

Surface ultrasound is often used to identify an optimal puncture site and to gain access to the femoral artery [73]. However, because of the technical limitation of sonography, this approach is insufficient to comprehensively assess arterial size, calcification, and tortuosity of the iliofemoral system and the aorta. Although there is little or no data regarding the utility of intravascular ultrasound for TAVR planning, studies in abdominal aortic aneurysm subjects have provided reliable information of aortoiliofemoral anatomy, especially luminal dimension, presence of and morphology of atherosclerotic plaque, and calcification [74,75].

Summary

- Similar to the process of developing guidelines for the recently FDA-approved TAVR procedure, the role of imaging should be guided by expert consensus.
- Many clinical studies regarding the management of AS have been based on echocardiography and have shaped guidelines for surgical treatment. However, increasing evidence reveals that TTE tends to underestimate the AVA and overestimate stenosis severity.
- CT constitutes a central tool for preprocedural TAVR planning by providing crucial information about the LVOT, aortic valve, aortic root anatomy, thoracoabdominal aorta, and peripheral arteries.
- Current CT scanners permit planimetry of AVAs with high accuracy and may be of clinical use to determine stenosis severity in selected patients, especially when other methods fail.
- The superior spatial resolution of CT (0.5 mm) allows for accurate anatomic evaluation of the aortic valve and extent of calcification. Evidence exists that there is decreased incidence of paravalvular AR using a CT-based approach.
- Radiation exposure and iodine injection are important MDCT limitations, but the modality may provide useful additional information such as the anatomy of the coronary arteries and AVA as well as anatomy and the plane of the valve and the distribution of aortic valve calcifications.
- There is a paucity of data on the role of CMR for TAVR planning and follow-up, with positive preliminary results in limited circumstances.
- Echocardiography is the most widely used method for measuring the aortic annulus. Although there is no consensus regarding the reference standard imaging technique for annular sizing, TTE performs this task adequately in most patients.

Relative Radiation Level Information

Potential adverse health effects associated with radiation exposure are an important factor to consider when selecting the appropriate imaging procedure. Because there is a wide range of radiation exposures associated with different diagnostic procedures, a relative radiation level (RRL) indication has been included for each imaging examination. The RRLs are based on effective dose, which is a radiation dose quantity that is used to estimate population total radiation risk associated with an imaging procedure. Patients in the pediatric age group are at inherently higher risk from exposure, both because of organ sensitivity and longer life expectancy (relevant to the long latency that appears to accompany radiation exposure). For these reasons, the RRL dose estimate ranges for pediatric examinations are lower as compared to those specified for adults (see Table below). Additional information regarding radiation dose assessment for imaging examinations can be found in the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® [Radiation Dose Assessment Introduction](#) document.

Relative Radiation Level Designations		
Relative Radiation Level*	Adult Effective Dose Estimate Range	Pediatric Effective Dose Estimate Range
○	0 mSv	0 mSv
⊛	<0.1 mSv	<0.03 mSv
⊛⊛	0.1-1 mSv	0.03-0.3 mSv
⊛⊛⊛	1-10 mSv	0.3-3 mSv
⊛⊛⊛⊛	10-30 mSv	3-10 mSv
⊛⊛⊛⊛⊛	30-100 mSv	10-30 mSv

*RRL assignments for some of the examinations cannot be made, because the actual patient doses in these procedures vary as a function of a number of factors (eg, region of the body exposed to ionizing radiation, the imaging guidance that is used). The RRLs for these examinations are designated as “Varies”.

Supporting Documents

For additional information on the Appropriateness Criteria methodology and other supporting documents go to www.acr.org/ac.

