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I. INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

It is essential in clinical practice to use an integrative approach when...
grading the severity of stenosis, combining all Doppler and 2D data, and not relying on one specific measurement. Loading conditions influence velocity and pressure gradients; therefore, these parameters vary depending on intercurrent illness of patients with low vs. high cardiac output. In addition, irregular rhythms or tachycardia can make assessment of stenosis severity problematic. Finally, echocardiographic measurements of valve stenosis must be interpreted in the clinical context of the individual patient. The same Doppler echocardiographic measures of stenosis severity may be clinically important for one patient but less significant for another.

II. AORTIC STENOSIS

Echocardiography has become the standard means for evaluation of aortic stenosis (AS) severity. Cardiac catheterization is no longer recommended except in rare cases when echocardiography is non-diagnostic or discrepant with clinical data.

This guideline details recommendations for recording and measurement of AS severity using echocardiography. However, although accurate quantitation of disease severity is an essential step in patient management, clinical decision-making depends on several other factors, most importantly symptom status. This echocardiographic standards document does not make recommendations for clinical management: these are detailed in the current guidelines for management of adults with valvular heart disease.

A. Causes and Anatomic Presentation

The most common causes of valvular AS are a bicuspid aortic valve with superimposed calcific changes, calcific stenosis of a trileaflet valve, and rheumatic valve disease (Figure 1). In Europe and the USA, bicuspid aortic valve disease accounts for ~50% of all valve replacements for AS. Calcification of a trileaflet valve accounts for most of the remainder, with a few cases of rheumatic AS. However, worldwide, rheumatic AS is more prevalent.

Anatomic evaluation of the aortic valve is based on a combination of short- and long-axis images to identify the number of leaflets, and to describe leaflet mobility, thickness, and calcification. In addition, the combination of imaging and Doppler allows the determination of the level of obstruction; subvalvular, valvular, or supravalvular. Transcatheter imaging usually is adequate, although transesophageal echocardiography (TEE) may be helpful when image quality is suboptimal.

A bicuspid valve most often results from fusion of the right and left coronary cusps, resulting in a larger anterior and smaller posterior cusp with both coronary arteries arising from the anterior cusp (~80% of cases), or fusion of the right and non-coronary cusps resulting in a larger right than left cusp with one coronary artery arising from each cusp (about 20% of cases). Fusion of the left and non-coronary cusps is rare. Diagnosis is most reliable when the two cusps are seen in systole with only two commissures framing an elliptical systolic orifice. Diastolic images may mimic a tricuspid valve when a raphe is present. Long-axis views may show an asymmetric closure line, systolic doming, or diastolic prolapse of the cusps but these findings are less specific than a short-axis systolic image. In children and adolescents, a bicuspid valve may be stenotic without extensive calcification. However, in adults, stenosis of a bicuspid aortic valve typically is due to superimposed calcific changes, which often obscures the number of cusps, making determination of bicuspid vs. tricuspid valve difficult.

Calcification of a tricuspid aortic valve is most prominent when the central part of each cusp and commissural fusion is absent, resulting in a stellate-shaped systolic orifice. With calcification of a bicuspid or tricuspid valve, the severity of valve calcification can be graded semi-quantitatively, as mild (few areas of dense echogenicity with little acoustic shadowing), moderate, or severe (extensive thickening and increased echogenicity with a prominent acoustic shadow). The degree of valve calcification is a predictor of clinical outcome.

Rheumatic AS is characterized by commissural fusion, resulting in a triangular systolic orifice, with thickening and calcification most prominent along the edges of the cusps. Rheumatic disease nearly always affects the mitral valve first, so that rheumatic aortic valve disease is accompanied by rheumatic mitral valve changes. Subvalvular or supravalvular stenosis is distinguished from valvular stenosis based on the site of the increase in velocity seen with colour or pulsed Doppler and on the anatomy of the outflow tract. Subvalvular obstruction may be fixed, due to a discrete membrane or muscular band, with haemodynamics similar to obstruction at the valvular level. Dynamic subaortic obstruction, for example, with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, refers to obstruction that changes in severity during ventricular ejection, with obstruction developing predominantly in mid-to-late systole, resulting in a late peaking velocity curve. Dynamic obstruction also varies with loading conditions, with increased ob-
struction when ventricular volumes are smaller and when ventricular contractility is increased.

Supravalvular stenosis is uncommon and typically is due to a congenital condition, such as Williams syndrome with persistent or recurrent obstruction in adulthood.

With the advent of percutaneous aortic valve implantation, anatomic assessment appears to become increasingly important for patient selection and planning of the intervention. Besides underlying morphology (bicuspid vs. tricuspid) as well as extent and distribution of calcification, the assessment of annulus dimension is critical for the choice of prosthesis size. For the latter, TEE may be superior to transthoracic echocardiography (TTE). However, standards still have to be defined.

