

Response to the Editor/reviewer's comment

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised draft of the manuscript. We are most grateful for the time the editors and reviewers spent on providing suggestions on how to improve our paper. In our revision, we have tried to address all the queries raised by the editor and the reviewers'.

Point-by-point response:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

Editorial is interesting and valuable. I have only minor comment. It would be advisable to present data on PPM implantation after classic AVR surgeries. Language correction and correction of typos are also needed

Response: We thank the reviewer for the kind words of appreciation. The reviewers comment are indeed thoughtful and relevant to this paper. We have accordingly added the data on PPM need after surgical AVR. You may find these lines added in the revised paper “Traditionally, PPM implantation rate following SAVR is around 2-7%, which in general is lower than PPM need after TAVR. Hence, choosing between SAVR and TAVR in low-risk younger patients should take into account the risk of PPM implantation and its long-term impact (8,9)”.

Further as per the suggestion we have got the paper edited by an English expert and fixed the grammatical errors. If there are any other concerns or specific errors, do guide us.

Once again we express our sincere thanks and gratitude to all the editor and the reviewers comment for providing valuable insights into our paper. we believe that these comments indeed go a long way in improving the overall quality and clinical impact of our research in the future.