References

1. Vahanian A, Alfieri O, Andreotti F, et al. Guidelines on the management of valvular heart disease (version 2012). *Eur Heart J*. 2012;33(19):2451-2496.
2. 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.
3. Baumgartner H, Hung J, Bermejo J, et al. Echocardiographic assessment of valve stenosis: EAE/ASE recommendations for clinical practice. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2009;22(1):1-23; quiz 101-102.
4. Vahanian A, Alfieri O, Andreotti F, et al. Guidelines on the management of valvular heart disease (version 2012): the Joint Task Force on the Management of Valvular Heart Disease of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS). *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg*. 2012;42(4):S1-44.
5. Bach DS, Cimino N, Deeb GM. Unoperated patients with severe aortic stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2007;50(20):2018-2019.
6. Dua A, Dang P, Shaker R, Varadarajan P, Pai RG. Barriers to surgery in severe aortic stenosis patients with Class I indications for aortic valve replacement. *J Heart Valve Dis*. 2011;20(4):396-400.
7. Iung B, Baron G, Butchart EG, et al. A prospective survey of patients with valvular heart disease in Europe: The Euro Heart Survey on Valvular Heart Disease. *Eur Heart J*. 2003;24(13):1231-1243.
8. Tamburino C, Capodanno D, Ramondo A, et al. Incidence and predictors of early and late mortality after transcatheter aortic valve implantation in 663 patients with severe aortic stenosis. *Circulation*. 2011;123(3):299-308.
9. Zahn R, Gerckens U, Grube E, et al. Transcatheter aortic valve implantation: first results from a multi-centre real-world registry. *Eur Heart J*. 2011;32(2):198-204.
10. Buellesfeld L, Gerckens U, Schuler G, et al. 2-year follow-up of patients undergoing transcatheter aortic valve implantation using a self-expanding valve prosthesis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2011;57(16):1650-1657.
11. Leon MB, Smith CR, Mack M, et al. Transcatheter aortic-valve implantation for aortic stenosis in patients who cannot undergo surgery. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;363(17):1597-1607.
12. Smith CR, Leon MB, Mack MJ, et al. Transcatheter versus surgical aortic-valve replacement in high-risk patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;364(23):2187-2198.
13. Thomas M, Schymik G, Walther T, et al. One-year outcomes of cohort 1 in the Edwards SAPIEN Aortic Bioprosthesis European Outcome (SOURCE) registry: the European registry of transcatheter aortic valve implantation using the Edwards SAPIEN valve. *Circulation*. 2011;124(4):425-433.
14. Achenbach S, Delgado V, Hausleiter J, Schoenhagen P, Min JK, Leipsic JA. SCCT expert consensus document on computed tomography imaging before transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI)/transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR). *J Cardiovasc Comput Tomogr*. 2012;6(6):366-380.
15. Schoenhagen P, Kapadia SR, Halliburton SS, Svensson LG, Tuzcu EM. Computed tomography evaluation for transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI): imaging of the aortic root and iliac arteries. *J Cardiovasc Comput Tomogr*. 2011;5(5):293-300.
16. Ng AC, Delgado V, van der Kley F, et al. Comparison of aortic root dimensions and geometries before and after transcatheter aortic valve implantation by 2- and 3-dimensional transesophageal echocardiography and multislice computed tomography. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2010;3(1):94-102.
17. Schwartz JG, Neubauer AM, Fagan TE, Noordhoek NJ, Grass M, Carroll JD. Potential role of three-dimensional rotational angiography and C-arm CT for valvular repair and implantation. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2011;27(8):1205-1222.
18. Siegel RJ, Luo H, Biner S. Transcatheter valve repair/implantation. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2011;27(8):1165-1177.
19. Delgado V, Ng AC, van de Veire NR, et al. Transcatheter aortic valve implantation: role of multi-detector row computed tomography to evaluate prosthesis positioning and deployment in relation to valve function. *Eur Heart J*. 2010;31(9):1114-1123.
20. Zamorano JL, Badano LP, Bruce C, et al. EAE/ASE recommendations for the use of echocardiography in new transcatheter interventions for valvular heart disease. *Eur Heart J*. 2011;32(17):2189-2214.

