

Dear Editor and Reviewer,

Thank you for your decision and constructive comments on my manuscript. We have carefully considered the suggestion of Reviewer and make some changes. We have tried our best to improve and made some changes in the manuscript. The yellow part that has been revised according to your comments. Revision notes, point-to-point, are given as follows:

1. Please provide a literature review of similar cases.

Thank you for pointing this out. We provide new published case reports in recent years, such as References 20, 21.

2. Add more background to pathology of both SLE and UC and how plasma exchange may be a therapeutic option.

We modified throughout the text according to the comment (Line 24-32, page 7-page 8). Modified throughout the text according to the comment (Line 20, page 1).

3. Organize the discussion and references properly and expand the cited literature
Follow-up and Prognosis: While the manuscript mentions that the patient's condition improved and stabilized, it would be beneficial to include more detailed information about the patient's long-term follow-up and prognosis. Have there been any disease flares or complications since the initial presentation? Discussion: In the discussion section, discuss the potential mechanisms or hypotheses regarding the co-occurrence of UC and SLE. Are there any known shared genetic factors or immunological pathways that may explain this concomitant presentation? Offering insights into the pathogenesis would enhance the manuscript's value.

Thank you for the suggested. The patient was stable during the follow-up period, and no new complications appeared, so we did not discuss it too much. Although some literature reports the underlying mechanism of co-occurrence of UC and SLE, it is not identified. We think there is commonality between diseases, but there are still differences between individuals, as we assume in the discussion.

We apologize for the poor language of our manuscript. We worked on the manuscript for a long time and the repeated addition and removal of sentences and sections obviously led to poor readability. We have now worked on both language and readability and have also involved native English speakers for language corrections. We really hope that the flow and language level have been substantially improved.

At last we would like again to thank the reviewers for taking the time to review our manuscript.

Best regards,

Dai-xing Chen