B. How to Assess Aortic Stenosis (Tables 1 and 2)

B.1. Recommendations for Standard Clinical Practice (Level 1 Recommendation 5 appropriate in all patients with AS)

The primary haemodynamic parameters recommended for clinical evaluation of AS severity are:

- AS jet velocity
- Mean transaortic gradient
- Valve area by continuity equation.

### Table 1 Recommendations for data recording and measurement for AS quantitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data element</th>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LVOT diameter</td>
<td>2D parasternal long-axis view, Zoom mode, Adjust gain to optimize the blood tissue interface</td>
<td>Inner edge to inner edge, Mid-systole, Parallel and adjacent to the aortic valve or at the site of velocity measurement (see text), Diameter is used to calculate a circular CSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVOT velocity</td>
<td>Pulsed-wave Doppler, Apical long axis or five-chamber view, Sample volume positioned just on LV side of valve and moved carefully into the LVOT if required to obtain laminar flow curve, Velocity baseline and scale adjusted to maximize size of velocity curve, Time axis (sweep speed) 100 mm/s, Low wall filter setting, Smooth velocity curve with a well-defined peak and a narrow velocity range at peak velocity</td>
<td>Maximum velocity from peak of dense velocity curve, VTI traced from modal velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS jet velocity</td>
<td>CW Doppler (dedicated transducer), Multiple acoustic windows (e.g. apical, suprasternal, right parasternal, etc), Decrease gains, increase wall filter, adjust baseline, and scale to optimize signal, Gray scale spectral display with expanded time scale, Velocity range and baseline adjusted so velocity signal fits but fills the vertical scale</td>
<td>Maximum velocity at peak of dense velocity curve, Avoid noise and fine linear signals, VTI traced from outer edge of dense signal curve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valve anatomy</td>
<td>Parasternal long- and short-axis views, Zoom mode</td>
<td>Identify number of cusps in systole, raphe if present, Assess cusp mobility and commissural fusion, Assess valve calcification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.1.1. Jet velocity. The antegrade systolic velocity across the narrowed aortic valve, or aortic jet velocity, is measured using continuous-wave (CW) Doppler (CWD) ultrasound.8–10 Accurate data recording mandates multiple acoustic windows in order to determine the highest velocity (apical and suprasternal or right parasternal most frequently yield the highest velocity; rarely subcostal or supraclavicular windows may be required). Careful patient positioning and adjustment of transducer position and angle are crucial as velocity measurement assumes a parallel intercept angle between the ultrasound beam and direction of blood flow, whereas the 3D direction of the aortic jet is unpredictable and usually cannot be visualized. AS jet velocity is defined as the highest velocity signal obtained from any window after a careful examination; lower values from other views are not reported. The acoustic window that provides the highest aortic jet velocity is noted in the report and usually remains constant on sequential studies in an individual patient.

Occasionally, colour Doppler is helpful to avoid recording the CWD signal of an eccentric mitral regurgitation (MR) jet, but is usually not helpful for AS jet direction. Any deviation from a parallel intercept angle results in velocity underestimation; however, the degree of underestimation is 5% or less if the intercept angle is within 15° of parallel. ‘Angle correction’ should not be used because it is likely to introduce more error given the unpredictable jet direction. A
A dedicated small dual-crystal CW transducer is recommended both due to a higher signal-to-noise ratio and to allow optimal transducer positioning and angulation, particularly when suprasternal and right parasternal windows are used. However, when stenosis is only mild (velocity $<3$ m/s) and leaflet opening is well seen, a combined imaging-Doppler transducer may be adequate.

The spectral Doppler signal is recorded with the velocity scale adjusted so the signal fills, but fits, on the vertical axis, and with a time scale on the x-axis of 20 or 30 echo. Wall (or high pass) filters are set at a high level and gain is decreased to optimize identification of the velocity curve. Grey scale is used because this scale maps signal strength using a decibel scale that allows visual separation of noise and transit time effect from the velocity signal. In addition, all the validation and interobserver variability studies were done using this mode. Colour scales have variable approaches to matching signal strength to colour hue or intensity and are not recommended unless a decibel scale can be verified.

A smooth velocity curve with a dense outer edge and clear maximum velocity should be recorded. The maximum velocity is measured at the outer edge of the dark signal; fine linear signals at the peak of the curve are due to the transit time effect and should not be included.

Table 2: Measures of AS severity obtained by Doppler echocardiography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of AS severity obtained by Doppler echocardiography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS jet velocity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Units</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS jet velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean gradient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity equation valve area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplified continuity equation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velocity Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planimetry of Anatomic Valve Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV % Stroke Work Loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovered Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Loss Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valvular-Arterial Impedance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aortic Valve Resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Valve Area at Normal Flow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation for clinical application: (1) appropriate in all patients with AS (yellow); (2) reasonable when additional information is needed in selected patients (green); and (3) not recommended for clinical use (blue).