21. Chin D. Echocardiography for transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Eur J Echocardiogr.* 2009;10(1):i21-29.
22. Altiok E, Koos R, Schroder J, et al. Comparison of two-dimensional and three-dimensional imaging techniques for measurement of aortic annulus diameters before transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Heart.* 2011;97(19):1578-1584.
23. Koos R, Altiok E, Mahnken AH, et al. Evaluation of aortic root for definition of prosthesis size by magnetic resonance imaging and cardiac computed tomography: implications for transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Int J Cardiol.* 2012;158(3):353-358.
24. Messika-Zeitoun D, Serfaty JM, Brochet E, et al. Multimodal assessment of the aortic annulus diameter: implications for transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2010;55(3):186-194.
25. Tops LF, Wood DA, Delgado V, et al. Noninvasive evaluation of the aortic root with multislice computed tomography implications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2008;1(3):321-330.
26. Wood DA, Tops LF, Mayo JR, et al. Role of multislice computed tomography in transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *Am J Cardiol.* 2009;103(9):1295-1301.
27. Piazza N, de Jaegere P, Schultz C, Becker AE, Serruys PW, Anderson RH. Anatomy of the aortic valvar complex and its implications for transcatheter implantation of the aortic valve. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv.* 2008;1(1):74-81.
28. Blanke P, Siepe M, Reinohl J, et al. Assessment of aortic annulus dimensions for Edwards SAPIEN Transapical Heart Valve implantation by computed tomography: calculating average diameter using a virtual ring method. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2010;38(6):750-758.
29. Dashkevich A, Blanke P, Siepe M, et al. Preoperative assessment of aortic annulus dimensions: comparison of noninvasive and intraoperative measurement. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2011;91(3):709-714.
30. Gurvitch R, Webb JG, Yuan R, et al. Aortic annulus diameter determination by multidetector computed tomography: reproducibility, applicability, and implications for transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2011;4(11):1235-1245.
31. Apfaltrer P, Schymik G, Reimer P, et al. Aortoiliac CT angiography for planning transcatheter aortic valve implantation: aortic root anatomy and frequency of clinically significant incidental findings. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2012;198(4):939-945.
32. Blanke P, Euringer W, Baumann T, et al. Combined assessment of aortic root anatomy and aortoiliac vasculature with dual-source CT as a screening tool in patients evaluated for transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2010;195(4):872-881.
33. Bloomfield GS, Gillam LD, Hahn RT, et al. A practical guide to multimodality imaging of transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2012;5(4):441-455.
34. Kurra V, Schoenhagen P, Roselli EE, et al. Prevalence of significant peripheral artery disease in patients evaluated for percutaneous aortic valve insertion: Preprocedural assessment with multidetector computed tomography. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2009;137(5):1258-1264.
35. Leipsic J, Wood D, Manders D, et al. The evolving role of MDCT in transcatheter aortic valve replacement: a radiologists' perspective. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2009;193(3):W214-219.
36. Vahanian A, Alfieri OR, Al-Attar N, et al. Transcatheter valve implantation for patients with aortic stenosis: a position statement from the European Association of Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS) and the European Society of Cardiology (ESC), in collaboration with the European Association of Percutaneous Cardiovascular Interventions (EAPCI). *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2008;34(1):1-8.
37. Wake N, Kumamaru K, Prior R, Rybicki FJ, Steigner ML. Computed tomography angiography for transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *Radiol Technol.* 2013;84(4):326-340.
38. Fraccaro C, Napodano M, Tarantini G, et al. Expanding the eligibility for transcatheter aortic valve implantation the trans-subclavian retrograde approach using: the III generation CoreValve revalving system. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2009;2(9):828-833.
39. Petronio AS, De Carlo M, Bedogni F, et al. Safety and efficacy of the subclavian approach for transcatheter aortic valve implantation with the CoreValve revalving system. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv.* 2010;3(4):359-366.
40. Schafer U, Ho Y, Frerker C, et al. Direct percutaneous access technique for transaxillary transcatheter aortic valve implantation: "the Hamburg Sankt Georg approach". *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2012;5(5):477-486.
41. Kahlert P, Al-Rashid F, Plicht B, et al. Suture-mediated arterial access site closure after transfemoral aortic valve implantation. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* 2013;81(2):E139-150.

