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**Reviewer’s report:**

**GENERAL COMMENTS**
The addition of the validation of the scanning technique in the Results section definitely adds credibility to the data and represents a unique approach to use older data to address new research questions. I appreciate the response to my concern about the large number of heart failure patients and a possible overriding influence on the data. As you point out, you have shown that disease type has a minimal effect on the error between the studies. The addition of the CPET and 6MWT data to Table 1 are most helpful as they define the functional capacity of the subject groups. Thanks for the clarification on reference #9. You have adequately justified adding these data to your analysis. The Discussion has been improved and reads well and the addition of the tables are vital to reading the manuscript. The SEE of the derived mean peak VO2 from your regression equation is low enough to have clinical relevance. As you emphasize, your equation can only be used in studies of patients with moderate to severe exercise impairment and studies where the mean 6MWT exceeds 600 meters cannot be evaluated by this means. My only remaining comment relates to Table 2. Table 2 is not discussed in the body of the manuscript, unless I missed it. With the large amount of non-reported data, could this table be eliminated and the results summarized in the Methods section when discussing the individual studies.

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS**
Page 10, para 3, line 3: I think you are referring to Table 1 and not Table 2.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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