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Reviewer’s report:

In the present manuscript Minardi et al. compare the haemodynamic profile of 2 bioprostheses. The assessment is performed early after surgery and the haemodynamic profile is good and comparable between the 2 types of prosthesis. There are several issues that authors should address:

1. In the abstract section of the manuscript there are no numbers.
2. Authors state clearly that the echo assessment is performed early after surgery, with all the possible confounding factors in the haemodynamic assessment at such a stage (anemia etc.). Please address.
3. Please give the time (days/weeks) of echo assessment after surgery.
4. The mean EF is normal in the patient population. Did authors exclude patients with LV dysfunction? Please address.
5. Do authors have any data on the FU echo (at 1 year). These data would be important to prove their initial working hypothesis.
6. In line with the previous comment, if they do not have echo parameters at FU, it would be interesting to have data on the clinical FU.
7. The clinical significance of PPM is highly debated. In the patient population under investigation the percentage of patients with PPM is very high, particularly with the smaller prosthesis. These results would suggest that the measured PPM by echo does not have a clinical side (symptoms etc.). Please discuss.
8. Authors conclude that the haemodynamic profile of the 2 types of prostheses is comparable but this is not supported by their data since the incidence rate of PPM is significantly higher in the CEPs type. Please address.
9. The clinical implications of the present study are not clear. Authors should expand it and suggest a clinical algorithm in this set of patients.
10. In line with the previous comment, authors discuss the potential role of stress echocardiography to discern the real impact of PPM. Do they have data? Again, what is the clinical management and where stress echocardiography should be indicated in their clinical algorithm?
11. Due to the nature of the journal, it would be important to upload sample cases (clips, there is no space limit).
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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