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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

The data presentation in the manuscript is extremely hard to follow and does not make sense. Whereas Table 1 listed 30 non-pregnant women and 51 pregnant women, Table 2 lists 12 women with a normal pregnancy tested "before" (is this preconception or during pregnancy?) and "post-partum", and 15 non-pregnant women. Where are the pregnancy data from the remaining women? If the authors intend to show follow-up data in a subset of patients, they should clarify this. The pregnancy data on all subjects must still be presented. The results state that table 2 describes the results for morphological changes in the RCCA, including diameter, RI and PI. I can’t find any of these values in table 2. The only place that data from the 30 non-pregnant and 51 pregnant women appears to be presented is in the figures. However, the value of these figures is not clear. They only show relationship with systolic pressure. Is there contention that all differences in parameters during pregnancy are explained by differences in systolic pressure? If the authors report that values are not significant after adjustment for all variables, what insight do figures focusing on systolic pressure provide? The differences in scale between graphs for pregnant and non-pregnant women make visual comparisons of these two groups very difficult. The reader is left with no clear understanding of the study design, findings, or how the paper adds to the literature. The paper needs to be rewritten. It is the reviewers opinion that while the english is significantly improved from the previous version, there are still many things which are unclear and very difficult to understand.

Details regarding the recruitment and characteristics of subjects were provided in response to reviews, but not addressed in the paper. This must be included in the manuscript.

The authors should adjust for gestational age in the pregnancy analyses.
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**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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