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Reviewer's report:
In the manuscript entitled "Characteristics of exercise capacity in female systolic lupus erythematosus associated pulmonary arterial hypertension patients", the authors replied to the concerns that I pointed out before. The revised manuscript is improved somewhat compared to the previous version. However, regarding the parts that the authors claimed to have modified, the text was not revised. I think the revised manuscript has still not reached the level that can be accepted. Please carefully review the text and correct it with keeping a good attitude toward this issue.

#1 The authors replied as "some of the key parameters are later on calculated on a per kg body weight format thus elimination some of the potential bias as you have correctly pointed out". However, the description is not added in this manuscript as a potential limitation.

#2 A lot of typo errors remains in this revised manuscript (As an example, in Abstract, Line 15, IAPH). I pointed out that I corrected misspellings last time.

#3 Last time, I pointed out the first word should be spelled out, on the other hand, the second or subsequent words are need not to be spelled out. However, it has not been improved at all. As an example, "mean pulmonary arterial pressure (mPAP)" in Right heart catheterization in Method is already mentioned in Subjects in Method. The authors must carefully examine and correct all errors.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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