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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors addressed all comments made. However there are still some questions/ comments left:

I acknowledge that during data collection no changes concerning methods and study protocol are possible, however some weaknesses concerning methods should then be addressed:

**Minor Essential Revision**

1. Please add patient entities besides ALL
2. Please do not call patients or ward staff blinded. I think it is great that physical therapist doing the testing are blinded, however neither patients nor ward staff will be really “blind” about the group randomization
3. Please add to your manuscript that the Fitbit is so far not validated but will be validated by you before data analysis.
4. Concerning the diary I am still very skeptical, please change the sentence :“Using the activity diary data, it is possible to assess the intensity, frequency and duration of activity." (page 14) A diary will maybe add information but it will not be precise here. Furthermore, I do figure 10-minute intervals for subjective assessment (for 24/7) definitely unrealistic. I am very curious concerning your results.
5. I can understand why you only use the Fitbit twice per patient due to resources, however, I figure this a clear limitation to your study especially as you name it as your main device for your primary outcome plus it is the objective measurement, please address.
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