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BMC Pulmonary Medicine
Dear Prof. Scichilone,

Your manuscript "Circadian rhythm of COPD symptoms in clinically based phenotypes. Results from the STORICO Italian observational study." (PULM-D-19-00132R1) has been assessed by our reviewers. Based on these reports, and my own assessment as Editor, I am pleased to inform you that it is potentially acceptable for publication in BMC Pulmonary Medicine, once you have carried out some essential revisions:

*please also address the reviewer comments which are at the foot of this email*

1. In the section 'Funding', please also describe the role of the funding body/bodies in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Answer. Laboratori Guidotti and Malesci, Italy provided unconditional financial support to the study. No other support was provided. This was clarified in the manuscript (row 446) and in the online Funding statement.

2. In your availability of data and materials section, please provide the contact details for Laboratori Guidotti and Malesci.

Answer. Data availability statement was updated as requested in the manuscript (rows 430-435).

3. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions.

Answer. Cleaned version of manuscript, figures and letter of reply to reviewers were uploaded.

[...]

BMC Pulmonary Medicine operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.
Reviewer reports:

Ulrich Koehler (Reviewer 1): I accept the revision of the manuscript for publication.

Marise J. Kasteleyn, PhD (Reviewer 2): The authors did a great job and improved the article. My comments were addressed adequately and the manuscript is adjusted accordingly.

Some minor comments:

* I commented on the study design description. This is clarified in the methods section of the manuscript, but not in the abstract. I suggest to include "observational prospective cohort" in the abstract as well.

Answer. We thank the reviewer for the comment. The abstract was changed as requested (see row 35).

* figures are still of poor quality, but they are readable, and hopefully the editors/lay-out can help with that.

Answer. Figures were not changed. We are at your disposal if you need further changes.

* In the discussion the authors compare their results to previous literature (thanks for that). However, references are missing (line 387-389)

Answer. Appropriate references were added as requested (see rows 314 and 563-568).