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Reviewer's report:

Overall a good revision especially the statistical section, however, minor issues still remain.

For future reference, provide a version with marked changes throughout the manuscript. As the current version is, it is not clear what has been added. However, there exists disagreement between point-by-point response and the manuscript.

4.4. The authors argument that TAVI is advocated on the basis equal complications but shorter recovery and improved QOL (1 month) although only shown as secondary outcomes. This is the valid and relevant argument. Therefore, write this in the text instead of the current poorly formulated text with conflicting versions R1, R2 and R3.

QOL have always been relevant to the patient, however, clinicians have not given it relevant focus.

4.10. Please provide concrete corrections instead of mentioning something has been performed to the manuscript. Again a version with marked changes is relevant so the review process can be transparent.

4.11. This issue has not been addressed. If the authors cannot provide a proper reference then simply write it, so it is transparent.

4.12. Fair if reference 26 is the SATSCORE. However, if you have a reference then use it in the body of the manuscript. Reference 26 is only mentioned in the sample size calculation on a topic of EQ-5D-5L.
4.17. How was the manuscripts modified?

4.22. Good additional patients are included if drop-out or exclusion should occur.

Where specifically is this mentioned in the manuscript?

And essentially what time-point will be considered for additional inclusion. 1 month, 6 months or the relevant 12 months assessment?

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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