**VR**, Velocity ratio; **TVI**, time-velocity integral; **LVOT**, LV outflow tract; **AS**, AS jet; **TTE** and **TEE**, transthoracic and transesophageal echocardiography; **SWL**, stroke work loss; $\Delta P$, mean transvalvular systolic pressure gradient; **SBP**, systolic blood pressure; $P_{rest}$, pressure at the ascending aorta; $AA$, size of the ascending aorta; **ELI**, energy-loss coefficient; **BSA**, body-surface area; **AVR**, aortic valve resistance; $Q$, mean systolic transvalvular flow-rate; $AVA_{proj}$, projected aortic valve area; $AVA_{rest}$, AVA at rest; $VC$, valve compliance derived as the slope of regression line fitted to the AVA versus $Q$ plot; $Q_{rest}$, flow at rest; **DSE**, dobutamine stress echocardiography; **N**, number of instantaneous measurements.
which varies with stenosis severity and flow rate. The mean transaortic gradient is easily measured with current echocardiography systems and provides useful information for clinical decision-making. Transaortic pressure gradient ($\Delta P$) is calculated from velocity ($v$) using the Bernoulli equation as:

$$\Delta P = 4v^2$$

The maximum gradient is calculated from maximum velocity:

$$\Delta P_{\text{max}} = 4v_{\text{max}}^2$$

and the mean gradient is calculated by averaging the instantaneous gradients over the ejection period, a function included in most clinical instrument measurement packages using the traced velocity curve. Note that the mean gradient requires averaging of instantaneous mean gradients and cannot be calculated from the mean velocity.

This clinical equation has been derived from the more complex Bernoulli equation by assuming that viscous losses and acceleration effects are negligible and by using an approximation for the constant that relates to the mass density of blood, a conversion factor for measurement units.

In addition, the simplified Bernoulli equation assumes that the proximal velocity can be ignored, a reasonable assumption when velocity is $<1$ m/s because squaring a number $<1$ makes it even smaller. When the proximal velocity is over 1.5 m/s or the aortic velocity is $<3.0$ m/s, the proximal velocity should be included in the Bernoulli equation so that

$$\Delta P = 4(v_{\text{max}}^2 - v_{\text{proximal}}^2)$$

when calculating maximum gradients. It is more problematic to include proximal velocity in mean gradient calculations as each point on the ejection curve for the proximal and jet velocities would need to be matched and this approach is not used clinically. In this situation, maximum velocity and gradient should be used to grade stenosis severity.

**Sources of error for pressure gradient calculations**

In addition to the above-mentioned sources of error (malalignment of jet and ultrasound beam, recording of MR jet, neglect of an elevated proximal velocity), there are several other limitations of transaortic pressure gradient calculations. Most importantly, any underestimation of aortic velocity results in an even greater underestimate in gradients, due to the squared relationship between velocity and pressure difference. There are two additional concerns when comparing pressure gradients calculated from Doppler velocities to pressures measured at cardiac catheterization. First, the peak gradient calculated from the maximum Doppler velocity represents the maximum instantaneous pressure difference across the valve, not the difference between the peak LV and peak aortic pressure measured from the pressure tracings. Note that peak LV and peak aortic pressure do not occur at the same point in time; so, this difference does not represent a physiological measurement and this peak-to-peak difference is less than the maximum instantaneous pressure difference. The second concern is the phenomenon of pressure recovery (PR). The conversion of potential energy to kinetic energy across a narrowed valve results in a high velocity and a drop in pressure. However, distal to the orifice, flow decelerates again. Although some of the kinetic energy dissipates into heat due to turbulences and viscous losses, some of the kinetic energy will be reconverted into potential energy with a corresponding increase in pressure, the so-called PR. Pressure recovery is greatest in stenoses with gradual distal widening since occurrence of turbulences is then
reduced. Aortic stenosis with its abrupt widening from the small orifice to the larger aorta has an unfavourable geometry for pressure recovery. In AS, PR (in mmHg) can indeed be calculated from the Doppler gradient that corresponds to the initial pressure drop across the valve (i.e. $4v^2$), the effective orifice area as given by the continuity equation (EOA) and the cross-sectional area (CSA) of the ascending aorta (AoA) by the following equation: 

$$PR = \frac{4v^2 	imes 2EOA/AoA \times (1-EOA/AoA)}{CSA/AoA}.$$ 

Thus, PR is basically related to the ratio of EOA/AoA. As a relatively small EOA is required to create a relevant gradient, AoA must also be relatively small to end up with a ratio favouring PR. For clinical purposes, aortic sizes, therefore, appear to be the key player and PR must be taken into account primarily in patients with a diameter of the ascending aorta <30 mm. It may be clinically relevant particularly in congenital AS. However, in most adults with native AS, the magnitude of PR is small and can be ignored as long as the diameter of the aorta is >30 mm. When the aorta is <30 mm, however, one should be aware that the initial pressure drop from LV to the vena contracta as reflected by Doppler measurement may be significantly higher than the actual net pressure drop across the stenosis, which represents the pathophysiological relevant measurement.

