

Table 1: Studies on the change in diastolic dysfunction in patients with AS after AVR

1 <sup>st</sup> Author / Year	N	AVR	Diastolic dysfunction evaluation	Diastolic dysfunction variables	Grading	Change in diastolic dysfunction after AVR																																				
Villari 1995 <sup>A</sup>	12	SAVR	Cath	Peak filling rate early and late, and the myocardial stiffness constant (b)	No	<table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>Baseline</b></td> <td><b>Early (22m)</b></td> <td><b>Late (81m)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>PFR Early</td> <td>402±111</td> <td>372±83</td> <td>330 ±132</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PFR Late</td> <td>370±107</td> <td>332 ±121</td> <td>276±123</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b</td> <td>21±6</td> <td>30±7</td> <td>11 ±4</td> </tr> </table>		<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Early (22m)</b>	<b>Late (81m)</b>	PFR Early	402±111	372±83	330 ±132	PFR Late	370±107	332 ±121	276±123	b	21±6	30±7	11 ±4																				
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Early (22m)</b>	<b>Late (81m)</b>																																							
PFR Early	402±111	372±83	330 ±132																																							
PFR Late	370±107	332 ±121	276±123																																							
b	21±6	30±7	11 ±4																																							
Villari 1996 <sup>B</sup>	10	SAVR	Cath	Peak filling rate, myocardial stiffness constant (b)	No	<table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>Baseline</b></td> <td><b>Early (21m)</b></td> <td><b>Late(89m)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>PFR</td> <td>384 ±95</td> <td>388±57</td> <td>353 ±79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b</td> <td>19±5</td> <td>28±7</td> <td>10±3 *</td> </tr> </table> <p>* P&lt;0.001 early vs. late after AVR</p>		<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Early (21m)</b>	<b>Late(89m)</b>	PFR	384 ±95	388±57	353 ±79	b	19±5	28±7	10±3 *																								
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Early (21m)</b>	<b>Late(89m)</b>																																							
PFR	384 ±95	388±57	353 ±79																																							
b	19±5	28±7	10±3 *																																							
Bech-Hanssen 1999 <sup>C</sup>	239	SAVR	TTE	E/A, S/D, DT	None, mild to moderate, severe	<table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>Baseline</b></td> <td><b>2 years</b></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4"><b>Mechanical Valves</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>E/A</td> <td>1.0 ± 0.74</td> <td>1.02 ± 0.31</td> <td>P=0.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S/D</td> <td>1.41 ± 0.64</td> <td>1.26 ± 0.33</td> <td>P&lt;0.01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DT</td> <td>239 ± 99.5</td> <td>238 ± 72.5</td> <td>P=0.21</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4"><b>Biologic prosthetic valves</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>E/A</td> <td>1.0 ± 0.57</td> <td>0.94 ± 0.3</td> <td>P=0.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S/D</td> <td>1.36 ± 0.58</td> <td>1.29 ± 0.53</td> <td>P=0.15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DT</td> <td>268 ± 120</td> <td>241 ± 68</td> <td>P=0.15</td> </tr> </table>		<b>Baseline</b>	<b>2 years</b>		<b>Mechanical Valves</b>				E/A	1.0 ± 0.74	1.02 ± 0.31	P=0.4	S/D	1.41 ± 0.64	1.26 ± 0.33	P<0.01	DT	239 ± 99.5	238 ± 72.5	P=0.21	<b>Biologic prosthetic valves</b>				E/A	1.0 ± 0.57	0.94 ± 0.3	P=0.4	S/D	1.36 ± 0.58	1.29 ± 0.53	P=0.15	DT	268 ± 120	241 ± 68	P=0.15
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>2 years</b>																																								
<b>Mechanical Valves</b>																																										
E/A	1.0 ± 0.74	1.02 ± 0.31	P=0.4																																							
S/D	1.41 ± 0.64	1.26 ± 0.33	P<0.01																																							
DT	239 ± 99.5	238 ± 72.5	P=0.21																																							
<b>Biologic prosthetic valves</b>																																										
E/A	1.0 ± 0.57	0.94 ± 0.3	P=0.4																																							
S/D	1.36 ± 0.58	1.29 ± 0.53	P=0.15																																							
DT	268 ± 120	241 ± 68	P=0.15																																							
McKenney 1999 <sup>D</sup>	14	SAVR	TTE	LVED area at similar pulmonary arterial wedge pressure, DT	No	<table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>Baseline</b></td> <td><b>Postprocedural</b></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>LVED area</td> <td>17.9 ±1.7</td> <td>12.1 ±1.2</td> <td>P&lt; 0.0001</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DT</td> <td>260 ±30</td> <td>108 ±4</td> <td>P&lt;0.0001</td> </tr> </table>		<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Postprocedural</b>		LVED area	17.9 ±1.7	12.1 ±1.2	P< 0.0001	DT	260 ±30	108 ±4	P<0.0001																								
