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Reviewer's report:

Akca et al have described an interesting case of redo surgery for an calcified homograft. Overall the report is of good quality and highlights all the pertinent points. There is now a growing understanding that the Perceval valve is a good option for the calcified homograft and significantly shortens the procedure. A few key issues regarding the use of Perceval is worth discussing. First it is to do with the sizing as the remaining homograft annulus is usually not round and very calcified. The second is with method of deployment as not always is it possible to pass any sutures through the annulus due to the calcification. I believe this was the issue in this case. Akca et al describe this case as a bale out option which would account for the long operative time. There is no mention of the intra-operative gradient as the post operative one performed during follow-up is rather high and should be explained. This is likely to be the case if a valve is oversized (not properly expanded) or that there is mismatch. Whatever the cause is in this case it should be discussed. More information is required prior to publication.
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