Consequences and management approaches aortic stenosis

Haitham Rasheed AlHaeti, Meshari Khaled Alowais, Razan Yaseen Alharbi, Abdulrahman Salem Al-Nahdi, Randah Fahad Alsallum, Rawan Khalid AlBraik, Faisal Abdullah Alosaimi, Afnan Ayed O Almutairi, Ahmad Edan Alzahrani

Abstract: The aim of this review is to briefly explain the pathology and etiology. As well as to discuss the management methods and further progress and consequences of the AS. We conducted a search using electronic databases; MEDLINE, EMBASE, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), through October, 2017. Search strategies used following MeSH terms in searching via these databases: “aortic stenosis”, “Management”, “Treatment”, “etiology”. The progression of AS is very variable. At this point there are no medical therapies that have been proven to postpone the progression of AS. Aortic valve replacement is indicated for patients with symptomatic serious AS. In the great majority of patients with asymptomatic serious AS, the danger of surgery exceeds the danger of watchful waiting. There are clinical, echocardiographic and biochemical indicators which could help identify those likely to develop symptoms. A cautiously monitored stress test appears safe and useful in patients with equivocal symptoms.

Introduction:

Aortic stenosis (AS) is a hemodynamically considerable constricting of the outlet of the left ventricle with multiple potential etiologies, whereas aortic sclerosis is a thickening or calcification of the aortic valve without obstruction to left ventricular outflow. Depending upon the level of the blockage, AS is classified as valvular, sub-valvular, or supra-valvular. The occurrence of valvular AS in the population aged 65 years or older is roughly 2%, while another 25-30% have aortic sclerosis [1] [2]. A regular aortic valve area is roughly 3-4 cm2, and symptoms of AS tend to develop when the aortic valve area is 1 cm2 or much less.

Aortic stenosis (AS) is a progressive disease that hemodynamically narrow the outlet of the ventricle with multiple potential etiologies. The aim of this review is to briefly explain the pathology and etiology. As well as to discuss the management methods and further progress and consequences of the AS.

Methodology:

We conducted a search using electronic databases; MEDLINE, EMBASE, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), through October, 2017. Search strategies used following MeSH terms in searching via these databases: “aortic stenosis”, “Management”, “Treatment”, “etiology”. Then we also searched the bibliographies of included studies for further relevant references to our review.

Discussion:

- **Etiology and Pathophysiology**

Aortic stenosis (AS) is one of the most common kind of cardiovascular disease in the Western world after hypertension and coronary artery disease. It is normally brought on by either degenerative calcification of a trileaflet valve or modern stenosis of a congenital bicuspid valve. Rheumatic cardiovascular disease, the most typical etiology worldwide, is less usual in the United States. Aortic stenosis creates from progressive calcification of leaflets with restriction of leaflet opening with time. The danger aspects for the advancement of degenerative calcific AS, which resemble those for the development of vascular atherosclerosis, include diabetes, hypertension, smoking, and raised levels of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol and lipoprotein(a) [3].Blockage of left ventricular (LV) outflow can also happen at the subvalvular degree (discrete subvalvular blockage, hypertrophic cardiomyopathy) or over the valve (supravalvular stenosis).

In patients with valvular AS, the intensity of stenosis increases gradually over years. The left ventricle adapts to the obstruction by enhancing wall thickness while maintaining regular LV chamber size (concentric hypertrophy). The growth of hypertrophy is an offsetting device to stabilize the LV wall tension and seems an essential component of ventricular efficiency in patients with AS. Left ventricular systolic function is typically preserved, and cardiac result is maintained for several years regardless of the pressure gradient throughout the aortic valve. In many patients, this compensatory mechanism can not be kept forever, and systolic function starts to decrease as a result of the pressure overload. If LV systolic disorder exists, it often improves after aortic valve replacement (AVR). Nonetheless, LV function will not boost if myocardial contractile dysfunction is irreversible [4].Distinction in between reversible and irreversible LV dysfunction is not possible on the basis of a preoperative resting imaging research study alone.