Current guidelines for decision-making in patients with valvular heart disease recommend non-invasive evaluation with Doppler echocardiography. Cardiac catheterization is not recommended except in cases where echocardiography is non-diagnostic or is discrepant with clinical data. The prediction of clinical outcomes has been primarily studied using Doppler velocity data.

### B.1.3. Valve area

Doppler velocity and pressure gradients are flow dependent; for a given orifice area, velocity and gradient increase with an increase in transaortic flow rate, and decrease with a decrease in flow rate. Calculation of the stenotic orifice area or aortic valve area (AVA) is helpful when flow rates are very low or very high, although even the degree of valve opening varies to some degree with flow rate (see below).

Aortic valve area is calculated based on the continuity-equation (Figure 4) concept that the stroke volume (SV) ejected through the LV outflow tract (LVOT) all passes through the stenotic orifice (AVA) and thus SV is equal at both sites:

$$SV_{AV} = SV_{LVOT}$$

Because volume flow rate through any CSA is equal to the CSA times flow velocity over the ejection period (the VTI of the systolic velocity curve), this equation can be rewritten as:

$$AVA \times VTI_{AV} = CSA_{LVOT} \times VTI_{LVOT}$$

Solving for AVA yields the continuity equation:

$$AVA = \frac{CSA_{LVOT} \times VTI_{LVOT}}{VTI_{AV}}$$
Calculation of continuity-equation valve area requires three measurements:

- AS jet velocity by CWD
- LVOT diameter for calculation of a circular CSA
- LVOT velocity recorded with pulsed Doppler.

AS jet velocity is recorded with CWD and the VTI is measured as described above.

**Left ventricular outflow tract stroke volume**

Accurate SV calculations depend on precisely recording the LVOT diameter and velocity. It is essential that both measurements are made at the same distance from the aortic valve. When a smooth velocity curve can be obtained at the annulus, this site is preferred (i.e. particularly in congenital AS with doming valve). However, flow acceleration at the annulus level and even more proximally occurs in many patients, particularly those with calcific AS, so that the sample volume needs to be moved apically from 0.5 to 1.0 cm to obtain a laminar flow curve without spectral dispersion. In this case, the diameter measurement should be made at this distance from the valve (Figure 5). However, it should be remembered that LVOT becomes progressively more elliptical (rather than circular) in many patients, which may result in underestimation of LVOT CSA and in consequence underestimation of SV and eventually AVA.\(^\text{16}\) Diameter is measured from the inner edge to inner edge of the septal endocardium, and the anterior mitral leaflet in mid-systole. Diameter measurements are most accurate using the zoom mode with careful angulation of the transducer and with gain and processing adjusted to optimize the images. Usually three or more beats are averaged in sinus rhythm, averaging of more beats is appropriate with irregular rhythms (at least 5 consecutive beats). With careful attention to the technical details, diameter can be measured in nearly all patients. Then, the CSA of the LVOT is calculated as the area of a circle with the limitations mentioned above:

\[
\text{CSA}_{\text{LVOT}} = \pi \left( \frac{D}{2} \right)^2
\]

where \( D \) is diameter. LVOT velocity is recorded with pulsed Doppler from an apical approach, in either the anteriorly angulated four-chamber view (or 'five-chamber view') or in the apical long-axis view. The pulsed-Doppler sample volume is positioned just proximal to the aortic valve so that the location of the velocity recording matches the LVOT diameter measurement. When the sample volume is optimally positioned, the recording (Figure 6) shows a smooth velocity curve with a well-defined peak, narrow band of velocities throughout systole. As mentioned above, this may not be the case in many patients at the annulus due to flow convergence resulting in spectral dispersion. In this case, the sample volume is then slowly moved towards the apex until a smooth velocity curve is obtained. The VTI is measured by tracing the dense modal velocity throughout systole.\(^\text{17}\)

**Limitations of continuity-equation valve area**

The clinical measurement variability for continuity-equation valve area depends on the variability in each of the three measurements, including both the variability in acquiring the data and variability in measuring the recorded data. AS jet and LVOT velocity measurements have a very low intra- and interobserver variability (\( \sim 3-4\% \)), both for data recording and measurement in an experienced laboratory. However, the measurement variability for LVOT diameter ranges from 5\% to 8\%. When LVOT diameter is squared for calculation of CSA, it becomes the greatest potential source of error in the continuity equation. When transthoracic images are not adequate for the measurement of LVOT diameter, TEE measurement is recommended if this information is needed for clinical decision-making.

Accuracy of SV measurements in the outflow tract also assumes laminar flow with a spatially flat profile of flow (i.e. velocity is the same in the centre and at the edge of the flow stream). When subaortic flow velocities are abnormal, for example, with dynamic
subaortic obstruction or a subaortic membrane, SV calculations at this site are not accurate. With combined stenosis and regurgitation, high subaortic flow rates may result in a skewed flow profile across the outflow tract that may limit the accuracy. When LVOT velocity must be measured with some distance to annulus due to flow convergence, the velocity profile may no longer be flat but rather skewed with highest velocities present at the septum. Placement of the sample volume in the middle of the LVOT cross-section may nevertheless give a measurement reasonably close to the average. Placement closer to the septum or the mitral anterior leaflet may, however, yield higher or lower measurements, respectively.

