

## Reply to the Reviewers and the editor

We thank all referees for the thorough evaluation of our manuscript and for the important comments. We have carefully considered their recommendations and incorporated the changes proposed in the manuscript. In the following we respond in detail to their questions:

### Editor

We thank the editor for the valuable comments. We adapted the suggestions (ethics statement, comments, core tip, audio core tip) to our manuscript and highlighted the changes.

### Reviewer 1 (00214310)

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

This is a nicely written article showing additional information about anaemia and RDW in TAVI patients which possibly effecting the clinical outcome.

We thank the reviewer for this comment.

**Reviewer 1 (02441247)**

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search: <input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	BPG Search: <input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

The paper is well structured, the presentation is clear and the discussion is in accordance with the results presented. The paper brings some novelty in the field. In the result section, row 242 and 243, there is a minor text error, namely “one- year survival ” must be changed to “one- year mortality”, as it is depicted in the paper on Figure 6 B

We thank the reviewer for this comment. We corrected the mistake and highlighted the change in the revised manuscript (row 293).

**Reviewer 3 (03290740)**

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search: <input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	BPG Search: <input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

This is a well written and interesting article. They found that anisocytosis of red blood cells in anemic patients predicts short term outcome after TAVI. Comments: Please specify how GFR was calculated (there are several equations) 144 out of 239 anemic subjects (60.3%) had chronic kidney disease -CKD- vs 54% in non anemic group. They should specify how were

they treated (erythropoiesis stimulating agents? iron supplementation?) It is possible that CKD subjects not properly treated are skewing their data.

We thank the reviewer for this comment. The GFR was calculated by using the Cockcroft-Gault Equation. We provided these information in the revised manuscript. Unfortunately we did not evaluate the treatment of patients with chronic kidney disease which may be an interesting aspect with regard to the outcome. We mentioned this point under study limitations.

#### Reviewer 4 (03386700)

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search: <input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> No BPG Search:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

The discussion in the manuscript is based on the blood samples data “taken from every patient before and at fixed intervals up to 72 hours after TAVI” and “one-year follow up data for mortality-only” analysis, therefore, should be carefully discussed and interpreted. For example, statement in line 269-272 and is misleading and should be revised.

We thank the reviewer for this comment. As we did the analysis on one-year follow up data, the results have to be confirmed in further long-term analysis and therefore have to be interpreted carefully. We revised the statement in the text (row 320-322) and mentioned this aspect in the study limitations (row 377).