Concentric hypertrophy as an adaptive response to blockage could additionally be maladaptive [5].As stenosis severity progresses, the left ventricle ends up being less compliant and the LV diastolic pressure raises even though the ventricular size is normal. Thus, dyspnea on exertion might arise from LV systolic disorder or elevated diastolic filling pressures with managed systolic function [6].The raised wall surface thickness could additionally cause reduced coronary artery blood circulation each gram of muscle and reduced coronary flow reserve, resulting in angina pectoris even if the epicardial coronary arteries are typical.

- **Diagnosis**

Symptoms

The cardinal signs of aortic stenosis include dyspnea and various other symptoms of heart failure, angina, and syncope. Symptom onset determines medically considerable stenosis and the

requirement for immediate treatment [7].However, some patients with serious aortic stenosis- especially older patients- could not create classic symptoms originally and rather only experience a decrease in exercise resistance [8].Others may have an extra acute discussion, often with symptoms precipitated by concurrent medical conditions or therapies. For example, new-onset atrial fibrillation with a resultant decrease in atrial filling may bring about symptoms of heart failure, and initiation of vasodilator medicines could create syncope.

The timeless physical result of aortic stenosis is an extreme, late-peaking systolic murmur that is loudest over the 2nd right intercostal area and radiates to the carotid arteries. This could be accompanied by a sluggish and delayed carotid upstroke, a continual point of maximal impulse, and a lacking or diminished aortic second sound. Nevertheless, in older persons, the murmur might be less intense and frequently emits to the apex rather than to the carotid arteries. Likewise, the traditional carotid pulse modifications might be masked in individuals with atherosclerosis or hypertension.

Primary care physicians must take into consideration aortic stenosis in adults that provide with any of the cardinal symptoms accompanied by a systolic murmur. Furthermore, asymptomatic patients that have holosystolic and late systolic murmurs, grade 3 or louder mid-peaking systolic murmurs, or murmurs that radiate to the neck ought to be evaluated for aortic stenosis. A low-intensity murmur alone does not exclude aortic stenosis, particularly as LV systolic function deteriorates. The only physical examination result that could leave out severe aortic stenosis is a typically instant heart sound.

Diagnostic testing

Echocardiography is indicated in patients with a loud unexplained systolic murmur, a single second heart sound, a history of a bicuspid aortic valve, or symptoms that may be caused by aortic stenosis[9]. Transthoracic echocardiography, the recommended initial test for patients with suspected aortic stenosis, allows reliable identification of the number of valve leaflets and assessment of valve motion, leaflet calcification, and LV function[10]. The primary indices of stenosis severity are maximum transaortic velocity and the Doppler-derived mean pressure gradient (Table 1)[10]. Patients typically remain asymptomatic until maximum transvalvular velocity is more than four times the normal velocity or at least 4.0 m per second[11]. However, stenosis severity may be more difficult to assess in some patients who have only a moderately elevated transaortic velocity (3.0 to 4.0 m per second) but an aortic valve area less than 1.0 cm^2. If concurrent LV dysfunction is detected (ejection fraction [EF] less than 50%), these patients may have clinically significant “low-flow” aortic stenosis.

Table 1. Classification of Aortic Stenosis Severity [10].

CLASSIFICATION	TRANSAORTIC VELOCITY (M PER SECOND)	MEAN PRESSURE GRADIENT (MM HG)	AORTIC VALVE AREA (CM2)
Normal	< 2.0	< 10	3.0 to 4.0
Mild	2.0 to 2.9	10 to 19	1.5 to 2.9

Moderate	3.0 to 3.9	20 to 39	1.0 to 1.4
Severe	⩾ 4.0	⩾ 40	< 1.0

- **Referral and Treatment**

The presence or absence of symptoms, severity of aortic valve obstruction, and LV response to pressure overload are the primary drivers for clinical decision making in patients with aortic stenosis.

