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**Reviewer’s report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes, and of great importance. One of the first studies in ovarian setting.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Very clearly articulated. Please provide additional information about how the program was individualized to patients. Please address why longer walker sessions occurred “earlier” in the program? How did the program change over time? Why did they exercise longer at the start and shorter later?

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes and analysis is appropriate

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Absolutely

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes, and the finding are an important contribution to the science of cancer rehabilitation by demonstrating a benefit of exercise on for women with ovarian cancer. This is perhaps the first study to demonstrate efficacy and feasibility.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Provide additional limitations of the research – limited sample size, etc.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes, no conflicts.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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