42. Latsios G, Gerckens U, Buellesfeld L, et al. "Device landing zone" calcification, assessed by MSCT, as a predictive factor for pacemaker implantation after TAVI. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* 2010;76(3):431-439.
43. Ewe SH, Ng AC, Schuijf JD, et al. Location and severity of aortic valve calcium and implications for aortic regurgitation after transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Am J Cardiol.* 2011;108(10):1470-1477.
44. Jilaihawi H, Kashif M, Fontana G, et al. Cross-sectional computed tomographic assessment improves accuracy of aortic annular sizing for transcatheter aortic valve replacement and reduces the incidence of paravalvular aortic regurgitation. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2012;59(14):1275-1286.
45. John D, Buellesfeld L, Yuecel S, et al. Correlation of Device landing zone calcification and acute procedural success in patients undergoing transcatheter aortic valve implantations with the self-expanding CoreValve prosthesis. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2010;3(2):233-243.
46. Koos R, Mahnken AH, Dohmen G, et al. Association of aortic valve calcification severity with the degree of aortic regurgitation after transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Int J Cardiol.* 2011;150(2):142-145.
47. Shah RG, Novaro GM, Blandon RJ, Whiteman MS, Asher CR, Kirsch J. Aortic valve area: meta-analysis of diagnostic performance of multi-detector computed tomography for aortic valve area measurements as compared to transthoracic echocardiography. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2009;25(6):601-609.
48. Smid M, Ferda J, Baxa J, et al. Aortic annulus and ascending aorta: comparison of preoperative and perioperative measurement in patients with aortic stenosis. *Eur J Radiol.* 2010;74(1):152-155.
49. Willson AB, Webb JG, Labounty TM, et al. 3-dimensional aortic annular assessment by multidetector computed tomography predicts moderate or severe paravalvular regurgitation after transcatheter aortic valve replacement: a multicenter retrospective analysis. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2012;59(14):1287-1294.
50. Schultz CJ, Moelker A, Piazza N, et al. Three dimensional evaluation of the aortic annulus using multislice computer tomography: are manufacturer's guidelines for sizing for percutaneous aortic valve replacement helpful? *Eur Heart J.* 2010;31(7):849-856.
51. Gurvitch R, Wood DA, Leipsic J, et al. Multislice computed tomography for prediction of optimal angiographic deployment projections during transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2010;3(11):1157-1165.
52. Kurra V, Kapadia SR, Tuzcu EM, et al. Pre-procedural imaging of aortic root orientation and dimensions: comparison between X-ray angiographic planar imaging and 3-dimensional multidetector row computed tomography. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2010;3(1):105-113.
53. Binder RK, Leipsic J, Wood D, et al. Prediction of optimal deployment projection for transcatheter aortic valve replacement: angiographic 3-dimensional reconstruction of the aortic root versus multidetector computed tomography. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv.* 2012;5(2):247-252.
54. Rybicki FJ, Otero HJ, Steigner ML, et al. Initial evaluation of coronary images from 320-detector row computed tomography. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2008;24(5):535-546.
55. Steigner ML, Otero HJ, Cai T, et al. Narrowing the phase window width in prospectively ECG-gated single heart beat 320-detector row coronary CT angiography. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2009;25(1):85-90.
56. Otero HJ, Steigner ML, Rybicki FJ. The "post-64" era of coronary CT angiography: understanding new technology from physical principles. *Radiol Clin North Am.* 2009;47(1):79-90.
57. Wuest W, Anders K, Schuhbaeck A, et al. Dual source multidetector CT-angiography before Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation (TAVI) using a high-pitch spiral acquisition mode. *Eur Radiol.* 2012;22(1):51-58.
58. Colli A, D'Amico R, Kempfert J, Borger MA, Mohr FW, Walther T. Transesophageal echocardiographic scoring for transcatheter aortic valve implantation: impact of aortic cusp calcification on postoperative aortic regurgitation. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2011;142(5):1229-1235.
59. Moss RR, Ivens E, Pasupati S, et al. Role of echocardiography in percutaneous aortic valve implantation. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2008;1(1):15-24.
60. Paelinck BP, Van Herck PL, Rodrigus I, et al. Comparison of magnetic resonance imaging of aortic valve stenosis and aortic root to multimodality imaging for selection of transcatheter aortic valve implantation candidates. *Am J Cardiol.* 2011;108(1):92-98.
61. Babaliaros VC, Liff D, Chen EP, et al. Can balloon aortic valvuloplasty help determine appropriate transcatheter aortic valve size? *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2008;1(5):580-586.
62. Tsang W, Bateman MG, Weinert L, et al. Accuracy of aortic annular measurements obtained from three-dimensional echocardiography, CT and MRI: human in vitro and in vivo studies. *Heart.* 2012;98(15):1146-1152.

