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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper and, for the most part, a comprehensive review. The authors made a considerable effort to discuss the literature and importantly identify flaws in the existing interventions. The language and writing are mostly clear throughout and the structure is appropriate for the most part. However, the paper is in need of some revisions before the final version can be assessed and I include various comments on all sections below.

Introduction:
1. In the final paragraph of the Introduction, the aims of the full study should be stated. Thus, an aim of the study is to systematically review the literature and then report the results. (MER)

Methods:
2. Study design: It is not clear to me why the authors considered systematic reviews for inclusion in their review. In standard systematic reviews only primary research tends to be included, as secondary literature then has to be assessed for overlapping articles and is supposed to incorporate the former anyway. The authors do not include any reviews in their final list, however, this is a question that needs to be addressed. Additionally, it is not clear what is the study design of “overviews of systematic reviews”. (MCR)
3. Population: An explicit list of the specific diseases needs to be included, instead of the two examples. (MCR)
4. Literature searches c: Could the authors explain how these specific journals were selected? (MER)
5. Data extraction: The comment about heterogeneity of included papers is better suited in the Results section. How was heterogeneity assessed? (MER)
6. The authors include their keywords and search strategy in the Additional File, but it is not clear why numbers of retrieved papers for all keywords is important to include. More interesting to the reader are the combinations of keywords and algorithms along with numbers of retrieved articles in each database. (MER)

Results:
7. The Results section is not concise and generally hard to follow and at many points it feels that the authors are repeating a lot of the information contained in the tables. I would suggest to the authors to review this section and only include
collective information, minimise repetition and delete the part on Secondary Outcomes since they are not discussed in later sections. (MER)

Discussion:

8. The authors have made a good effort to discuss the results of the study, especially in terms of emerging issues in existing literature. Thus, I see that their review not only addresses the topic of physical activity interventions but also how relevant studies could be designed in better terms. This is a point that the authors may wish to raise in their paper. (DR)

9. Limitations: The authors identify only one limitation in the final paragraph of their Discussion. However, a number of other limitations is identified in previous paragraphs (e.g. heterogeneity, recall bias in the included studies, several included studies of borderline quality, 2nd paragraph in page 16). I suggest a slight restructure to collect all the limitations in one paragraph. (DR)
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10. In their acknowledgement the authors state that MG and MM carried out the literature searches which contradicts the statement in page 8. This point should be clarified. (MER)

11. The PRISMA statement is included but I do not see that it is completed. (MER)
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