Aortic valve replacement

Echocardiography is indicated in patients with a loud unexplained systolic murmur, a single second heart noise, a history of a bicuspid aortic valve, or symptoms that might be caused by aortic stenosis [9].Transthoracic echocardiography, the recommended preliminary test for patients with presumed aortic stenosis, enables reliable identification of the number of valve leaflets and evaluation of valve movement, leaflet calcification, and LV function [10].The primary indices of stenosis intensity are maximum transaortic velocity and the Doppler-derived mean pressure gradient (Table 1) [10].Patients normally remain asymptomatic up until maximum transvalvular velocity is more than 4 times the regular speed or at least 4.0 m per 2nd [11].Nevertheless, stenosis intensity may be harder to assess in some patients who have just a reasonably raised transaortic speed (3.0 to 4.0 m each second) however an aortic valve area less than 1.0 cm2. If concurrent LV disorder is identified (ejection portion [EF] less than 50%), these patients could have clinically considerable "low-flow" aortic stenosis.

Traditional signs of aortic stenosis accompanied by echocardiographic findings regular with extreme stenosis need to cause cardiology assessment [12], [13].Although results in asymptomatic patients with aortic stenosis resemble those in age-matched control patients, survival is extremely poor as soon as also refined symptoms exist. Two-year death rates of 50% to 68%- most often secondary to congestive heart failure-have been reported in symptomatic older patients who did not undertake surgical therapy [14].

Aortic valve replacement is the only effective treatment for symptomatic, hemodynamically severe aortic stenosis. Surgical replacement leads to substantial improvement in survival, usually accompanied by sign improvement [15].The 10-year survival rate in Medicare-aged patients after aortic valve substitute is almost the same to that in age- and sex-matched persons who do not have aortic stenosis [16]. Although no randomized trials have compared aortic valve substitute with medical management in persons at reduced medical risk, observational studies revealing a more than fourfold difference in survival in between operatively and medically cured patients support the well-accepted suggestion that valve replacement be carried out immediately in symptomatic patients with severe aortic stenosis.

Cardiology recommendation is likewise suitable when a symptomatic patient is located to have moderate stenosis because it could cause the identification of low-flow, low-gradient severe aortic stenosis in spite of a typical EF (due to a little stroke volume in a patient with a little ventricular cavity). This circumstance is more usual in older women with hypertension. Additionally, if the EF is less than 50%, dobutamine stress echocardiography could expose severe aortic stenosis or prompt assessment for various other reasons for LV disorder.

Aortic valve replacement is also suggested for asymptomatic patients with extreme stenosis accompanied by LV systolic disorder (EF less than 50%). When extreme stenosis is discovered to be the primary pathology in this setting, aortic valve replacement is a lifesaving therapy and boosts LV function [17].Aortic valve substitute is also shown in asymptomatic patients with severe and even moderate stenosis that are undergoing cardiac surgical treatment for other signs; this prevents the need for repeat surgery once the valve disease inevitably proceeds.

Watchful waiting

Watchful waiting is recommended for most asymptomatic patients with aortic stenosis, including those with serious illness [10].Survival rates are comparable to those in patients without aortic stenosis, and the death danger in patients going through valve replacement surpasses the risk of premature death in asymptomatic patients with aortic stenosis.

Efforts have been made to recognize patients that are more probable to have poor outcomes without very early aortic valve substitute. Patients with extreme stenosis (transaortic velocity of at the very least 5.0 m per secondly) or a rapid rise in transaortic velocity over time (0.3 m each 2nd or more per year) have a high likelihood of coming to be symptomatic and of needing aortic valve replacement within the next one to two years. Valve replacement could be considered in these patients if they have a reduced medical risk. High-risk patients, involving those who do not live near a treatment facility, may require closer monitoring or factor to consider of possible advantages vs. dangers of early valve substitute [18].

It is essential to differentiate patients who are genuinely asymptomatic from those whose routine activity degree has discreetly lowered to listed below their symptom threshold. This is especially vital in older patients, who may connect their signs to normal aging or simultaneous disease. In

patients whose symptom condition is unclear, cautious exercise stress and anxiety examining could fairly assess exercise resistance or identify an abnormal blood pressure response (hypotension with exertion), potentially leading to a suggestion for aortic valve replacement [19].