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Postprocedural</b>																																								
LVED area	17.9 ±1.7	12.1 ±1.2	P< 0.0001																																							
DT	260 ±30	108 ±4	P<0.0001																																							
Ikonomidis 2001 <sup>E</sup>	41	SAVR	TTE	E/A, IVRT, DT	No	<table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>Baseline</b></td> <td><b>2w after SAVR</b></td> <td><b>4y after SAVR</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>DT</td> <td>241 ±102</td> <td>205 ±77</td> <td>226 ±96 *</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IVRT</td> <td>93 ± 20</td> <td>78 ±12</td> <td>81 ±15 *</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E/A</td> <td>1.05 ±0.5</td> <td>1.0 ±0.5</td> <td>91 ±0.3</td> </tr> </table> <p>* P&lt;0.05 baseline vs. 4y after SAVR</p>		<b>Baseline</b>	<b>2w after SAVR</b>	<b>4y after SAVR</b>	DT	241 ±102	205 ±77	226 ±96 *	IVRT	93 ± 20	78 ±12	81 ±15 *	E/A	1.05 ±0.5	1.0 ±0.5	91 ±0.3																				
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>2w after SAVR</b>	<b>4y after SAVR</b>																																							
DT	241 ±102	205 ±77	226 ±96 *																																							
IVRT	93 ± 20	78 ±12	81 ±15 *																																							
E/A	1.05 ±0.5	1.0 ±0.5	91 ±0.3																																							
Lamb 2002 <sup>F</sup>	12	SAVR	MRI	E/A peak	No	<table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>Baseline</b></td> <td><b>Postprocedural</b></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>E/A peak</td> <td>1.40 ±0.88</td> <td>1.34 ±0.6</td> <td>P=NS</td> </tr> </table>		<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Postprocedural</b>		E/A peak	1.40 ±0.88	1.34 ±0.6	P=NS																												
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Postprocedural</b>																																								
E/A peak	1.40 ±0.88	1.34 ±0.6	P=NS																																							
Gjertsson 2005 <sup>G</sup>	57	SAVR	TTE	DT	None, Grade I, Grade II, Grade III	<table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>Baseline</b></td> <td><b>2y</b></td> <td><b>10y</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>DT</td> <td>272±107</td> <td>248 ±73 (P&lt;0.05)</td> <td>236 ±88 (P&lt;0.05)</td> </tr> </table> <p>10y follow-up: 61% decrease in patients with moderate to severe diastolic dysfunction (P&lt; 0.0001)</p>		<b>Baseline</b>	<b>2y</b>	<b>10y</b>	DT	272±107	248 ±73 (P<0.05)	236 ±88 (P<0.05)																												
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>2y</b>	<b>10y</b>																																							
DT	272±107	248 ±73 (P<0.05)	236 ±88 (P<0.05)																																							
Ding 2007 <sup>H</sup>	66	SAVR	TTE	E/A, IVRT	No	<table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>Baseline</b></td> <td><b>46 months</b></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>E/A</td> <td>2.6±0.2</td> <td>1.9±0.1</td> <td>P&lt;0.05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IVRT</td> <td>57±4</td> <td>69±3</td> <td>P&lt;0.01</td> </tr> </table>		<b>Baseline</b>	<b>46 months</b>		E/A	2.6±0.2	1.9±0.1	P<0.05	IVRT	57±4	69±3	P<0.01																								
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>46 months</b>																																								
E/A	2.6±0.2	1.9±0.1	P<0.05																																							
IVRT	57±4	69±3	P<0.01																																							
Brown 2009 <sup>I</sup>	115	SAVR	TTE	E/e', LA size, DT	None, delayed relaxation, increased LA pressure	Diastolic dysfunction persisted postoperatively in 84% of patients with baseline diastolic dysfunction, while 46% of them (persisted diastolic dysfunction) had P/PM																																				
Guaraccino 2010 <sup>J</sup>	30	SAVR & TAVR	TEE	Vp, e'	No	<table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>Baseline</b></td> <td><b>Postprocedural</b></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4"><b>TAVR</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vp</td> <td>35 ± 6.4</td> <td>43 ±7.5</td> <td>*</td> </tr> </table>		<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Postprocedural</b>		<b>TAVR</b>				Vp	35 ± 6.4	43 ±7.5	*																								
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Postprocedural</b>																																								
<b>TAVR</b>																																										
Vp	35 ± 6.4	43 ±7.5	*																																							