Continuity-equation valve area calculations have been well validated in both clinical and experimental studies. In addition, continuity-equation valve areas are a reliable parameter for prediction of clinical outcome and for clinical decision-making. Of course, valve area calculations are dependable only when there is careful attention to technical aspects of data acquisition and measurement as detailed above. In addition, there are some theoretical concerns about continuity-equation valve areas.

First, the continuity-equation measures the effective valve area—the area of the flow stream as it passes through the valve—not the anatomic valve area. The effective valve area is smaller than the anatomic valve area due to contraction of the flow stream in the orifice, as determined by the contraction and discharge coefficients for a given orifice geometry. Although, the difference between effective and anatomic valve area may account for some of the discrepancies between Doppler continuity equation and catherization Gorlin equation valve areas, there now are ample clinical-outcome data validating the use of the continuity equation. The weight of the evidence now supports the concept that effective, not anatomic, orifice area is the primary predictor of clinical outcome.

The second potential limitation of valve area as a measure of stenosis severity is the observed changes in valve area with changes in flow rate. In adults with AS and normal LV function, the effects of flow rate on valve area can be used to diagnostic advantage in AS with LV dysfunction. However, the effect of flow rate on valve area calculations are dependable only when there is careful attention to technical aspects of data acquisition and measurement as detailed above. In addition, there are some theoretical concerns about continuity-equation valve areas.

When serial measurements are performed during follow-up, any significant changes in results should be checked in detail:

- make sure that aortic jet velocity is recorded from the same window with the same quality (always report the window where highest velocities can be recorded).
- when AVA changes, look for changes in the different components incorporated in the equation. LVOT size rarely changes over time in adults.

**B.2. Alternate measures of stenosis severity (Level 2 Recommendation 5 reasonable when additional information is needed in selected patients) B.2.1. Simplified continuity equation.**

The simplified continuity equation is based on the concept that in native aortic valve stenosis the shape of the velocity curve in the outflow tract and aorta is similar so that the ratio of LVOT to aortic jet VTI is nearly identical to the ratio of the LVOT to aortic jet maximum velocity (V). Thus, the continuity equation can be simplified to:

\[
AVA = \frac{CSA_{LVOT} \times V_{LVOT}}{V_{AV}}
\]

This method is less well accepted because some experts are concerned that results are more variable than using VTIs in the equation.

**B.2.2. Velocity ratio.** Another approach to reducing error related to LVOT diameter measurements is removing CSA from the simplified continuity equation. This dimensionless velocity ratio expresses the size of the valvular effective area as a proportion of the CSA of the LVOT.

\[
\text{Velocity ratio} = \frac{V_{LVOT}}{V_{AV}}
\]

Substitution of the time-velocity integral can also be used as there was a high correlation between the ratio using time–velocity integral and the ratio using peak velocities. In the absence of valve stenosis, the velocity ratio approaches 1, with smaller numbers indicating more severe stenosis. Severe stenosis is present when the velocity ratio is 0.25 or less, corresponding to a valve area 25% of normal. To some extent, the velocity ratio is normalized for body size because it reflects the ratio of the actual valve area to the expected valve area in each patient, regardless of body size. However, this measurement ignores the variability in LVOT size beyond variation in body size.

**B.2.3. Aortic valve area planimetry.** Multiple studies have evaluated the method of measuring anatomic (geometric) AVA by direct visualization of the valvular orifice, either by 2D or 3D TTE or TEE. Planimetry may be an acceptable alternative when Doppler estimation of flow velocities is unreliable. However, planimetry may be inaccurate when valve calcification causes shadows or reverberations limiting identification of the orifice. Caution is also needed to ensure that the minimal orifice area is identified rather than a larger apparent area proximal to the cusp tips, particularly in congenital AS with a doming valve. In addition, as stated previously, effective, rather than anatomic, orifice area is the primary predictor of outcome.

**B.3. Experimental descriptors of stenosis severity (Level 3 Recommendation = not recommended for routine clinical use)** Other haemodynamic measurements of severity such as valve resistance, LV percentage stroke-work loss, and the energy-loss coefficient are based on different mathematical derivations of the relationship between flow and the trans-valvular pressure drop. Accounting for PR in the ascending aorta has demonstrated to improve the agreement between invasively and non-invasively derived measurements of the transvalvular pressure gradient, and is particularly useful in the presence of a high output state, a moderately narrowed valve orifice and, most importantly, a non-dilated ascending aorta.

A common limitation of most these new indices is that long-term longitudinal data from prospective studies are lacking. Consequently, a robust validation of clinical-outcome efficacy of all these indices is pending, and they are seldom used for clinical decision-making.