- **Medical therapy**

In patients with calcific AS, there are currently no medical therapies that delay the progression of disease. However, medical therapy plays an important role in the treatment of common co-morbidities in patients with AS.

Cardiovascular risk reduction

In addition to discussing the advantages and risks of statin treatment and aspirin prophylaxis, the doctor needs to identify a patient's 10-year cardiovascular threat according to present standards. The overall danger of cardio events raises 1.5- to twofold in the visibility of aortic valve calcification, also in the lack of valvular stenosis [21].Other risk-reduction measures should consist of discontinuation of cigarette use and involvement in routine exercise if exertional symptoms are absent. Patients with light stenosis ought to not be restricted from physical activity. Asymptomatic patients with moderate to severe stenosis need to avoid affordable or strenuous activities that include high dynamic and fixed muscular demands, although other types of workout are safe [22].

Hypertension

Since calcific AS is a disease of the senior, concomitant hypertension is very common. In relatively young accomplices, the prevalence of hypertension was 30-40% [23], compared to 75% or higher in researches that consisted of older patients undergoing transcatheter AVR. There has been an under-appreciation of the prevalence of hypertension in AS patients and hesitation to

adequately treat it due to traditional teaching that AS is an illness with a "set afterload" and an emphasis on avoidance of vasodilators. Nevertheless, it is misleading to assume of AS as a disease with "fixed afterload." Without a doubt, raised vascular afterload acts as an additional load on the left ventricle and is associated with increased hypertrophic improvement and LV disorder in patients with AS [24] Raised global LV load- measured as the Zva(see above)- also hints an even worse end result [25].Thus, it is necessary to recognize and deal with hypertension in patients with AS. Uncontrolled hypertension could additionally mask the seriousness of AS so that AS extent should be re-evaluated after blood pressure control. There are no long-lasting prospective information sustaining any particular anti-hypertensive representative, yet given their possible favorable effects on hypertrophic LV renovation, ACE/ARB medications may be considered preferentially.

Atrial fibrillation

AS patients may end up being quite symptomatic with atrial fibrillation (AF), particularly when the ventricular response is fast, due to the fact that the atrial contribution to ventricular diastolic filling is particularly important in a little, hypertrophied ventricle with concomitant diastolic disorder. Rate and rhythm control as suggested by the medical circumstance is essential, as is anticoagulation according to management guidelines. The beginning of AF in an otherwise asymptomatic patient with serious AS could be a very early marker of sign start.

Coronary artery disease

CAD prevails in patients with AS, and guidelines for primary and secondary prevention need to be adhered to. These consist of the use of aspirin, statins, ß-blockers, ACE-inhibitors, and

aldosterone antagonists as indicated. While nitrates could be used for anginal symptoms, an excessive reduction in preload and/or afterload must be avoided.

Heart failure

In patients with severe AS, initial signs of heart failure typically occur in the setting of managed EF. Symptomatic patients require AVR, although diuretics are frequently utilized pre-operatively to reduce blockage and offer symptomatic relief [29].AVR is additionally indicated in patients with severe AS and a lowered LVEF, despite whether LV dysfunction results from chronic pressure overload or primary myocardial disease [29].However, some patients existing with heart failure signs in the setting of only mild or moderate AS and primary LV disorder. These patients need to be treated with basic heart failure therapies consisting of ß-blockers, ACE-inhibitors/ARBs, aldosterone antagonists, nitrates/hydralazine, and diuretics as clinically suggested.

