

## **Response To Reviewer Comments By The Authors**

We thank the Editor and the reviewers for their comments. Please find enclosed our responses:

### **Reviewer #1:**

Minor comments:

1) Lack of uniformity in the description of diabetes, atrial fibrillation, etc.

**Response:** Thanks for the comments, the necessary changes have been made in the manuscript and the changes have been highlighted with yellow

2) Please provide more detailed additional comments regarding the inconsistency between past facts and the current study regarding the effects of SEV and BEV differences on the stimulus delivery system.

**Response:** Thanks for the comments, the necessary changes have been made in the manuscript and the changes have been highlighted with yellow

3) Finally, while identifying predictive factors is important, TAVR is an important treatment modality for older AS patients. Please add new predictors and their significance to treatment choice and methodology in this regard.

**Response:** Thanks for the comments, the newer predictors identified from the current study have been added in text at the end of manuscript, the necessary changes have been made in the manuscript and the changes have been highlighted in yellow.

### **Reviewer #2:**

The comments are all of appreciable value, despite the fact that the topic itself does not present much new in this area. The editorial is in urgent need of revision in formal writing, but overall presents a careful analysis of the article, with correct and interesting insights.

**Response:** Thanks for the comments, the manuscript has now been revised as suggested.