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Reviewer's report:

In the phase II clinical trial “Benefits of whole body vibration to people with COPD: a community based efficacy trial”, Trentham and Co-Authors present first data for WBV in COPD patients with a 2 times weekly home based training set up. A good compliance to the 6 week intervention was reported. Some relevant questions remain open. The patients and procedures must be described much more detailed. The impact for further clinical questions but also the limitations in regard to the scientific question in that special set up have to be discussed more focussed.

Major Revisions

1. Which device did you use for WBV (Galileo, Power Plate…)?
2. Which intensity did you use for training (Hz?)?
3. In which position did the patients perform the measurements (standing upright position, bended knees)?
4. How long were the training periods? (3x2 min..like described before?)
5. Please provide an example for a training plan.
6. How did you do placebo WBV- was it a Sham training procedure-was it possible to blind the patients for that? Did you use lower Hz training set ups in the Placebo group like 2 Hz?
7. Did every patient receive a training device? Or did you transport the training devices to the patient ?
8. With how many devices did you work than?
9. Is there a special relationship to the device distributors which is not mentioned in the conflict of interest?
10. How did you choose the patients, you contacted?
11. Please provide GOLD grade for every patient (xx in GOLD 1, XX in GOLD2..)
12. What are the reasons for the lost in follow up of the patients ?
14. Did patients do other forms of endurance ore resistance training? How could
you rule out?
15. What kind of drugs did they use- please provide in patients characteristics?
16. Where subjects on systemic steroids?
17. What kind of comorbidities where to elicit?
18. What where the approximately costs for the home based training?
19. Is it feasible in a bigger set up? Please comment.
20. Please shape and shorten your discussion.-What is for example the knowledge impact in regard to your results from line 247-280?
21. Please discuss more critical the limitations of the study.
22. Some figures would ease to get the main results of the study.
23. The statistics are not complete obvious for me- did you use paired t-tests- where the groups normal distributed...

Minor Revisions

23. What kind of comorbidities where to elicit?
24. Add Marc Miravittles data (Respirology. 2013 Aug;18(6):1028-34) in your discussion, not only the step length improves also the distance (6MWT (81.2 ± 9.2) after WBV in COPD patients.
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