

Supplementary Table 1: Baseline characteristics of study population

	Emergency TAVI N=23	Emergency BAV N=118	Elective TAVI after eBAV N=32
NYHA I-	0	0	0
NYHA II	0	0	20.7% 6/29
NYHA III	4.3% 1/23	5.2% 6/115	62.1% 18/29
NYHA IV	95.7% 22/23	94.8% 109/115	17.2% 5/29
EF%:			
Good (>50%)	30.4% 7/23	29.7% 33/111	30.4% 7/23
Moderate (31-50%)	47.8% 11/23	33.3% 37/111	39.1% 9/23
Poor (21-30%)	17.4% 4/23	30.6% 34/111	30.4% 7/23
Very poor (<20%)	4.3% 1/23	6.3% 7/111	0
Valve Area (cm²)	0.59±0.05	0.60±0.02	0.67±0.04
Moderate or severe Aortic Regurgitation	6.7% 1/15	14.3% 13/91	25.0% 6/24
Moderate or severe Mitral Regurgitation	20.0% 3/15	16.5% 15/91	34.4% 11/32
Resuscitation	8.7% 2/23	15.6% 17/109	3.1% 1/32

Supplementary Table 2: adjusted Cox models eTAVI vs eBAV

	With censoring at time of elective TAVI			Without censoring at the time of elective TAVI		
eTAVI vs eBAV	Adjusted for Aortic Regurgitation	Adjusted for Mitral Regurgitation	Adjusted for Reanimation	Adjusted for Aortic Regurgitation	Adjusted for Mitral Regurgitation	Adjusted for Reanimation
Overall survival	0.35 (0.11, 1.16), p=0.09	0.41 (0.13, 1.34), p=0.14	0.54 (0.26, 1.15), p=0.11	0.37 (0.11, 1.21), p=0.10	0.39 (0.12, 1.28), p=0.12	0.56 (0.27, 1.17), p=0.12

The survival analyses have also been adjusted, both with and without censoring at the time of the elective TAVI, for aortic regurgitation, mitral regurgitation and reanimation, respectively. Results are presented in the table above in terms of hazard ratios, with 95% CI and p values, comparing emergency TAVI with emergency BAV. Consistent with previous results, the estimates suggest improved survival following emergency TAVI but there is not statistically significant evidence of a difference.