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Reviewer's report:

This article with further work has the potential to be interesting - overall the purpose of the research study is clear, however the writing needs to be reviewed as it is confusing and contradictory in places. There are typographical errors and misuse of English throughout. I suggest a review of the writing style and use of firm scientific language to support the main text, discussion and conclusions. The COPD group only has 9 subjects, I suggest more data be added to this sample in order to make a stronger statistical argument. Please include more detail on lung function data (baseline and post bronchodilator response, proportion of patients that meet the GINA reversibility criteria. ACT score data should be included. Page 11 line 2 and 3 - describes mild/moderate bronchospasm as PPCs, how was this assessed? Abbreviation PD is not listed. The section on limitations should be expanded in order to show the authors awareness of the study limitations.

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

Unable to assess

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

Unable to assess

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

Unable to assess

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 recommend additional statistical review

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