

Manuscript NO.: 28962– **Rebuttal Letter**

Dr. Fang-Fang Ji

Scientific editor chief

World Journal of Cardiology

September 8th, 2016

RE: Manuscript NO.: 28962

Dear Dr. Fang-Fang Ji,

Please find enclosed our revised article entitled “Comparison of The SAPIEN S3 Versus The SAPIEN XT Transcatheter Heart Valves: A Single Center-Experience” for consideration for publication in the world journal of cardiology.

We thank the editor and the reviewers for their willingness to consider a revised version of our previously submitted work. We appreciate the time they have taken to fully and fairly evaluate our manuscript and found their comments to be valuable. The manuscript has been appropriately edited and a comprehensive list of the main changes is included in the cover letter.

We have addressed to the best of our capabilities all of the reviewer’s comments as detailed below. We have typed all the reviewer’s comments in bold followed by our responses. The tracked changes in the manuscript are highlighted in yellow and diligently referenced in the reviewer’s response.

Fadi Sawaya MD and Bernard Chevalier MD

Reviewer 1:

In this single center experience of comparison of Sapien S3 and XT-THV TAVI, no significant difference in 30-day mortality was found between the two valves and major vascular complications were lower in the S3 group compared with XT-THV group in the expense of increased permanent pacemaker implantation. The outlined predictors of permanent pacemaker implantation included antecedent RBBB, PR interval and loss of coaxiality during device deployment. Minor error: Page 2: Line 17: PVL may be altered to PVR.

Response: We thank the reviewer for their thoughtful comments.

PVL was altered to PVR in Line 17 Page 2

Reviewer 2:

The entire text of submitted paper should be shortened. It is essential for readers and it definitely improve the final quality of above paper. If abbreviation PVL (on page 2)is not a typo error, it should be listed and explained as well further - Page 4. Finally, I have no major criticism and I regard the work near to ready for publication

Response: We thank the reviewer for their thoughtful comments.

PVL was altered to PVR in Line 17 Page 2. The text was shortened slightly in order not to change the context of the paper. The deleted part of the manuscript part was crossed in the main text and kept for reviewer evaluation.

Reviewer 3:

This study describes a single center TAVR experience comparing outcomes between the Edwards XT and S3 valves up to one year. It found that although mortality rates were similar between the valves, the S3 valve had dramatically fewer vascular complications and twice the pacemaker rate. The study also lists predictors of permanent pacemaker implantation and offers clinical advice based on the observations of coaxial position of the valve at implantation. The paper is well written and offers a fairly large comparison of the performance of these 2 valves. The results are similar to those previously reported and the description of coaxial positioning in the discussion could be clinically useful.

Response: We thank the reviewer for their thoughtful comments.