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Reviewer’s report:

Revisions/Clarification
1. An interesting, descriptive paper with pilot data necessary to justify a larger RCT. The study is well done, thorough and the manuscript easy to read. There is very little to critique although as a pilot study, it could be shortened considerably.

2. Early in the paper it would be helpful to introduce the 'concerns' that were raised prior to initiating the study.

3. What is unique about patients with ovarian cancer (in comparison to breast cancer) that might prohibit them from participating in a walking program? Why do you think they might respond differently than other cancer populations?

4. An important finding is that this program is 'safe'. It appears that there was only one minor adverse event in the entire study, however, the participants missed a median of 2 sessions during the program. Can you comment on the possibility that the exercise program contributed to the hospitalizations, illness etc?

5. In this study, 13 of 17 women completed 85% of their planned chemotherapy dose; this variable should be calculated for all 17 participants. How does this compare to the 83% reported in women with advanced ovarian cancer. Once again, can you comment on the effect of this exercise intervention on chemotherapy completion rate?

6. Although the exercise programs were individualized, they were not supervised. Did the face-to-face weekly contacts with the exercise physiologist involve supervised exercise? There seems to be a great deal of flexibility in the exercise program and while that is positive in many ways, you may need more structure to the program in a RCT.

7. Overall adherence should be reported as a percentage for all 17 women. Should adherence not be defined as the number of exercise sessions completed/ the number of exercise sessions prescribed?

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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