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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have revised the paper in a largely satisfying manner. They have also responded to the issues mentioned in the review.

However there is still one major issue pending:

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

In Accordance with my suggestions the authors do report stat.significant and non-significant results in the text:

Page 13, para 1:

For educational status, participants that completed high school reported higher mean time (Min week-1) in doing moderate (98.5 vs 95.8, p= 0.89), walking (75.8 vs 66.3, p= 0.56) and total physical activity (MET- Min week-1 of 3892.3 vs 3417, p= 0.57), while those without high school educations reported higher mean time (Min week-1) in vigorous (88.5 vs 81.7, p=0.77) and sitting (1646.9 vs 1363.3, p=0.34) activities. Participants that were employed reported more time (Min week-1) in vigorous (90.6 vs 72.9, p= 0.34), moderate (107.8 vs 87.8, p= 0.20), walking (77.7 vs 70.0, p= 0.56) and total physical activity (MET- Min week-1 of 4008.5 vs 3571.8, p=0.57) than those who were unemployed, who reported higher time in sitting activity (1664.1 vs 1504.9, p=0.52) (Not shown in table).

However what I intended the author to do is to report that there are no stat.differences: So these above paragraph should report e.g.

“For educational status, participants that completed high school did not report statistical significant higher mean time (Min week-1) in doing moderate (98.5 vs 95.8, p= 0.89), walking (75.8 vs 66.3, p= 0.56) and total physical activity (MET- Min week-1 of 3892.3 vs 3417, p= 0.57). Similar those without high school educations did not report statistical significant higher mean time (Min week-1) in vigorous (88.5 vs 81.7, p=0.77) and sitting (1646.9 vs 1363.3, p=0.34) activities. Participants that were employed did not report statistical significant more time (Min week-1) in vigorous (90.6 vs 72.9, p= 0.34), moderate (107.8 vs 87.8, p= 0.20), walking (77.7 vs 70.0, p= 0.56) and total physical activity (MET- Min week-1 of 4008.5 vs 3571.8, p=0.57) than those who were unemployed, who reported no statistical significant higher time in sitting activity (1664.1 vs 1504.9, p=0.52) (Not shown in table).”
Please feel free to find some better formulations but it is important to tell that there are no stat. significant results for these aspects.

Of course the Discussion had to be amended in a similar way:

Page 17, para 2, lines 6-12:

“Similar findings were found for the socioeconomic-based analyses, where participants with higher socioeconomic status as indicated by education (high school education) and employment (those employed) were more physically active than those with low socioeconomic status, and more consistent in their response to questions on vigorous and total physical activity. While it may be difficult to draw any definite conclusion from these findings, they reflect the potential influence of gender and socioeconomic status on physical activity assessment”

Should read like “No statistical significant differences … were found for participants with higher socioeconomic status as indicated by education (high school education) and employment (those employed) … “

Please feel free to find some better formulations but it is important to tell that there are no stat. significant results for these aspects.

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable