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Author's response to reviews: see over
REVIEWER: 1

Reviewer comment 1: Table 4 is unclear. The legend, the aim and the results of this table should be clearly explained.
Author response 1: We have deleted table 4, due to the fact that it does not add much to the manuscript, but retained some of it in the text.

Reviewer comment 2: The questionnaire was translated into Greek. No details were provided how this was done. Was an official translation followed by a backward translation by a native speaker and subsequently checked? If not, what was the reason that this procedure was not followed?
Author response 2: A mistake was made during the preparation of the draft, the questionnaire was provided from Van der Molen in Greek format and had been translated and back translated in one of his previous collaborations with Greek scientists. This has been re-phrased and omitted as we performed the validation and then assessed the role of smoking cessation, we did not perform the translation.

REVIEWER: 2

Reviewer comment 1: The study presents itself as a complete validation study, however that classification does not seem to be in place here as that would require a larger patient group as well as a better control group. Also some information regarding the participant groups seems to be missing. Desirable would be a table with extensive patient characteristics comparing the study group with the control group and information regarding the number of participants invited to participate (a flow-chart containing this information is advised).
Author response 1:

Reviewer comment 2: What guidelines are used to classify the COPD patients?
Author response 2: COPD patients were classified according to the GOLD guidelines (reference 2), this has been now noted clearer in the text.

Reviewer comment 3: 26 patients quit smoking during the study as part of the protocol. It is however not clear whether these patients were the only ones requested to do so, and therefore the success rate was 100%, or whether a larger part of the patient group was advised to quit smoking. Following this, were there participants that quit smoking for a period yet started again? If there were participants with this profile, did they remain in the smoking group or were they excluded from the analyses? It is also not entirely clear how long the smoking had stopped prior to completing the CCQ for the second time. This should be clarified.
Author response 3: The purpose of the study was not to assess smoking cessation, but to assess the change in quality of life among patients with COPD that quit
smoking (after 2 months of smoking cessation), and therefore we can not report a success rate. All groups were “clean” and whoever changed category was excluded from the study. However, we have stated this in the limitations section.

**Reviewer comment 4:** In the study a Greek translation of the CCQ was used. Is this the official translation by MAPI or was the translation done by one of the authors? If yes how was the translation performed? This should be made clear in the paper.

**Author response 4:** The questionnaire was provided from Van der Molen in Greek format and had been translated and back translated in one of his previous collaborations with Greek scientists. This has been re-phrased and omitted as we performed the validation and then assessed the role of smoking cessation, we did not perform the translation.

**Reviewer comment 5:** It is mentioned in the statistical section that the variables have been checked for normality, however the results of this check are not mentioned and it is therefore difficult to judge whether the statistical tests have been used properly.

**Author response 5:**

**Reviewer comment 6:** It is unusual to label a correlation below 0.3 as strong.

**Author response 6:** Yes, we agree and have removed the word strong from the sentences in which this was written throughout the text.

**Reviewer comment 7:** The conclusion of ‘ideal validity, reliability and responsiveness’ could be considered debatable, I would advise to rephrase this sentence.

**Author response 7:** We have re-phrased this sentence.

**Reviewer comment 8:** In general the English is adequate, however some sentences are difficult to understand. I advise the language to be checked by a medical native English speaker.

**Author response 8:** The manuscript has been read carefully by the native English speaker co-authors and has improved. Thank you for this comment.