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Málaga, 21 December 2012

Dear Editor-in-Chief:

In this letter answer, point by point, on the advice of the reviewers.

THE ANSWERS TO THE REVIEWERS ARE GIVING BELOW.

Results

1. Please include in result section, some text that should be used to describe key observation made for Table 1-2. Please clarify.

* Thank you for your correction. I added some clarification sentences in the results section to the revised manuscript.

2. Regarding Tables 1-2, Please use footnotes for abbreviations if necessary.

* We agree with your correction and we made in the version of the revised manuscript

Discussion

3. Generally for the discussion section, I suggest you to improve the first sentences of this paragraph. I think that it is better because this sentence would be more representative. It should be clarified which dependent aims presented on the introduction section.

* It has been made the above corrections in the following first paragraph:

“Quality of life improved significantly for inactive subjects who carried out the PAPP ($p = 0.05$). Besides, pulmonary function parameters FVC and FEV1/FVC
values found statistically significant differences within experimental group. However, these differences were not found within the control group”.

4. Page 9: Paragraph 2 should be remade.

* We agree with the correction and we made in the version of the revised manuscript

5. Page 9: Paragraph 3 should follow criteria’s Vancouver on the before last sentence.

* Thank you for your correction. I have changed the before last sentence.

6. Page 10: Paragraph 1 and 2 should be avoided due to this information has been included on both tables.

* We agree with you. I have avoided both paragraphs.

6. Page 10: Paragraph 3 will be useful to reorganize these sentences.

* We agree with the correction and we made in the version of the revised manuscript.

7. Page 10: Paragraph 4 would be important to remake these sentences.

* We agree with the correction and we made in the version of the revised manuscript.

8. Page 10: Paragraph 5, the use of the term study should be avoided it is not necessary to mention.

* Thank you for your correction. We have avoided “In this study”.

9. Page 10: the last paragraph must been clarify.

* We agree with the correction and we made in the version of the revised manuscript.

10. Page 11: Paragraph 1 will be useful to reorganize these sentences.

* We agree with the correction and we made in the version of the revised manuscript.

11. Page 11, paragraph 2: I recommend omitting “In this study”. Please you redo these sentences.
*Thank your very much, I agree with you. The correction has been incorporated into the revised manuscript.

12. **Page 11, paragraph 3: Please include more recent research to support the Buffalo study**

* More recent references have been incorporated in the revised manuscript. I added these references following:


**Methods:**

13. In addition to this, I have removed an error reference and I have revised the paragraph about “sample size”:

“The sample size was calculated with an alpha error of 0.05, a power of 0.80 and a beta risk of 0.20 according to the effect size of EQ-5D that it was made according to Cohen’s criteria [21]. One hundred subjects taken part in this research against 60 individuals are needed in a priori estimation: 30 individuals in the IG and 30 in the CG”.

Finally, we would like to include the acknowledgements before references.

Thank you for your help. Waiting your reply

Kind regards,