Decompensated heart failure

Patients with severe AS may offer with sophisticated cardiac arrest signs and symptoms defined by pulmonary congestion, pulmonary high blood pressure, afterload mismatch, and lowered cardiac output. While AVR is shown, these patients go to considerable surgical danger [26].In high risk surgical patients, balloon valvuloplasty could modestly reduce AS severity, albeit momentarily. Additionally, systemic vascular resistance (SVR) could be targeted to unload the heart. Here, nitroprusside has been revealed to reduce wedge pressure and enhance cardiac output by decreasing SVR and raising LV contractility, which might stabilize patients with low output [27].Just recently, a single dose of sildenafil has been shown to unload both right and left ventricles in patients with extreme AS and advanced heart failure by reducing pulmonary and systemic vascular afterload [28].These initial outcomes increase the opportunity that medical

treatment could function as a maintaining bridge to definitive AVR in high-risk patients with advanced heart failure symptoms and reduced output.

Conclusion:

The progression of AS is very variable. At this point there are no medical therapies that have been proven to postpone the progression of AS. Aortic valve replacement is indicated for patients with symptomatic serious AS. In the great majority of patients with asymptomatic serious AS, the danger of surgery exceeds the danger of watchful waiting. There are clinical, echocardiographic and biochemical indicators which could help identify those likely to develop symptoms. A cautiously monitored stress test appears safe and useful in patients with equivocal symptoms.

Reference:

1. Otto CM, Lind BK, Kitzman DW, Gersh BJ, Siscovick DS. Association of aortic valve sclerosis with cardiovascular mortality and morbidity in the elderly. N Engl J Med. 1999;341:142–7.
2. Stewart BF, Siscovick D, Lind BK, et al. Clinical factors associated with calcific aortic valve disease. J Am Coll Cardiol. 1997;29:630–4.
3. Otto CM, Bonow RO. Valvular heart disease. In: Libby P, Bonow RO, Mann DL, Zipes DP, editors. , eds. Braunwald's Heart Disease: A Textbook of Cardiovascular Medicine 8th ed.Philadelphia, PA: WB Saunders; 2007:1625-1712.
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 Develop Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Valvular Heart Disease). Circulation2008;118:e523-e661
5. Levine RA, Schwammenthal E. Ischemic mitral regurgitation on the threshold of a solution: from paradoxes to unifying concepts. Circulation 2005;112:745-758 .
6. Enriquez-Sarano M, Avierinos JF, Messika-Zeitoun D, et al. Quantitative determinants of the outcome of asymptomatic mitral regurgitation. N Engl J Med. 2005;352(9):875-883.
7. Ross J, Jr, Braunwald E. Aortic stenosis. Circulation 1968;38(1)(suppl): 61-67 .
8. Bouma BJ, van den Brink RBA, van der Meulen JH, et al. To operate or not in elderly patients with aortic stenosis: the decision and its consequences. Heart 1999;82:143-148.
9. Munt B, Legget ME, Kraft CD, Miyake-Hull CY, Fujioka M, Otto CM. Physical examination in valvular aortic stenosis: correlation with stenosis severity and prediction of clinical outcome. Am Heart J. 1999;137(2):298–306.
10. Nishimura RA, Otto CM, Bonow RO, et al. 2014 AHA/ACC guideline for the management of patients with valvular heart disease: executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice

Guidelines [published correction appears in J Am Coll Cardiol. 2014;63(22):2489]. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2014;63(22):2438–2488.