						e' 4.0 ±0.5 5.0 ±0.7 * SAVR Vp 37 ±6.0 29 ±5.4 * e' 4.2 ±0.5 3.1 ±0.7 * * p <0.001 baseline vs. postprocedural
Seo 2012 <sup>K</sup>	38	SAVR	TTE	e', E/A, E/e', DT	No	<b>Baseline</b> <b>25weeks</b> <b>50weeks</b> E/A 1.2±0.4 0.9±0.3 * 0.9±0.3 DT 237.8±54 177.8±30.6 * 162.7±35.6 E/e' 15.5±4.7 16.9±4.8 * 17.8±5 e' 6.3±1.8 7.8±2.0 * 9.2±3.3 * * P<0.05 baseline vs. 25w or 50w
Gotzmann 2010 <sup>L</sup>	39	TAVR	TTE	e', E/e'	No	<b>Baseline</b> <b>30d</b> <b>6m</b> e' 5.19 ± 1.56 5.62 ± 1.54 (P=0.15) 5.8 ± 1.53 (P=0.004) E/e' 20 ± 6.7 18.1 ± 5.7 (P=0.153) 17.2 ± 5.4 (P=0.21)
Vizzardi 2010 <sup>M</sup>	135	TAVR	TTE	E/A, E/e', DT	None, Grade I, Grade II, Grade III	<b>Baseline</b> <b>6 months</b> DT 210±48 230 ±71 P=0.08 e' 4.1 6 ±1.7 5.6±2.2 P<0.0001 E/e' 24 ±7 17±6 P<0.0001
Tzikas 2011 <sup>N</sup>	63	TAVR	TTE	E/A, DT, e', E/e'	None, Grade I, Grade II, Grade III	<b>Baseline</b> <b>Discharge</b> <b>1y</b> Grade I 59% 51% 57% Grade II 23% 36% 33% Grade III 18% 13% 10% P=1.0
Gonzalez 2011 <sup>O</sup>	61	TAVR	TTE & TEE	E/A, IVRT, DT	None, Grade I, Grade II, Grade III	<b>Baseline</b> <b>Postprocedural</b> E/A 1.2 (0.9; 1.4) 1.5 (1.2; 1.8) P=0.002 DT 211.2 (191.7; 230.6) 252.7 (226.8; 278.7) P=0.001 IVRT 83.0 (73.8; 92.8) 97.1 (87.9; 106.4) P=0.003
Spethmann 2013 <sup>P</sup>	46	TAVR	TTE	E/e'	None, Grade I, Grade II, Grade III	46.9% of the patients improved by at least one grade <b>Baseline</b> <b>8 days after TAVR</b> E/e' 18.7±8 17.6±7.3 P=NS
Spethmann 2014 <sup>Q</sup>	54	TAVR	TTE	e', E/e', E/A, DT, IVRT	None, Grade I, Grade II, Grade III	<b>Baseline</b> <b>12months post TAVR</b> e' 5.5±1.6 6.2±1.9 E/E' 17.4±7.4 15.9±6 IVRT 108.9±37.5 120.4 ±33.6 DT 204.1±73.7 224.2 ±62.5 E/A 1.16 ±0.77 1.16± 0.83 P=0.17 for e', P = NS otherwise Diastolic dysfunction grade III 24% 10% grade II 34% 26% grade I 42% 52% None 0 12% P=NS
Aslan 2015 <sup>R</sup>	55	TAVR	TTE	E/e'	No	<b>Pre-operation</b> <b>7-days after TAVR</b> E/e' 13.7±4.6 11.5 ± 4.1 P< 0.001
Muratori 2015 <sup>S</sup>	358	TAVR	TTE	E/A ratio, DT, e', E/e'	None, Grade I, Grade II, Grade III	<b>LVEF&lt;50%</b> <b>Baseline</b> <b>12months</b> Diastolic dysfunction grade ≥II 100% 58.8% *

