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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to the Reviewers’ Comments

We would like to thank Professor Vipin Zamvar, Editor of the Journal of Cardiothoracic Surgery, the Editorial Board, and the reviewers for the careful and constructive evaluation of our manuscript entitled “Giant unruptured sinus of Valsalva aneurysm successfully managed with valve-sparing procedure – a case report”. We appreciate the opportunity to revise the manuscript and the possibility of reconsidering it for publication. According to the editors’ and referees’ comments, we revised our manuscript. Please find below our point-by-point responses to the comments of the editors and reviewers. All changes are marked with red in a separate document. A clean version of the new manuscript is also uploaded. We feel to have addressed all the criticized points of this manuscript.

We would like to express our thanks to all three Reviewers for the careful evaluation of the manuscript and the helpful and constructive suggestions.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1:
Dear Authors,
Your manuscript is well written, however it deserve some comments.
Response: First of all, we thank you for your thoughtful evaluation of our manuscript. A reference in the Conclusions paragraph is not usual (line 37): it is better to remove it.

Response: As suggested, we removed the reference and rephrased the sentence.

Have you a volume rendering of the giant sinus to replace panel B in figure 1?
Response: Thanks for the good suggestion, we have inserted a new figure 4 with volume rendering of the CTA as requested.

Have you a longer follow-up?
Response: Thanks to the Reviewer for this raised concern. The first regular follow up was done with good results, we are waiting for the one year echo check.

There are excessive references; you can cut some of them.
Response: As advised, we have removed some of the references.

Reviewer #2:
The authors present a case highlighting an important indication when valve sparing root repair can be performed for treatment of a rare condition involving sinus of Valsalva aneurysms that are typically treated with complete replacement of aortic root along with valve. I congratulate the authors for their technical success in treatment of this interesting case.
Response: We thank you for your comprehensive and constructive review.

Minor Comments:
1. Although the abstract summarizes the case well, however, the outcome of the case in follow-up should be discussed as well.
Response: As advised, we added the most recent follow-up results in the abstract.

2. Can the authors comment on the etiology or potential risk factors for developing the large aneurysm of the Valsalva?
Response: Thanks for this comment. The potential risks are connective tissue disorders, atherosclerotic plaques, hypertension, bicuspid aortic valve. In such conditions, yearly echocardiography should be performed to rule out rapid enlargement of the Sinuses.

3. Minor language and structural edits are advised for instance on
- page 4 line 5 - "in less than 1% of the cases in cardiac surgery," a reference in support of the statement is required
Response: Thank you for the observation, we added a reference that supports our statement.
- page 4 line 6- citation should be provided for the statement "an incidence of less than 3.5% of all congenital heart defects"
Response: We added a reference to support the affirmation.
- page 4 line 11 - needs attention as the authors are not discussing the reference quoted in the previous line - do they mean "has been shown to be correlated?" (see attached pdf for comments);
Response: Thank you for underlining this aspect, we corrected the expression as advised.
- page 4 lines 17-18 - delete in and rephrase to "around 44% of the cases SVAs were associated"
Response: We rephrased the sentence to "...around 44% of SVAs were associated...".
- page 4 lines 31-32- "Still, published literature on SVA reports few cases in which valve-sparing was preferred over complete replacement" - should it not be something along the line of "Despite these advances, there are only a few reports in the current published literature demonstrating that valve-sparing technique was preferred over complete replacement in treatment of SVA"
Response: We rephrased the structure based on your suggestion.
- page 4 lines 54-55 - consider rephrasing to "progressive worsening or long-standing progression?" instead of "lengthy evolution"
Response: We replaced the construction "lengthy evolution" with "long-standing progression".
- page 6 line 30 and 34/35- please consider rephrasing to "giant or large" instead of gigantic.
Response: We rephrased the sentences as advised.
4. Is there follow-up available beyond 1 month? 
Response: Thanks to the Reviewer for this important question. The first regular follow up was done with good results, we are waiting for the one year echo check.

Reviewer #3:
Dear Authors
Thank you very much for your submission. 
I found it well written with good structure. 
It is an interesting scenario. 
Valve sparing root replacement in an established procedure with aortic root aneurysm. 
In this particular case, there is added complexity requiring additional modifications to the procedure. 
Congratulations on achieving a successful outcome. 
Response: We thank you for your careful and considerate review.
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