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Reviewer's report:

Comments
The manuscript has improved, but some major compulsory revision is still needed.

Intervention
It seems as though the TAKE 10! Program already had been implemented at all community center but that the new part is the educational program, but this must be stated more clearly. If so, it can explain some of the non-significant changes. If not, how were the control group introduced to the program?

Main outcome measures
The physical activity questions still need to be elaborated. Was it the TAKE 10! Calender that was used as the outcome measure? If so, what efforts were made to increase exercise levels apart from the exercise sessions that were offered. Were any behavioral aspects addressed during the lectures apart from explaining the reasoning behind each exercise? If not this should be addressed as a limitation and is not, to my view, equal to evaluating for example self-efficacy. If the calendar was used as the outcome measure this should be stated as a limitation. It would have been more appropriate to use a validated physical activity questionnaire.

Statistical analyses
The reason for having a randomized controlled trial is to compare results between groups not to perform within-groups analyses, but the only between-group analyses that is presented is in Table 3. It is also not clear to me why the authors haven't performed between group analyses for the total DVS or the physical activity outcome. This hampers the possibility to draw conclusion.

Results
At the end of this section, the results of a crossover design are suddenly described, but this is as far as I can see not described in the Method section, this should be clarified as well as the rationale for this design.

Discussion and conclusion
The summary of the results is based on the within-groups analyses not the
between-group which is the correct way when reporting results from an RCT. This should be corrected.

Tables and figures
There are two many tables and several of them can be collapsed for example in main and secondary outcomes. Figure 1 is informative but I don not understand what median size is, this needs to be explained. Figure 2 is difficult to interpreter since a figure text is missing, but apart from that, I do not think that this figure add any important information.
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