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Reviewer: Luc Noyez

1. There were no differences between the included patients (n=283) and those that were excluded (n=30) from the previously published main study [1] regarding age, gender, lung function, or length of surgery. This information has been added to the Methods section. Unfortunately, we do not have complete data concerning EuroScore.

2. All patients in the main study [1] provided information on physical activity preoperatively, 30 patients did not provide information after two months. As mentioned, we have added information on demographics and lung function of the included versus excluded patients.

3. Information on the sample has been reported in the main study [1]. Kindly see answers on questions 1 and 2.

Referee 2:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. We agree, the part promoting the assessment tool as a future tool for validation has been removed from the Discussion.

2. Definition has been changed and clarified in the Methods, Results, and Discussion.

3. The results mentioned in paragraph 4 of the Discussion refers to the preoperative values, expressed as percent of predicted, presented in Results, paragraph 2. Information on preoperative lung function for the groups has been added to the Results and Table 3.

4. We have added information on preoperative lung function and Confidence intervals for the difference between groups postoperatively to easier interpret the significance of the results. A sentence on the subject has been added to the Discussion, paragraph 1.

5. Sentence in Discussion paragraph 4 has been deleted. Also, the Conclusion has been changed as suggested.
7. The BMI for both groups were below risk levels reported in earlier studies. Information on this has been added to the Discussion paragraph 2. We agree that gender differences are important and would be interesting to study. However, this was not the focus of this study, and since there were no significant differences in gender between the groups, we have chosen not to include this in the Discussion.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. The word spirometry has been replaced with the suggested phrase.
2. Definition of groups has been clarified in the Abstract.
3. The suggested changes have been made regarding description of the groups.
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