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**Reviewer's report:**

By reading the abstract, we got a clear message, that there is no difference between TAVI and SAVR. I suggest to modify the article name by highlighting this result, for example: No difference in outcome between…. Keeping "a systematic review and meta-analysis"

I would ask the author about the PROSPERO registration code. If not applicable, I would just ask to remind for their future publications.

About the study selection, I would ask a k-agreement between reviewers. Anyway the process of articles to be included and data extraction is well performed.

Down and black scale for risk assessment of bias would be of interest and recommended.

Risk of bias should be analyzed in its chapter. Above all by adding: check supplementary material #3 in its chapter.

Very good organization of the tables and format.

I would ask the authors to justify the choice of random effect model with few sentences.

I would ask author to suggest and discuss other variables that could help in choice of the best treatment and to which ways future research could be addressed; first according to their experience if possible, than trying to understand which variables could influence in the different outcomes if it is researchable in the literature. For example, I could be the responsible of the surgery team. I have to choose between the two kinds of intervention. By a new title, I could quickly read about the result. In the conclusion chapter I would check for more details about variables that could influence the outcome. This would be of aid in everyday clinical practice decision.
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