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Author’s response to reviews:

Fish oil supplementation in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: feasibility of conducting a randomised controlled trial” (PAFS-D-17-00021)

Response to reviewers:

The reviewers comments are shown below, our responses can be found directly under each reviewer comment (Author response).

Reviewer #1: The authors responded well to the critiques and have improved aspects of their reporting. I recommend this paper be accepted.

Author response: Thank you for the time taken to review the paper.

Reviewer #2: I think the authors have done a very good job of addressing comments. My only remaining comment is around the objectives (including table 1) and whether "feasibility" and
"clinical" might be better ways of describing the two types of objective, and fit more with current thinking than "process" and "scientific"?

Author response: We have incorporated the suggested changes in the manuscript (Table 1, and throughout the document as tracked). Your appraisal of this manuscript has been very helpful.

We have also updated the results section of the abstract to reflect the method where we have mentioned calculation of effect sizes for clinical outcomes.