						<b>LVEF ≥ 50%</b> Diastolic dysfunction grade ≥II	<b>Baseline</b> 100%	<b>12months</b> 87.1% *
						* P < 0.001		

AS=Aortic Stenosis, AVR=Aortic Valve Replacement, SAVR=Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement, TAVR=Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement, TEE=Transesophageal echocardiogram, TTE=Transthoracic echocardiogram, LA=Left Atrial, LVEF=Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction, LVED=Left Ventricular End Diastolic; DT= deceleration time, Vp=transmitral flow propagation velocity. E=peak early transmitral velocity, A= peak late transmitral velocity, e'= peak early mitral annular velocity Doppler, S= peak systolic pulmonary vein flow velocity, D= peak diastolic pulmonary vein velocity, CV=Cardiovascular, P/PM=Patient-Prosthesis Mismatch, HR= Hazard Ratio, OR=Odds Ratio

Table 2: Studies on the impact of diastolic dysfunction on clinical outcomes of patients with AS undergoing AVR

1 <sup>st</sup> Author / Year	N	AVR	Diastolic dysfunction evaluation	Diastolic dysfunction variables	Diastolic dysfunction grading	Measured outcome	Results
Lund 1997 <sup>T</sup>	91	SAVR	TTE	LV fast filling fraction, LV late filling fraction	No	Short and long-term mortality	LV fast filling fraction <45% had a regression coefficient = 0.98 (p=0.03) for crude mortality and 1.07 (p=0.03) for aortic stenosis specific deaths
Bernard 2001 <sup>U</sup>	66	SAVR	TTE	E/A, DT, S/D	None, Grade I, Grade II, Grade III	Need for inotropic support 0-12 hours after surgery	Diastolic dysfunction OR: 6.17; 95% CI: (1.9–19.8), P= 0.002
Gjertsson 2005 <sup>V</sup>	399	SAVR	TTE	E/A, S/D	None, Grade I, Grade II, Grade III	Long-term mortality	Grade II-III vs. Grade I-normal: HR 1.72; p=0.005 for mortality risk Patients with mild diastolic dysfunction did not have decreased survival compared to the general population
Denault 2006 <sup>W</sup>	54	SAVR	TTE	e'	None, Grade I, Grade II, Grade III	Separation from cardiopulmonary bypass	65.5% of the patients with moderate to severe diastolic dysfunction had a difficulty in the separation from the cardiopulmonary bypass vs. 40.9% for patients with no or mild diastolic dysfunction, P = 0.017
Ding 2010 <sup>X</sup>	112	SAVR	TTE	E/A	No	Short and long-term mortality	HR 1.85; 95% CI: (1.06–3.22), P= 0.03 for short term mortality HR 2.09; 95% CI: (1.24–3.12) p<0.01 for long-term mortality HR 3.35; 95% CI: (1.23–9.17); p<0.01 for long-term mortality (elderly only)
Linker 2010 <sup>Y</sup>	108	SAVR	TEE	E/A, DT, S/D	None, Grade I, Grade II, Grade III	Weaning off ventilator	Diastolic dysfunction was a risk factor for post-CPB LV dysfunction. Multivariate logistic regression for Vp<40cm/s effect in weaning off ventilator: OR = 0.65; 95% CI: 0.52-0.81
Chang 2010 <sup>Z</sup>	248	SAVR	TTE	E/e'	No	In-hospital and Long-term CV Events	E/e' >12 was associated with increased in- hospital (P=0.04) and long-term CV events (10.1% vs. 2.8%, P=0.03)
Rassi 2013 <sup>AA</sup>	1267	SAVR	Exercise TTE	E/A, S/D, LA size	Normal, stage I, stage II	Long term Mortality or AVR (combined)	Baseline stage II diastolic dysfunction was an independent predictor of the composite endpoint of death and AVR, HR; 1.75; 95% CI: 1.13-2.71, P= 0.012. Mild diastolic dysfunction had not a significant association with the endpoint
Tann 2015 <sup>BB</sup>	432	SAVR	TTE	E/e'	No	Combined Endpoint*, Long-term mortality	Combined Endpoint* adjusted OR:1.40; 95% CI: 1.03-1.78 Long-term mortality adjusted OR:1.51; 95% CI: 1.18-1.92

Muratori 2015 <sup>S</sup>	358	TAVR	TTE	E/A, DT, e', E/e'	None, Grade I, Grade II, Grade III	1 year mortality	Similar mortality among patients with advanced vs. mild diastolic dysfunction Patients with baseline severe diastolic dysfunction who showed an improvement in their diastolic dysfunction after TAVR had better one year survival, compared to those who did not show an improvement
Kampaktsis 2016 <sup>CC</sup>	195	TAVR	TTE	e', LAVI, E/A, DT	None, Grade I, Grade II, Grade III	Long-term mortality	Severe diastolic dysfunction was not independently associated with mortality Severe diastolic dysfunction with Post-TAVR AR was associated with increased mortality (HR: 3.89; 95% CI: 1.76–8.6; P=0.001)

\*combined endpoint: in-hospital mortality or major morbidity defined as all-cause death, stroke, renal failure (Risk, Injury, Failure, Loss of kidney function or End-stage kidney disease [RIFLE] classification  $\geq 3$ )

AS=Aortic Stenosis, AVR=Aortic Valve Replacement, SAVR=Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement, TAVR=Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement, TEE=Transesophageal echocardiogram, TTE=Transthoracic echocardiogram, LAVI=Left Atrium Index Volume, LA=Left Atrial, LV=Left Ventricle, DT= deceleration time, Vp=transmitral flow propagation velocity. E=peak early transmitral velocity, A= peak late transmitral velocity, e' = peak early mitral annular velocity Doppler, S= peak systolic pulmonary vein flow velocity, D= peak diastolic pulmonary vein velocity, CV=Cardiovascular, HR= Hazard Ratio, OR=Odds Ratio, CI=Confidence Interval