11. Oh JK, Taliercio CP, Holmes DR Jr, et al. Prediction of the severity of aortic stenosis by Doppler aortic valve area determination: prospective Doppler-catheterization correlation in 100 patients. J Am Coll Cardiol. 1988;11(6):1227–1234.
12. Nishimura RA, Otto CM, Bonow RO, et al. 2014 AHA/ACC guideline for the management of patients with valvular heart disease: executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines [published correction appears in J Am Coll Cardiol. 2014;63(22):2489]. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2014;63(22):2438–2488.
13. Otto CM, Burwash IG, Legget ME, et al. Prospective study of asymptomatic valvular aortic stenosis. Clinical, echocardiographic, and exercise predictors of outcome. Circulation. 1997;95(9):2262–2270.
14. Pellikka PA, Sarano ME, Nishimura RA, et al. Outcome of 622 adults with asymptomatic, hemodynamically significant aortic stenosis during prolonged follow-up. Circulation. 2005;111(24):3290–3295.
15. Makkar RR, Fontana GP, Jilaihawi H, et al.; PARTNER Trial Investigators. Transcatheter aortic-valve replacement for inoperable severe aortic stenosis [published correction appears in N Engl J Med. 2012;367(9):881]. N Engl J Med. 2012;366(18):1696–1704.
16. Lindblom D, Lindblom U, Qvist J, Lundström H. Long-term relative survival rates after heart valve replacement. J Am Coll Cardiol. 1990;15(3):566–573.
17. Otto CM. Valvular aortic stenosis: disease severity and timing of intervention. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2006;47(11):2141–2151.
18. Rosenhek R, Binder T, Porenta G, et al. Predictors of outcome in severe, asymptomatic aortic stenosis. N Engl J Med. 2000;343(9):611–617.
19. Rajani R, Rimington H, Chambers JB. Treadmill exercise in apparently asymptomatic patients with moderate or severe aortic stenosis: relationship between cardiac index and revealed symptoms. Heart. 2010;96(9):689–695.
20. Maréchaux S, Hachicha Z, Bellouin A, et al. Usefulness of exercise-stress echocardiography for risk stratification of true asymptomatic patients with aortic valve stenosis. Eur Heart J. 2010;31(11):1390–1397.

21. Otto CM, Lind BK, Kitzman DW, Gersh BJ, Siscovick DS. Association of aortic-valve sclerosis with cardiovascular mortality and morbidity in the elderly. N Engl J Med. 1999;341(3):142–147.
22. Bonow RO, Cheitlin MD, Crawford MH, Douglas PS. Task Force 3: valvular heart disease. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2005;45(8):1334–1340.
23. Otto CM, Burwash IG, Legget ME, Munt BI, Fujioka M, Healy NL, Kraft CD, Miyake-Hull CY, Schwaegler RG. Prospective study of asymptomatic valvular aortic stenosis. Clinical,echocardiographic,exercise predictors of outcome. Circulation. 1997;95:2262–2270.
24. Briand M, Dumesnil JG, Kadem L, Tongue AG, Rieu R, Garcia D, Pibarot P. Reduced systemic arterial compliance impacts significantly on left ventricular afterload and function in aortic stenosis: implications for diagnosis and treatment. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2005;46:291–298.
25. Hachicha Z, Dumesnil JG, Pibarot P. Usefulness of the valvuloarterial impedance to predict adverse outcome in asymptomatic aortic stenosis. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2009;54:1003–1011.
26. Di Eusanio M, Fortuna D, De Palma R, Dell'Amore A, Lamarra M, Contini GA, Gherli T, Gabbieri D, Ghidoni I, Cristell D, Zussa C, Pigini F, Pugliese P, Pacini D, Di Bartolomeo R. Aortic valve replacement: results and predictors of mortality from a contemporary series of 2256 patients. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2011;141:940–947.
27. Khot UN, Novaro GM, Popovic ZB, Mills RM, Thomas JD, Tuzcu EM, Hammer D, Nissen SE, Francis GS. Nitroprusside in critically ill patients with left ventricular dysfunction and aortic stenosis. N Engl J Med. 2003;348:1756–1763.
28. Lindman BR, Zajarias A, Madrazo JA, Shah J, Gage BF, Novak E, Johnson SN, Chakinala MM, Hohn TA, Saghir M, Mann DL. Effects of phosphodiesterase type 5 inhibition on systemic and pulmonary hemodynamics and ventricular function in patients with severe symptomatic aortic stenosis. Circulation. 2012;125:2353–2362.
29. Bonow RO, Carabello BA, Kanu C, de Leon AC, Jr, Faxon DP, Freed MD, Gaasch WH, Lytle BW, Nishimura RA, O'Gara PT, O'Rourke RA, Otto CM, Shah PM, Shanewise JS, Smith SC, Jr, Jacobs AK, Adams CD, Anderson JL, Antman EM, Fuster V, Halperin JL, Hiratzka LF, Hunt SA, Nishimura R, Page RL, Riegel B. 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) Circulation. 2006;114:e84–231