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Reviewer's report:

We have reviewed the changes introduced in the original submission:

• The inclusion criteria are now well and carefully explained

• The following sentence has been added in the Discussion section (page 17):
  “As the population in Limburg is the least physically active population of the Netherlands, this might influence the external validity of the study.”

• We understand now the importance of an optimal inhalation technique and the way it’s going to be measured thought we find it very subjective it’s the only way you have to do it on practices

• According to the presented references we understand that thought there is no consensus on the optimal duration of pulmonary rehabilitation a 4 months intervention could be better to measure the possible outcomes than shorter ones and we see form other reviewer comments that even a 6 months intervention could have been implemented and the way it has been explained in the text now

• We see the two proposed references in the background section

• "The six-minute walk test (6MWT) problem is now mentioned it in the Discussion section as limitation (page 17).

• We see now that the selected daily physical activity questionnaire is a validated tool in the Netherlands as proposed by Dutch Societies

We now accept the document for publication in the journal and congratulate the authors for the excellent work wishing to have important results published in the short time

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.