## References

- A. Villari B, Vassalli G, Monrad ES, Chiariello M, Turina M, Hess OM. Normalization of diastolic dysfunction in aortic stenosis late after valve replacement. *Circulation*. 1995;91(9):2353-2358.
- B. Villari B, Vassalli G, Betocchi S, Briguori C, Chiariello M, Hess OM. Normalization of left ventricular nonuniformity late after valve replacement for aortic stenosis. *Am J Cardiol*. 1996;78(1):66-71.
- C. Bech-Hanssen O, Caidahl K, Wall B, Myken P, Larsson S, Wallentin I. Influence of aortic valve replacement, prosthesis type, and size on functional outcome and ventricular mass in patients with aortic stenosis. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 1999;118(1):57-65.
- D. McKenney PA, Apstein CS, Mendes LA, Connelly GP, Aldea GS, Shemin RJ, et al. Immediate effect of aortic valve replacement for aortic stenosis on left ventricular diastolic chamber stiffness. *Am J Cardiol*. 1999;84:914-8.
- E. Ikonomidis I, Tsoukas A, Parthenakis F, Gournizakis A, Kassimatis A, Rallidis L, Nihoyannopoulos P. Four year follow up of aortic valve replacement for isolated aortic stenosis: a link between reduction in pressure overload, regression of left ventricular hypertrophy, and diastolic function. *Heart Br Card Soc*. 2001;86(3):309-316.
- F. Lamb HJ, Beyerbacht HP, de Roos A, van der Laarse A, Vliegen HW, Leujes F, Bax JJ, van der Wall EE. Left ventricular remodeling early after aortic valve replacement: differential effects on diastolic function in aortic valve stenosis and aortic regurgitation. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2002;40(12):2182-2188.
- G. Gjertsson P, Caidahl K, Bech-Hanssen O. Left ventricular diastolic dysfunction late after aortic valve replacement in patients with aortic stenosis. *Am J Cardiol*. 2005;96(5):722-727. doi:10.1016/j.amjcard.2005.04.052.
- H. Ding W, Lam Y, Kaya MG, Li W, Chung R, Pepper JR, Henein MY. Echocardiographic predictors of left ventricular functional recovery following valve replacement surgery for severe aortic stenosis. *Int J Cardiol*. 2008;128(2):178-184. doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2007.05.025.
- I. Brown J, Shah P, Stanton T, Marwick TH. Interaction and prognostic effects of left ventricular diastolic dysfunction and patient-prosthesis mismatch as determinants of outcome after isolated aortic valve replacement. *Am J Cardiol*. 2009;104:707-12.
- J. Guarracino F, Talini E, Landoni G, Petronio S, Giannini C, Di Bello V. Effect of aortic valve surgery on left ventricular diastole assessed by echocardiography and neuroendocrine response: percutaneous versus surgical approach. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth*. 2010;24:25-9.