**B.4. Effects of concurrent conditions on assessment of severity B.4.1. Concurrent left ventricular systolic dysfunction.** When LV systolic dysfunction co-exists with severe AS, the AS velocity and gradient may be low, despite a small valve area; a condition termed ‘low-flow low-gradient AS’. A widely used definition of low-flow low-gradient AS includes the following conditions:
• Effective orifice area <1.0 cm², 1,33,34
• LV ejection fraction <40%; and
• Mean pressure gradient <30–40 mmHg

Dobutamine stress provides information on the changes in aortic velocity, mean gradient, and valve area as flow rate increases, and also provides a measure of the contractile response to dobutamine, measured by the change in SV or ejection fraction. These data may be helpful to differentiate two clinical situations:

• Severe AS causing LV systolic dysfunction. The transaortic velocity is flow dependent; so, LV failure can lead to a patient with severe AS having an apparently moderate transaortic peak velocity and mean pressure gradient associated with a small effective orifice area. In this situation, aortic valve replacement will relieve afterload and may allow the LV ejection fraction to increase towards normal.
• Moderate AS with another cause of LV dysfunction (e.g. myocardial infarct or a primary cardiomyopathy). The effective orifice area is then low because the LV does not generate sufficient energy to overcome the inertia required to open the aortic valve to its maximum possible extent. In this situation, aortic valve replacement may not lead to a significant improvement in LV systolic function.

A patient with a low ejection fraction but a resting AS velocity 4.0 m/s or mean gradient 40 mmHg does not have a poor left ventricle (LV). The ventricle is demonstrating a normal response to high afterload (severe AS), and ventricular function will improve after relief of stenosis. This patient does not need a stress echocardiogram.

The protocol for dobutamine stress echocardiography for evaluation of AS severity in setting of LV dysfunction uses a low dose starting at 2.5 or 5 mg/kg/min with an incremental increase in the infusion every 3–5 min to a maximum dose of 10–20 mg/kg/min. There is a risk of arrhythmia so there must be medical supervision and high doses of dobutamine should be avoided. The infusion should be stopped as soon as a positive result is obtained or when the heart rate begins to rise more than 10–20 bpm over baseline or exceeds 100 bpm, on the assumption that the maximum inotropic effect has been reached. In addition, dobutamine administration should also be terminated when symptoms, blood pressure fall, or significant arrhythmias occur.

Doppler data are recorded at each stage including LVOT velocity recorded from the apical approach. AS jet velocity optimally is recorded from the window that yields the highest velocity signal but some laboratories prefer to use comparative changes from an apical window to facilitate rapid data acquisition. The LVOT diameter is measured at baseline and the same diameter is used to calculate the continuity-equation valve area at each stage. Measurement of biplane ejection fraction at each stage is helpful to assess the improvement in LV contractile function.

The report of the dobutamine stress echocardiographic study should include AS velocity, mean gradient, valve area, and ejection fraction preferably at each stage (to judge reliability of measurements) but at least at baseline and peak dose. The role of dobutamine stress echocardiography in decision-making in adults with AS is controversial and beyond the scope of this document. The findings we recommend as reliable are:

• An increase in valve area to a final valve area >1.0 cm² suggests that stenosis is not severe. 35

For all other findings, more scientific data are required before they can be included in recommendations for clinical decision-making.

B.4.2. Exercise stress echocardiography. As described in the previous section, dobutamine stress echocardiography is applied to assess contractile reserve and AS severity in the setting of LV dysfunction. In addition, exercise stress echocardiography has been used to assess functional status and AS severity. Several investigators have suggested that the changes in haemodynamics during exercise study might provide a better index of stenosis severity than a single resting value. Specifically, impending symptom onset can be identified by a fixed valve area that fails to increase with an increase in transaortic volume flow rate. While clinical studies comparing groups of patients support this hypothesis and provide insight into the pathophysiology of the disease process, exercise stress testing to evaluate changes in valve area is not helpful in clinical decision-making in individual patients and therefore is currently not recommended for assessment of AS severity in clinical practice. While exercise testing has become accepted for risk stratification and assessment of functional class in asymptomatic severe AS, 1,2 it remains uncertain whether the addition of echocardiographic data is of incremental value in this setting. Although the increase in mean pressure gradient with exercise has been reported to predict outcome and provide information beyond a regular exercise test, 22 more data are required to validate this finding and recommend its use in clinical practice.

B.4.3. Left ventricular hypertrophy. Left ventricular hypertrophy commonly accompanies AS either as a consequence of valve obstruction or due to chronic hypertension. Ventricular hypertrophy typically results in a small ventricular cavity with thick walls and diastolic dysfunction, particularly in elderly women with AS. The small LV ejects a small SV so that, even when severe stenosis is present, the AS velocity and mean gradient may be lower than expected for a given valve area. Continuity-equation valve area is accurate in this situation. Many women with small LV size also have a small body size (and LVOT diameter), so indexing valve area to body size may be helpful.

