

Reviewer 3 v.1

Comments to the Author

This study compares the performance and reliability of two methods used to measure endurance time in COPD, as a secondary analysis of the TORRACTO clinical trial.

This study sounds pretty important in this field, especially looking to define multicentre guidelines. Despite the importance and convenience of this paper, I have some suggestion and a central concern regards methodology.

Overall, this study was very well written and presented. Some specific points that I would like highlight and suggest to the authors are numbered bellow.

1. The conclusions in the abstract and the main manuscript are not similar, and they should be more concordant a specific.
2. The CWRCE seems to present heteroscedasticity as presented on the Bland-Altman plot (Figure 2d). The authors should describe and calculate this, discussing the findings.
3. Could the authors explain why use both the Pearson correlation coefficient and ICC? There is a specific reason for presenting both methods?
4. Considering the importance of establishing narrow limits on endurance time during cycle ergometry between 3-8 min, I think the authors should present a sub-analysis of performance and reliability within these limits. I have serious concerns about the data presented, because looking at the figure 1a. there are too much subjects <180sec and >480sec. This could bias importantly the results.