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Author’s response to reviews:

We have tried our best to address all the comments given by both the reviewers. We are grateful for all the comments and suggestions.

Maria Grau (Reviewer 1): In this study, there is a major problem with the abbreviations. For instance, IPAH and PAH have not been explained anywhere. I know that PAH is the abbreviation of pulmonary arterial hypertension, even though, the authors must always explain
the abbreviations. In addition, the abstract and Tables, which must be auto-explicative, are full of not explained abbreviations that difficult the readability and even the evaluation by this reviewer.

Response: We are sorry about the mediocre nature of the earlier submission. As per your erudite opinion we have tried our best to make every correction you have mentioned to improve the manuscript’s outlook. We have added the necessary abbreviations and their explanations where necessary. Thank you for your valuable suggestions.

The objective is very imprecise, what do the authors mean with "…to learn more about the response to exercise in SLE PAH patients"? A correct, rigorous and precise wording of the objective is required.

Response: Thank you for pointing it out. We have corrected it by omitting the first part so that it now reads, “To study the oxygen uptake efficiency and determine usefulness of submaximal parameters of oxygen uptake in SLE PAH on performing a cardiopulmonary exercise test”.

Nassos Manginas (Reviewer 2):

Major comments

1. The discussion section is too long, mostly due to the fact that it contains data that belong to the Results section. The Discussion should be shortened by at least 50%. It is better for the reader to see the data written in the Results. Additionally please do not duplicate writing the results in both text and Tables. It may be better to report them within your Tables/Figures.
Response: We have improved both the discussion and the results section as per your suggestion. Thank you.

2. There are many discrepancies in reporting statistical differences between the groups studied, when comparing text and Tables. Much of the symbols in Table 1 are not correct. Please clarify. Please omit the symbol dash from the column IPAH in Table 1 (having it in column SLE is enough).

Response: Thank you for pointing them out. We have made appropriate corrections.

3. Your correlation data should better fit within the results section.

Response: We have made necessary corrections to better fit the correlation data within the results section.

4. In the section Subjects line 19, please rephrase the sentence about FEV1/FVC % exclusion criterion

Response: We have corrected it, thank you for pointing that out.

5. In Table 1, what is the symbol ***?
Response: Thank you for pointing it out, we have corrected it. It should have just been two asterisk.

6. In Table 1 and in text, please add units on your measurements

Response: We have made appropriate correction both in the tables and in the text.

7. Please add abbreviations of Table 1

Response: We have made the corrections by adding the abbreviations, thank you.

8. The authors mentioned that CI is different between IPAH and SLE-PAH, however in Table 2 the p value is 0.24. Please correct.

Response: What we meant by the statement was that although there was a trend for a lower average value in IPAH but it was not statistically significant. Thank you for pointing it out as the statement was not clear. We have made corrections.

Minor comments

Some language editing will improve this manuscript

Response: Thank you for the suggestion, we have improved the overall scientific language and grammar of the manuscript.