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Reviewer's report:
Minor essential revisions
Comment 1:
In the abstract and results, the analysis of “number needed to treat” should specify the outcome – presumably an improvement in total AQOL score greater than 0.5 (i.e. greater than the MID)? Was this the same outcome for the sub-domains of the AQOL?

Response:
Mentioned in the abstract

Comment 2:
The data analysis for the PFTs and the AQOL scores includes an overall between group comparison, using a GLM with repeated measures, as well as a number of within-group comparisons between baseline and follow-up measurements. It is not clear why these within-group comparisons are needed, since the message of the paper is conveyed very clearly in the overall between group comparisons. To support the contention that changes in the yoga group occurred earlier and to a greater extent than in the control group, it would be more appropriate to include a group x time interaction in the GLM analysis. Similarly, a group x time interaction should be included in the Friedman analysis to allow an overall between group comparison for the non-normally distributed variables.

Response:
The analysis suggested by the referee has been done, but some additional analysis, although not contributing that much to the conclusions has been retained because it does no harm.

Discretionary revision:
The paragraph discussing previous trials of yoga is very lengthy, and could be shortened to focus on the key differences between this study and previous studies.

Response:
Deleted two large portions on pp 22 and 23 from the discussion of the manuscript. Also quality of written English has been improved.