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Reviewer’s report:

Dyspnea is probably the most universal symptom described by obese individuals, yet the best tool to use to describe its presence and severity and monitor change with intervention has not been widely investigated. While the mMRC is simple to apply in routine clinical practice, whether it has clinical utility in this population has not been previously investigated. This is a pilot study to look at this question, and the data seems to suggest it may reflect some clinical differences between obese individuals with and without dyspnea. The important limitations of the current study, as outlined by the authors, demonstrates this is very preliminary work. However, the data provides a foundation for further studies comparing the mMRC with other dyspnea scales in evaluating the usefulness of such tools in identifying functionally important differences between obese patients, and the responsiveness of these tools to interventions and predicting clinical outcomes.

The authors have addressed the points I raised previously.

There are a number of small grammatical changes that still require attention.

Page 4, Background, last paragraph: change to “its relationships with the 6-minute walk distance (6MWD), lung function and biological parameters”.

Page 8, 3rd Paragraph, Relationships between the mMRC etc, 1st sentence: “..demographic, lung functional and biological… Subjects in the mMRC >1 group had a higher BMI (p=0.01) (Figure 1a), lower ERV (p<0.005)(Figure 1B), FEV1 (p<0.05) and Hb levels (p<0.05), and covered less distance in the 6MWT…. than subjects in the mMRC=0 group.

2nd paragraph, 3rd sentence: “No relationship…”

Page 9, 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence: “.. and 40% a mMRC scale >2”.

2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence: for clarity I would remove the references at the end of this sentence and add them against the individual authors names in the next sentence. Similarly, in the 4th sentence add the reference number to El Gamal.

Page 10, 2nd paragraph, 3rd sentence: “.. and a mildly lower hemoglobin… “

5th sentence: “..bA1C, CRP or NT pro-BNP”.

Page 11, 1st sentence: change to “allow the analysis of sex differences..”
Conclusions, 1st sentence: “This pilot study investigated the potential .. groups as defined by the mMRC scale with respect to BMI, ERV etc”.
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