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Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors. Some comments and suggestions to try to help your nice paper.

-Logistic Eurscore- it's known this score was not developed for valve surgery and overestimates in about 3 times the mortality. The best score would be STS or EuroScore II or scores specific for valve surgery.

-Patient population is old (average age 75 years). The older the patient more is valve durability. As the follow up period is short it would be nice to see what happens to these valves in a younger population where the durability is supposed to be lower.

What is the usual lower age limit to indicate a biological prosthesis in your centers? How many patients received a mechanical valve at the same period? Another interesting data would be how many TAVIs were implanted at these institutions during the study period?

-30 months mean follow up is a relatively short period to evaluate valve durability, even in this relatively old population.

-What was the anticoagulation/antiplatelet treatment regime and for how long in the PO period?

-5 endocarditis occurred during follow up. How many of this patients were operated for native valve endocarditis?

-The authors recognized the study limitations such as the small sample size, lack of control group with other bioprosthesis and relatively short follow up period.

-The hemodynamic performance of this valve was quite good as shown in other studies.
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