Dear Editor,

We thank for the support from the editorial team in the revision of our manuscript. In our revised manuscript, we have addressed all the critical points raised by reviewers. Please, find below our reply to reviewers’ comments in the point-by-point fashion, a question *in italics* followed by our response.

Yours sincerely,

Bakytbek Egemnazarov on behalf of all co-authors.

**Editorial comments:**  
 *1. The editor has formatted the manuscript as per the journal's style. Please retain the same.*

We thank the editor for the work done.

*2. Please address all the specific comments marked in the manuscript.*

We introduced changes into manuscript according to comments.

*3. For the protocol section, please specifically write how you perform your experiment with all the details in an imperative tense as if directing someone how to do the experiment.*

In the revised version of the manuscript, we provide detailed description of every step during EchoCG paying attention to mentioning every button to press and expected action.

*4. Please make the steps exactly how you perform the experiment with specific details.*

We provide specific details to every step of the protocol.

*5. The protocol should only be made up of action steps which should be numbered as 1. followed by 1.1 and 1.1.1 and so on. Please do not use paragraph style for this section. Also use complete sentences for the protocol section.*

The protocol part is re-written in imperative tense using consecutive numbering.

***Reviewer #1:*** *Manuscript Summary:  
This revised manuscript by Egemnazarov B, et al. proposes an echocardiography-based assessment of right ventricle diastolic function in healthy and diseased mice. The authors addressed all the major concerns, as well as the majority of minor concerns raised by the previous review. The authors need careful and consistent editing throughout the manuscript, including the following minor concerns.  
  
Major Concerns:  
There is no major concern.  
  
Minor Concerns:  
Uncompleted work in response to the previous comment - References  
References are not fully formatted for the journal style, e.g., lack of published year and capital letters in title.*We apologize for the missing the point. In the revised manuscript, we manually inspected every reference in our reference library and introduced necessary changes to match to the journal style.

*New minor comment #1 - Text, Figure and Table editing  
Comment #1-1: Already performed experiments/analysis should be described in the past tense, not in the present tense.*

We thank the reviewer for drawing our attention to this point. In the revised manuscript, all sentences describing results are written in past tense.

*Comment #1-2: Figure 3 "sham" → "Sham"*

Changed accordingly.

*Comment #1-3: Table 1 "parameters" → "Parameters"*

Changed accordingly.

*Comment #1-4: Table 2 "400±33" →"400 ± 33"*

Changed accordingly

*Comment #1-5: Table 2 "401±15" →"401 ± 15"*

Changed accordingly

*New minor comment #2 - Table 1  
Comment #2-1: A unit of "heart rate for VTI" is missing.*

Units (beats per minute) are added.

*Comment #2-2: Is "mkl" correct?*Thank you for the remark. We corrected this mistake. In the revised manuscript, we use acronym “mcL” for microliters.  
***Reviewer #2:*** *Manuscript Summary:  
The revised manuscript strengthened well, both the representative images and the data presentation of pathological conditions are valuable parts.  
I have only one minor concern to add.  
  
Minor Concerns:  
-Table 2. and the statistical part is not clear. Are the data expressed as mean+SEM or SD?*

We added a sentence explaining the reasons for selecting statistical tests with references to the part “Representative results”. In the table 2, we added notifications that data are presented as *mean±SD.*

*What does the p value of Krukal Wallis test tell us? Is it not more practical to show post hoc test p values to show differences between Sham and PAB groups?*

We agree with the reviewer that the result Kruskal Wallis test alone is less informative, because it demonstrates only presence of significant differences between groups without specifying which ones. Therefore, we expanded the table and added results of Dunnet’s post-hoc test between selected groups. In the revised version, the table 2 demonstrates that within groups every position delivers similar results (Wilcoxon test) and the results from both positions demonstrate differences between sham and PAB groups (Dunnet’s test). This information is added to the “Representative results” part and expanded legend of the table 2.

*The p value with 1.000 is not informative using rank tests.*

We agree with the reviewer that this value delivers limited information; therefore, we have removed this information.

*Was the data not following normal distribution?*

With such small numbers of data points testing for distribution does not deliver reliable results. Therefore, we do not perform such test and routinely use non-parametric tests (Am J Ophthalmol. 2009 Apr;147(4):571-2; Int J Physiol Pathophysiol Pharmacol. 2017 Nov 1;9(5):157-163).

*Both the statistics part and Table 2. legend might be more detailed and informative.*

We expanded the legend of the table 2 by including more specific details about the tests used and results.