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Reviewer’s report:

Tonelli R et al carried out a prospective study aimed at confirming the efficacy of rehabilitation in a population of patients with ILDs and investigating whether baseline exercise capacity, disease severity or ILD etiology might affect outcomes. The study is interesting, since the role of PR in ILD is still controversial, and patients' selection can be crucial; in general the paper is well done.

Major comments

A "sample size" computation analysis is required. If, as I suspect, the number was not decided before the study, I suggest to include a comment in the "statistical analysis" chapter where to include the power expected by this number for the primary outcome of the study (i.e. the minimum difference this sample is able to appreciate).

Background: "In particular, the impaired level of gas exchange seems to be the major cause leading to exercise intolerance in these patients". Indeed, sometimes patients with ILD are limited by ventilation (I would add a comment on this).

In table 1 I suggest to add information about smoking history, type of LTOT (during effort vs. continuous), PaO2, PaCO2 (if available), the diagnosis (not only IPF or not IPF).

Table 2. The P values are relative to the changes as absolute or relative values?

I'm not sure Figure 1 is relevant for the reader.

Since endurance time is so far considered one the of most sensitive outcomes for exercise capacity, I suggest to add a new figure for the analysis of the correlation between changes in ET and FCV, DLCO, etc.

Minor comments
Abstract: "with the functional improvement of and HRQoL were assessed" please, check this sentence.

I suggest to merge descriptive analysis and patients' stratification in a single "statistical analysis" chapter.

The number of decimals for the different units should be wisely decided (e.g. two decimal for 6MWT distance are evidently not required, such as for watts, age, % of FEV1 and FVC, etc).

Discussion "In our opinion, multiple aspects deserve attention and discussion." I think this sentence is redundant.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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