- K. Seo J-S, Jang M-K, Lee E-Y, Yun S-C, Kim D-H, Song J-M, Kang D-H, Song J-K. Evaluation of left ventricular diastolic function after valve replacement in aortic stenosis using exercise Doppler echocardiography. *Circ J Off J Jpn Circ Soc.* 2012;76(12):2792-2798.
- L. Gotzmann M, Lindstaedt M, Bojara W, Mugge A, Germing A. Hemodynamic results and changes in myocardial function after transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Am Heart J.* 2010;159:926-32.
- M. Vizzardi E, D'Aloia A, Fiorina C, Bugatti S, Parrinello G, De Carlo M, et al. Early regression of left ventricular mass associated with diastolic improvement after transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr.* 2012;25:1091-8.
- N. Tzikas A, Geleijnse ML, Van Mieghem NM, Schultz CJ, Nuis RJ, van Dalen BM, et al. Left ventricular mass regression one year after transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2011;91:685-91.
- O. Goncalves A, Marcos-Alberca P, Almeria C, Feltes G, Rodriguez E, Hernandez-Antolin RA, et al. Acute left ventricle diastolic function improvement after transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Eur J Echocardiogr.* 2011;12:790-7.
- P. Spethmann S, Dreger H, Baldenhofer G, Stuer K, Saghabalyan D, Muller E, et al. Short-term effects of transcatheter aortic valve implantation on left atrial mechanics and left ventricular diastolic function. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr.* 2013;26:64-71.e2.
- Q. Spethmann S, Baldenhofer G, Dreger H, Stuer K, Sanad W, Saghabalyan D, et al. Recovery of left ventricular and left atrial mechanics in various entities of aortic stenosis 12 months after TAVI. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2014;15:389-98.
- R. Aslan S, Gul M, Cakmak HA, Ozturk D, Celik O, Satilmisoglu MH, Gode S, Tasbulak O, Yildirim A, Bakir I. Short-term effects of transcatheter aortic valve implantation on left atrial appendage function. *Cardiol J.* 2015;22(5):527-534. doi:10.5603/CJ.a2015.0024.
- S. Muratori M, Fusini L, Tamborini G, Gripari P, Delgado V, Marsan NA, Ghulam Ali S, Barbier P, Bartorelli AL, Alamanni F, Pepi M. Sustained favourable haemodynamics 1 year after TAVI: improvement in NYHA functional class related to improvement of left ventricular diastolic function. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging.* November 2015. doi:10.1093/ehjci/jev306.
- T. Lund O, Flo C, Jensen FT, Emmertsen K, Nielsen TT, Rasmussen BS, Hansen OK, Pilegaard HK, Kristensen LH. Left ventricular systolic and diastolic function in aortic stenosis. Prognostic value after valve replacement and underlying mechanisms. *Eur Heart J.* 1997;18(12):1977-1987.
- U. Bernard F, Denault A, Babin D, Goyer C, Couture P, Couturier A, Buithieu J. Diastolic dysfunction is predictive of difficult weaning from cardiopulmonary bypass. *Anesth Analg.* 2001;92(2):291-298.

