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Dear Editor,

We are glad to resubmit our revised manuscript entitled: *Effects of resistance and functional-skills training on habitual activity and constipation in older adults living in long-term care facilities: a randomized controlled trial [ISRCTN87177281]*.

We have addressed the comment of the reviewer about the rationale for not monitoring the intensity of the exercise training. The changes are printed in bold. A detailed response to the comments of the reviewer is given below. The paper was already written according to the manuscript formatting checklist of your journal.

We hope that we have satisfactorily responded to the reviewer’s comments and that the manuscript in its present form merits publication in BMC Geriatrics.

Sincerely,

Marijke Chin A Paw
**Reviewer’s comment**

The phrase in the discussion concerning the monitoring of the exercise intensity (page 13-14) raises a serious problem with the professional ethical standards of physical therapists when the paper is published. That is, the ethical standard of the Royal Dutch Society of Physiotherapy - in parallel with those of World Confederation of Physical Therapy-standards - demand proper registration and monitoring of therapy-input and its outcome. Based on the aforementioned phrase in the discussion, it seems that the 'real life' situation of this project was/is not in accordance with these ethical standards. In order to avoid discussion about this problem, I would like to advise the authors to change the phrase and come up with another rationale for not monitoring the exercise intensity and intermediate outcome. This should also be added in the discussion-phrase the authors added at page 14, lines 6-13. Might be that the authors could in this respect refer to amongst others a recent paper of Glasziou (P. Glasziou, L. Irwig, and D. Mant. Monitoring in chronic disease: a rational approach. Lancet 330:644-648, 2005).

**Author’s reply**

We have deleted the sentence the reviewer refers to on page 14 i.e. *For this reason there was no close control or exact measurement of the exercise intensity*

As suggested by the reviewer we have added the following sentences to the discussion section:

A limitation of our study is that because of the nature of the trial (i.e. an effectiveness trial rather than an efficacy trial), there was no close control or exact measurement of the exercise intensity by the researchers.

Practical systems for monitoring exercise intensity in care settings are needed. According to Glasziou et al. [1] monitoring should aim to establish the response to the exercise intervention, detect the need to adjust the exercise intensity and detect adverse effects.

**Page/paragraph of changes**

Discussion: page 14, lines 5,6 and 12-15
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