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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed several issues, but some issues still need to be clarified and the manuscript can be further improved.

1. Abstract:
   a. It should be indicated that the study population is Swedish.
   b. “more factors were associated with ….. among women”: please specify what factors.

2. Page 5, 2nd paragraph: “…all surviving members of the 81-, 84-, 87-, 90-, 93-, and 96-year age cohorts.” This sentence is not clear. If all surviving members aged 81 years or old were selected, no stratification by age group is necessary for this age group.

3. Page 5, 2nd paragraph: “…the participants were divided into the following 4 age groups: 60-66, 72-78, 81-87, and 90-96 years.” Why people aged 67-71, 79-80 and 88-89 years were not included? Were there no people at these ages?

4. Page 6, 2nd paragraph: If the 2 survey questions in the original questionnaire about outdoor recreational PH contained gymnastics, then the word “gymnastics” can not be deleted from the text.

5. Page 6: “stepwise multiple binary logistic regression was used to evaluate differences in variables with significantly …….“. The logistic regression was used to evaluate the associations between various independent variables and the performance of outdoor recreational PA, not to evaluate differences.

6. Results, page 7-8: It is better to be more conservative to say factors that were significantly associated with outdoor PA rather than “factors that significantly enhanced the performance of outdoor recreational PA” because the significant associations are necessarily causal relationships.

7. For table IV, please add a footnote or specify in the title that the analysis was done by four-fold table, rather than univariate logistic regression.

8. Table V presents the results from multivariate logistic regressions; therefore, please add a footnote that what covariates were adjusted to for each odds ratio.

9. Page 13, line 16: It is better to use the word “assess” rather than “check”.
**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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