- V. Gjertsson P, Caidahl K, Farasati M, Oden A, Bech-Hanssen O. Preoperative moderate to severe diastolic dysfunction: a novel Doppler echocardiographic long-term prognostic factor in patients with severe aortic stenosis. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2005;129(4):890-896.
- W. Denault AY, Couture P, Buithieu J, Haddad F, Carrier M, Babin D, Levesque S, Tardif J-C. Left and right ventricular diastolic dysfunction as predictors of difficult separation from cardiopulmonary bypass. *Can J Anaesth J Can Anesth*. 2006;53(10):1020-1029. doi:10.1007/BF03022532.
- X. Ding W, Lam Y, Pepper JR, Kaya MG, Li W, Chung R, Henein MY. Early and long-term survival after aortic valve replacement in septuagenarians and octogenarians with severe aortic stenosis. *Int J Cardiol*. 2010;141(1):24-31. doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2008.11.126.
- Y. Licker M, Cikirikcioglu M, Inan C, Cartier V, Kalangos A, Theologou T, Cassina T, Diaper J. Preoperative diastolic function predicts the onset of left ventricular dysfunction following aortic valve replacement in high-risk patients with aortic stenosis. *Crit Care Lond Engl*. 2010;14(3):R101.
- Z. Chang SA, Park PW, Sung K, Lee SC, Park SW, Lee YT, Oh JK. Noninvasive estimate of left ventricular filling pressure correlated with early and midterm postoperative cardiovascular events after isolated aortic valve replacement in patients with severe aortic stenosis. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2010;140(6):1361-1366.
- AA. Rassi AN, Aljaroudi W, Naderi S, Alraies MC, Menon V, Rodriguez L, Grimm R, Griffin B, Jaber WA. Exercise stress echocardiography in patients with aortic stenosis: impact of baseline diastolic dysfunction and functional capacity on mortality and aortic valve replacement. *Cardiovasc Diagn Ther*. 2013;3(4):205-215.
- BB. Tan TC, Flynn AW, Chen-Tournoux A, Rudski LG, Mehrotra P, Nunes MC, Rincon LM, Shahian DM, Picard MH, Afilalo J. Risk prediction in aortic valve replacement: Incremental value of the preoperative echocardiogram. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2015;4(10):e002129. doi:10.1161/JAHA.115.002129.
- CC. Kampaktsis PN, Bang CN, Chiu Wong S, Skubas NJ, Singh H, Voudris K, et al. Prognostic importance of diastolic dysfunction in relation to post procedural aortic insufficiency in patients undergoing transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. 2017;89:445-51.