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Dear Dr. Cornacchia:

First, thank you for your kindly valuable comments.

On behalf of co-authors, please find our responses to Prof. Benoit Arnold's comments as follows:

**Comment 1) Major compulsory revisions**

Thank you for taking into account my comments about practical use of CAT.

However, when reading this new version, I still feel the manuscripts conveys the idea that CAT has good measurement performances enough to allow its use in clinical practice on individual patients. Yet, Nunnally and Bernstein, in the third edition of the "psychometric theory" (McGraw-Hill series in psychology, 1994), have a discussion on the standards of reliability, which they claim should be...
different depending on how a measure is being used. They state (page 265): "In contrast to the standards used to compare groups, a reliability of .80 may not be nearly high enough in making decisions about individuals." And: "if important decisions are made with respect to specific test scores, a reliability of .90 is the bare minimum, and a reliability of .95 should be considered the desirable standard."

I would recommend the authors to make a clear disclaimer about the limitations of CAT in supporting decisions about individuals based on the score.

**Response:** This information has been changed in two places of “Discussion” section.

**First:** page 10, line 217-219 as the following sentence “This study provides the evidence that the official Thai CAT questionnaire is a reliable tool and valid for providing practicing physicians to measure the impact of COPD on health status of their groups of patients.”

**Second:** page 10-11, line 229-231 as the following sentence “Although the official Thai CAT questionnaire showed very similar property to the much more complex Thai version of SGRQ, with a reliability of 0.853, it could not be recommended to be used in making important decisions about individuals [23].”

**Comment 2) Minor Essential Revisions:**

I would recommend the authors to have a final checking of language and writing.
Response: We checked and corrected the errors of language in the whole manuscript with a native English speaker with scientific expertise.

With best regards,

Chaicharn Pothirat, MD, FCCP.