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Reviewer's report:

I read this article with great interest. I would like to congratulate the authors with this well designed analysis of the cost-utility of percutaneous mitral valve repair.

Some comments to the manuscript:

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. In line 103 you did not specify the source of the excessive all-cause mortality.

Discretionary Revisions:
2. What is the high prevalence of patients with heart failure and FMR? Can you support this with any data?

3. In line 58 you mention the QRS interval. Since I don't have a medical background, I am not familiar with this term. Maybe you should explain this shortly?

4. In Table 1 there is no transition probability for the optical medical treatment arm (cycles 2-11) to go from NYHA class II to III, while it is possible to go from II to II or II to IV.

I wonder if this is correct? Shouldn't there be a probability to go from II to III as well?

5. There were two long sentences (40-42 and 205-209) that were difficult to read. I would suggest splitting them up in two separate sentences.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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