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Reviewer’s report:

This reviewer believes this manuscript represents important work, but feel that major revisions, mostly concerning the statistical analysis, need to be made before recommending for publication.

(1) Abstract Results: The descriptive statistics of 6MWD by itself is irrelevant to the main message of the paper. The MCID estimate, sensitivity, specificity, area under ROC curve are all important and relevant results.

(2) Method, Participants: The descriptive statistics on participants are more appropriate for the beginning of the results section.

(3) Statistical Analysis: last paragraph. "...analysis will be carried out..." should be changed to "...analysis was performed..."

(4) Statistical Analysis: Why did the authors choose to completely ignore the distribution based method for determining MCID? Those estimates are functions of SD and reliability, and could be easily computed with the available data and would strengthen the manuscript substantially.

(5) Table 2: Numbers of participants without a GROC change is too small for estimating specificity with any reasonable level of precision.

(6) ROC curve: Change axes to range from 0 to 1 only.

(7) ROC curve: It is not clear why the ROC curve would dip below diagonal.

(8) ROC curve: It is not clear why the ROC curve has only 5 steps. One gets a pair of sensitivity and specificity for each potential cutpoint for 6MDW, and there are most certainly more than 5-6 potential cut points in 73 participants with a SD of 45.2 m.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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