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Reviewer's report:

The paper presents an interesting study on the applicability of the CCQ in Greece and the effects of smoking cessation.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

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).

2- What guidelines are used to classify the COPD patients?

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.

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.

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.

6- It is unusual to label a correlation below 0.3 as strong.

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

- Minor Essential Revisions
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.

- Discretionary Revisions

These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.

Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the questions below constitute the report, bearing your name, that will be forwarded to the authors and published on the site if the article is accepted.

**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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