B.4.4. Hypertension. Hypertension accompanies AS in 35–45% of patients. Although a recent in vitro study has demonstrated that systemic pressure may not directly affect gradient and valve area measurements, 37 increasing LV pressure load may cause changes in ejection fraction and flow. The presence of hypertension may therefore primarily affect flow and gradients but less AVA measurements. Nevertheless, evaluation of AS severity 38–40 with uncontrolled hypertension may not accurately reflect disease severity. Thus, control of blood pressure is recommended before echocardiographic evaluation, whenever possible. The echocardiographic report should always include a blood pressure measurement recorded at the time of the examination to allow comparison between serial echocardiographic studies and with other clinical data.

B.4.5. Aortic regurgitation. About 80% of adults with AS also have aortic regurgitation (AR) but regurgitation is usually only mild or moderate in severity and measures of AS severity are not significantly affected. When severe AR accompanies AS, measures of AS severity remain accurate including maximum velocity, mean gradient, and
C. How to Grade Aortic Stenosis

Aortic stenosis severity is best described by the specific numerical measures of maximum velocity, mean gradient, and valve area. However, general guidelines have been set forth by the ACC/AHA and ESC for categorizing AS severity as mild, moderate, or severe to provide guidance for clinical decision-making. In most patients, these three Level I recommended parameters, in conjunction with clinical data, evaluation of AR and LV functions, are adequate for clinical decision-making. However, in selected patients, such as those with severe LV dysfunction, additional measurements may be helpful. Comparable values for indexed valve area and the dimensionless velocity ratio have been indicated in Table 3, and the category of aortic sclerosis, as distinct from mild stenosis, has been added. When aortic sclerosis is present, further quantitation is not needed. In evaluation of a patient with valvular heart disease, these cut-off values should be viewed with caution; no single calculated number should be relied on for final judgement. Instead, an integrated approach considering AVA, velocity/gradient together with LVF, flow status, and clinical presentation is strongly recommended. The ACC/AHA and ESC Guidelines for management of valvular heart disease provide recommendations for classification of severity (Table 3).1,2

A normal AVA in adults is ~3.0–4.0 cm². Severe stenosis is present when valve area is reduced to ~25% of the normal size so that a value of 1.0 cm² is one reasonable definition of severe AS in adults. The role of indexing for body size is controversial, primarily because the current algorithms for defining body size [such as body-surface area (BSA)] do not necessarily reflect the normal AVA in obese patients, because valve area does not increase with excess body weight. However, indexing valve area for BSA is important in children, adolescents, and small adults as valve area may seem severely narrowed when only moderate stenosis is present. Another approach to indexing for body size is to consider the LVOT to AS velocity ratio, in addition to valve area, in clinical decision-making.

We recommend reporting of both AS maximum velocity and mean gradient. In observational clinical studies, a maximum jet velocity of 4 m/s corresponds to a mean gradient of ~40 mmHg and a maximum velocity of 3 m/s corresponds to a mean gradient of ~20 mmHg. Although there is overall correlation between peak gradient and mean gradient, the relationship between peak and mean gradients depends on the shape of the velocity curve, which varies with stenosis severity and flow rate.

In clinical practice, many patients have an apparent discrepancy in stenosis severity as defined by maximum velocity (and mean gradient) compared with the calculated valve area.

The first step in patients with either a valve area larger or smaller than expected for a given AS maximum velocity (or mean gradient)

---

Table 3 Recommendations for classification of AS severity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aortic sclerosis</th>
<th>Mild</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Severe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aortic jet velocity (m/s)</td>
<td>&lt;2.5 m/s</td>
<td>2.6–2.9</td>
<td>3.0–4.0</td>
<td>&gt;4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean gradient (mmHg)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>&lt;20 (&lt;30°)</td>
<td>20–40 (30–50°)</td>
<td>&gt;40° (&gt;50°)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWA (cm²)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>&gt;1.5</td>
<td>1.0–1.5</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexed AWA (cm²/m²)</td>
<td>&gt;0.85</td>
<td>0.60–0.85</td>
<td>≤0.6</td>
<td>≤0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velocity ratio</td>
<td>&gt;0.50</td>
<td>0.25–0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ESC Guidelines.*

*AHA/ACC Guidelines.*
is to verify the accuracy of the echocardiographic data (see above for sources of error).

The next step in evaluation of an apparent discrepancy in measure of AS severity is to evaluate LV ejection fraction and the severity of co-existing AR. If cardiac output is low due to small ventricular chamber or a low ejection fraction, a low AS velocity may be seen with a small valve area. If transaortic flow rate is high due to co-existing AR, valve area may be $> 1.0 \text{ cm}^2$ even though AS velocity and mean gradient are high. It may be useful to compare the SV calculated from the LVOT diameter and velocity with the SV measured on 2D echocardiography by the biplane apical method, to confirm a low or high transaortic volume flow rate.

When review of primary data confirms accuracy of measurements and there is no clinical evidence for a reversible high output state (e.g. sepsis, hyperthyroidism), the patient with an AS velocity of $> 4 \text{ m/s}^2$ and a valve area of $\geq 1.0 \text{ cm}^2$, most likely has only moderate AS/AR or a large body size. The AS velocity is a better predictor of clinical outcome than valve area in this situation and should be used to define valve disease as ‘severe’.

