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Reviewer's report:

The revised paper “Singing classes for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a randomized control trial” has undergone some changes but still some issues should be addressed.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Addressing the 2nd point of my former review (length of intervention) the points raised by the authors do not satisfactorily answer the point. Based on previous research findings with no significant findings it does not seem logic to increase the intervention length for only two more weeks and still not getting any significant findings. The argument by the reviewers to fit the intervention into clinical practice does not seem sufficient. Are there any health care regulations for COPD therapy regarding time frames then this regulation should be mentioned.

2. Even so the objectives are now stated more clearly major issues remain. As stated in the introduction part last paragraph the term health status is used but later in the intervention part (last paragraph) it becomes clear that the SF 36 is taken for health related quality of life as an outcome but not health status. Therefore either the objective should be changed to health related quality of life investigation and also mentioned in the title. As the title states now, singing is investigated on COPD (e.g. control of breathing or functional capacities) and not on health related quality of life.

3. Based on the above comments authors should change the title for not misleading the reader (e.g. Comparison two different interventions on COPD: a RCT).

4. Another issue now evolves regarding physical activity (PA). The authors state in the methods part baseline assessment last paragraph that each participant was given a Sensor Wears Pro prior to commencement of intervention and after completion of intervention. Based on the large difference at baseline data no arguments are given why the film group did decrease their PA after the intervention. Based on the study end (February 2011) this could be related to the winter weather and not actual PA level.

Discretionary Revision

1. The authors should also state some possible arguments/pathways for the differences in the ISW between the SG and the FG after the intervention.
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