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**Reviewer's report:**
Thank you to the authors for thoroughly addressing each of the reviewers' comments. It is obvious that the authors carefully considered the comments in the re-write, which is a significant improvement over the first version. Moreover, the direct clinical implications and incremental benefits are much more clear compared with the first version. Therefore, my comments on the revision are mostly minor.

* The sentence about the relationship between LVEF and morbidity/mortality (in both the abstract and first paragraph of the introduction) distracts from the main message of this paper; I would recommend removing it.

* The re-written introduction is much stronger; I would suggest using some of those points in the abstract background section as it is weak in its current form.

* Would recommend re-wording the equation sentences (under 500-m treadmill-walking test, lines 43-49) to make it explicitly clear (perhaps using the term respectively at the end). Alternatively, it would be cleaner to write the equations out using the Equation Editor function in Word.

* The first sentence after data analysis (regarding D'Agostino-Pearson test) is confusing. Please clarify.

* Would be cautious about using the term concordance because it implies that you tested reproducibility between operators. Also, please clarify the concordance statistic mentioned in the discussion (line 57) - how was this calculated?

* While this version has much more consistent use of terminology (particularly in regards to CRF terminology), I would suggest carefully reviewing the language to make sure it is as
consistent as possible. For example, do you mean the same thing with walking capacity, walking test, and walking performance (all used throughout the paper)?

* Remove excessive use of statistical results in the discussion section.

* The second point under limitations could be revised; that is, the clause about how exercise capacity is predictive of mortality in women does not fit well in that sentence.

* There remain a few grammatical errors or confusing sentences in this version. Examples: Background (line 61), Methods (line 13-14, line 22-23), Discussion (line 55-56), Conclusions (line 33-34).

* Would recommend using active voice as much as possible, particularly in the Methods section.

* Table 2: there is a lot of unneeded information - you could move this to the Supplemental Information.

* Table 3: Do you mean "highest" instead of higher"?

Thank you again for significantly revising this version, which has the potential to move this science forward with direct translational and clinical benefit for HF patients.
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