When review of primary data confirms accuracy of measurements and there is no clinical evidence for a low cardiac output state, the patient with an AS velocity of $< 4.0 \text{ m/s}$ and a valve area of $< 1.0 \text{ cm}^2$ most likely has only moderate AS with a small body size. The velocity of AS is a better measure of stenosis severity when body size is small and transvalvular flow rate is normal (Table 4).

### III. MITRAL STENOSIS

Echocardiography plays a major role in decision-making for MS, allowing for confirmation of diagnosis, quantitation of stenosis severity and its consequences, and analysis of valve anatomy.

#### A. Causes and Anatomic Presentation

Mitral stenosis is the most frequent valvular complication of rheumatic fever. Even in industrialized countries, the most cases remain of rheumatic origin as other causes are rare. Given the decrease in the prevalence of rheumatic heart diseases, MS has become the least frequent single left-sided valve disease. However, it still accounts for $\sim 10\%$ of left-sided valve diseases in Europe and it remains frequent in developing countries.42,43

The main mechanism of rheumatic MS is commissural fusion. Other anatomic lesions are chordal shortening and fusion, and leaflet thickening, and later in the disease course, superimposed calcification, which may contribute to the restriction of leaflet motion.

This differs markedly from degenerative MS, in which the main lesion is annular calcification. It is frequently observed in the elderly and associated with hypertension, atherosclerotic disease, and sometimes AS. However, calcification of the mitral annulus has few or no haemodynamic consequences when isolated and causes more often MR than MS. In rare cases, degenerative MS has haemodynamic consequences when leaflet thickening and/or calcification are associated. This is required to cause restriction of leaflet motion since there is no commissural fusion. Valve thickening or calcification predominates at the base of the leaflets whereas it affects predominantly the tips in rheumatic MS.

Congenital MS is mainly the consequence of abnormalities of the subvalvular apparatus. Other causes are rarely encountered: inflammatory diseases (e.g. systemic lupus), infiltrative diseases, carcinoid heart disease, and drug-induced valve diseases. Leaflet thickening and restriction are common here, while commissures are rarely fused.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 Resolution of apparent discrepancies in measures of AS severity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS velocity $&gt; 4 \text{ m/s}$ and $\text{AVA} &gt; 1.0 \text{ cm}^2$</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Check LVOT diameter measurement and compare with previous studies$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Check LVOT velocity signal for flow acceleration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Calculate indexed $\text{AVA}$ when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Height is $&lt; 135 \text{ cm}$ (5’5”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. BSA $&lt; 1.5 \text{ m}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. BMI $&lt; 22$ (equivalent to 55 kg or 120 lb at this height)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evaluate AR severity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluate for high cardiac output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. LVOT stroke volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. $2D \text{ LV EF}$ and stroke volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likely causes</strong>: high output state, moderate-severe AR, large body size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS velocity $\leq 4 \text{ m/s}$ and $\text{AVA} \leq 1.0 \text{ cm}^2$</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Check LVOT diameter measurement and compare with previous studies$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Check LVOT velocity signal for distance from valve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Calculate indexed $\text{AVA}$ when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Height is $&lt; 135 \text{ cm}$ (5’5”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. BSA $&lt; 1.5 \text{ m}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. BMI $&lt; 22$ (equivalent to 55 kg or 120 lb at this height)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evaluate for low transaortic flow volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. LVOT stroke volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. $2D \text{ LV EF}$ and stroke volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. MR severity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Mitral stenosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When $\text{EF} &lt; 55%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Assess degree of valve calcification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Consider dobutamine stress echocardiography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likely causes</strong>: low cardiac output, small body size, severe MR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. How to Assess Mitral Stenosis

**B.1. Indices of Stenosis Severity**

**B.1.1. Pressure gradient (Level 1 Recommendation).** The estimation of the diastolic pressure gradient is derived from the transmitral velocity flow curve using the simplified Bernoulli equation $\Delta P = 4v^2$. This estimation is reliable, as shown by the good correlation with invasive measurement using transseptal catheterization.44

The use of CWD is preferred to ensure maximal velocities are recorded. When pulsed-wave Doppler is used, the sample volume should be placed at the level or just after leaflet tips.

Doppler gradient is assessed using the apical window in most cases as it allows for parallel alignment of the ultrasound beam and mitral inflow. The ultrasound Doppler beam should be oriented to minimize the intercept angle with mitral flow to avoid underestimation of velocities. Colour Doppler in apical view is useful to identify eccentric diastolic mitral jets that may be encountered in cases of severe deformity of valvular and subvalvular apparatus. In these cases, the Doppler beam is guided by the highest flow velocity zone identified by colour Doppler.

Optimization of gain settings, beam orientation, and a good acoustic window are needed to obtain well-defined contours of the Doppler flow. Maximal and mean mitral gradients are calculated by integrated software using the trace of the Doppler diastolic mitral