Supplementary Materials

Transcatheter Versus Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients with Cardiac Surgery: Meta-Analysis and Systematic Review of the Literature

Azka Latif [1,]*, Noman Lateef [1], Muhammad Junaid Ahsan [1], Vikas Kapoor [1], Rana Mohammad Usman [2], Stephen Cooper [1], Venkata Andukuri [1], Mohsin Mirza [1], Muhammad Zubair Ashfaq [1] and Rami Khouzam [3]

[1] Department of Internal Medicine, Creighton University, Omaha, NE 68124, USA; noman.mlateef@gmail.com (N.L.); junaidahsan333@gmail.com (M.J.A.); VikasKapoor@creighton.edu (V.K.); StephenCooper@creighton.edu (S.C.); VenkataAndukuri@creighton.edu (V.A.); Muhammad.Ashfaq@alegent.org (M.Z.A.); mohsin.mirza@creighton.edu (M.M.)

[2] Department of Internal Medicine, University of Tennessee, Memphis, TN 38152, USA; rusman@uthsc.edu

[3] Department of Cardiology, University of Tennessee, Memphis, TN 38152, USA; khouzamrami@yahoo.com

* Correspondence: azkalatif@creighton.edu; Tel.: +402-651-4961



Supplementary Figure 1: Forest Plot showing comparing the risk of acute kidney injury between transcather versus surgical aortic valve replacement.



Supplementary Figure 2: Forest Plot showing comparing the procedural time between transcather versus surgical aortic valve replacement.



Supplementary Figure 3: Forest Plot showing comparing the length of hospital stay between transcather versus surgical aortic valve replacement.