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Reviewer’s report:

Re Review of the manuscript „The short international physical activity questionnaire: cross-cultural adaptation, validation and reliability of the Hausa language version in Nigeria.

The authors have spent a remarkable amount of work in the revision of their manuscript. The revised manuscript has improved very much. The authors also respond in a largely satisfying way to the comments of the reviewers.

There are only few issues left that should be addressed by the authors in revising their paper:

Major compulsory revisions:

Page 10, para 1 and Page 12, para 4 (construct validity). It remains unclear which relationships and differences had been actually tested and which findings were significant. Did the authors only examine association between IPAQ scales and rate-pressure-product? Or did they also examine association between IPAQ scales and BMI? Did they also examine mean-group differences in IPAQ scales between males and females, socio-economic status groups etc? If yes they should report that here. In the results section the authors then should report the findings (significant as well as non-significant results). If no such analyses had been performed I would recommend they do so.

Page 13, para 1, para 2 and para 3: Although the findings on the differences in reliability between the different groups are interesting and important, the actual sample is too small to allow meaningful comparisons. What I intended to suggest in my previous review was to examine differences in the mean scores between these groups – e.g. do people in low socioeconomic status group on average report higher or lower levels of physical activity. These group comparisons could be performed for socioeconomic status groups, gender and age-groups etc. (e.g. do woman or men report higher level of activity (not: does the measurement achieve a higher level of reliability). These findings of course should be reported in connection with the reports on the construct validity of the Measure.

Page 17, para 2 to page 18, para 1: See comment above.

Minor essential revisions:

Page 2, abstract, para 2: it should be made clear that concurrent validity refers to
the association between hausa and original version. E.g. “… for concurrent (correlation with English version) and construct …”.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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