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Reviewer's report:

An interesting trial about the quality of life, satisfaction and outcomes after ministernotomy versus full sternotomy access in isolated aortic valve replacement procedures.

The Trial is well designed. However, some English language editing is needed for improvement of the presentation.

* Background

This section could be rewritten to provide more details regarding the primary outcome and less details regarding secondary outcomes such as Mortality.

* Design

This study is single-blind. However, no details regarding the blinding process is given. A separate section for blinding could be added, delineating the different details of blinding.

* Secondary Outcome measures

It is mentioned that the AKIN criteria was used here to define acute renal failure. However, the KDIGO criteria is the most recent update of this definition. Please provide in-text a brief statement explaining the rationale for using the AKIN criteria.

* Sample Size

It is mentioned that a sample size of 100 patients will be used to account for any loss to follow-up. Please provide detail regarding the plan for any loss or withdrawals from the trial.
Ministernotomy

"Use of CO2 via drain at surgeon's criterion" This statement could be rewritten to clarify the meaning.

Finally, please provide a SPIRIT checklist and Figure to accompany the manuscript.

**Level of interest**
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

**Quality of figures**
All images and figures within the manuscript should be genuine i.e. without evidence of manipulation. No specific feature within an image may be enhanced, obscured, moved, removed, or introduced. If you have concerns about the veracity of the figures you should choose the first option below.

**Statistical review**
Is it essential that this manuscript is seen by an expert statistician? If so, please give your reasons in your report.
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