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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper with an interesting research question. Certainly for the field of practice (hospital, physiotherapists,...) it is interesting to have prediction possibilities from a quite simple submaximal test as there are Astrand or in this case 6 minute walk distance.

The abstract is sound, but is too long. Reduce this by 30%.

The background is stated well. The research question is documented well.

Methodology: This section is well described, but there are several sentences which are formulated not well.

Page 5 line 1 - 3: rewrite this sentence.

Page 5 line 6: IRB: what is this?

I think the methodology concerning the literature search could be improved by making a table were the different studies are described. At the moment we now that there is variability at the level of test methodology, patients,... but we do not know exactly what they are.

Also the statistics part is not clear, but as I am not an expert the input of a statistical expert is necessary.

Results:

Also here the different results are interesting but must be written much more clear. Page 7; line 4-5: However, close examination of that study (7) showed that there was an error in reporting. Explain what kind of error or was it just a "typing" error.

Example of strange sentences: page 7; line 19: they ranged from a low of 0.21 to a high of 0.70.

Linear Mixed Model Analysis (LMM): the presentation of these data can also be improved by rewriting it.

Discussion:

Good discussion. Here for the first time the authors confronts the reader with the variability of the different datasets. The connection to the clinical practice is made and discussed very well. Certainly the best part of the article.

Also here rereading and rewriting of sentences and paragraphs could improve the article.
Perhaps the paper should also improve when the limits and qualities of this study should be discussed more extensively.

Conclusion:
OK

References: OK
Figures and tables:
OK

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

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

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