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**Reviewer’s report:**

Dear authors,

The article entitled “Comparison 30-day clinical complications between transfemoral versus transapical aortic valve replacement for aortic stenosis: a meta-analysis review.” represents a metaanalysis on 30day outcomes comparing transfemoral and transapical transcatheter aortic valve implantation.

I have the following comments:

1. Your article has to undergo major language revision by a native speaker.
2. Out of 6509 included patients, almost 50% (2928) were from one single study out of 20 included studies. Could you comment on that, as this seems to introduce a significant bias.
3. The discussion is not appropriate given the large body of literature there is on TAVI. For example, another large meta-analysis with > 10,000 patients is not cited (Risk of stroke after transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI): a meta-analysis of 10,037 published patients. Eggebrecht H, Schmermund A, Voigtländer T, Kahlert P, Erbel R, Mehta RH. EuroIntervention. 2012 May 15;8(1):129-38. doi: 10.4244/EIJV8I1A20. Review.)
4. You should outline the difficulties in arranging a randomized trial comparing TA and TF, rather than just stating, that a RCT would be needed. Among TAVI implanters, most think we will never have a RCT on this topic.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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