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Reviewer’s report:

The paper has been revised accordingly and is extensively improved. However, there are still issues related to consistency and power that should be considered before publication.

Major comments

1. Method section, under the subheading IPAQ: Please use the same order of describing the different concepts/intensities in the questionnaire as they are written in the questionnaire itself (i.e. vigorous, moderate, walking and sitting). This will help the reader to understand the paper better. Please also use this order consistently throughout the paper.

2. Regarding statistical analysis and results splitting the file by SES I am concerned about the power i.e. correctness of using 4 and 5 groups of SES in a sample of 102 subjects. The sample consists for example of 4 students, 7 with no education etc. I suggest making a dichotomized variable for education and employment. The results are impossible to interpret. This is seen in the result section and discussion, where the authors try to make some type of interpretation based upon data that is not valid.

3. The authors have defined different ICC values to be graded/assessed based upon another reliability study, not upon any statistical guidelines. Furthermore this rating seems to be also used for the validity test, i.e. spearman correlations.

4. In the statistical part the authors first describe test-retest analysis then validity analysis. In the result section the authors report validity prior to reliability. Consistency would make the paper more readable.

5. Result section, construct validity last sentence can be deleted. The Bland-Altman analysis cannot be done if different units (RPP and min/week) are used as it is built upon mean and difference.

6. The discussion is too long and repeats the results more than discuss interpretation and methodological problems.

7. Page 19, line 3. I am not sure I understand this. If the subjects included in this study speak both Hausa and English, can one then say that the Hausa IPAQ SF is valid for those that only speak Hausa?

8. Page 19, line 6-7. I do not understand this statement.

9. Conclusion – consistency in order and what about moderate intensity?
10. Figure 1 and 2 – needs to be improved. The numbers do not need two decimals (neither in figure text nor in the figure) as it is not so precise. Bland-Altman suggests using the standard as reference i.e English minus Hausa. The bullets are difficult to see.

11. Check the abstract with regard to consistency as well.

Minor comments

12. Page 5, line 4 – add and “s” after population.
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