63. Quail MA, Nordmeyer J, Schievano S, Reinthaler M, Mullen MJ, Taylor AM. Use of cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging for TAVR assessment in patients with bioprosthetic aortic valves: comparison with computed tomography. *Eur J Radiol.* 2012;81(12):3912-3917.
64. La Manna A, Sanfilippo A, Capodanno D, et al. Cardiovascular magnetic resonance for the assessment of patients undergoing transcatheter aortic valve implantation: a pilot study. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson.* 2011;13:82.
65. Tzikas A, Schultz CJ, Piazza N, et al. Assessment of the aortic annulus by multislice computed tomography, contrast aortography, and trans-thoracic echocardiography in patients referred for transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* 2011;77(6):868-875.
66. Meyhoer J, Ahrens J, Neuss M, Holschermann F, Schau T, Butter C. Rotational angiography for preinterventional imaging in transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* 2012;79(5):756-765.
67. John M, Liao R, Zheng Y, et al. System to guide transcatheter aortic valve implantations based on interventional C-arm CT imaging. *Med Image Comput Comput Assist Interv.* 2010;13(Pt 1):375-382.
68. Mack MJ. Access for transcatheter aortic valve replacement: which is the preferred route? *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2012;5(5):487-488.
69. Ben-Dor I, Waksman R, Hanna NN, et al. Utility of radiologic review for noncardiac findings on multislice computed tomography in patients with severe aortic stenosis evaluated for transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Am J Cardiol.* 2010;105(10):1461-1464.
70. Joshi SB, Mendoza DD, Steinberg DH, et al. Ultra-low-dose intra-arterial contrast injection for iliofemoral computed tomographic angiography. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2009;2(12):1404-1411.
71. Nietlispach F, Leipsic J, Al-Bugami S, Masson JB, Carere RG, Webb JG. CT of the ilio-femoral arteries using direct aortic contrast injection: proof of feasibility in patients screened towards percutaneous aortic valve replacement. *Swiss Med Wkly.* 2009;139(31-32):458-462.
72. Collidge TA, Thomson PC, Mark PB, et al. Gadolinium-enhanced MR imaging and nephrogenic systemic fibrosis: retrospective study of a renal replacement therapy cohort. *Radiology.* 2007;245(1):168-175.
73. Troianos CA, Hartman GS, Glas KE, et al. Guidelines for performing ultrasound guided vascular cannulation: recommendations of the American Society of Echocardiography and the Society of Cardiovascular Anesthesiologists. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr.* 2011;24(12):1291-1318.
74. Slovut DP, Ofstein LC, Bacharach JM. Endoluminal AAA repair using intravascular ultrasound for graft planning and deployment: a 2-year community-based experience. *J Endovasc Ther.* 2003;10(3):463-475.
75. White RA, Donayre C, Kopchok G, Walot I, Wilson E, de Virgilio C. Intravascular ultrasound: the ultimate tool for abdominal aortic aneurysm assessment and endovascular graft delivery. *J Endovasc Surg.* 1997;4(1):45-55.

The ACR Committee on Appropriateness Criteria and its expert panels have developed criteria for determining appropriate imaging examinations for diagnosis and treatment of specified medical condition(s). These criteria are intended to guide radiologists, radiation oncologists and referring physicians in making decisions regarding radiologic imaging and treatment. Generally, the complexity and severity of a patient's clinical condition should dictate the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Only those examinations generally used for evaluation of the patient's condition are ranked. Other imaging studies necessary to evaluate other co-existent diseases or other medical consequences of this condition are not considered in this document. The availability of equipment or personnel may influence the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Imaging techniques classified as investigational by the FDA have not been considered in developing these criteria; however, study of new equipment and applications should be encouraged. The ultimate decision regarding the appropriateness of any specific radiologic examination or treatment must be made by the referring physician and radiologist in light of all the circumstances presented in an individual examination.