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Dear Associate Editor,

We would like to thank you for the opportunity to respond to the comments of the two reviewers. Please find below a point by point response (in italics) to each comment below. We have also used the yellow highlighter option in Word to show all of the changed sections.

**Reviewer 1:**
We appreciate that Reviewer 1 like the revised version of the paper.

**Reviewer 2:**
The revised manuscript is much improved.

*We thank the reviewer for the supportive comments.*

Given how much the results changed when inactivity was classified in 3 groups, instead of 2, it makes the reviewer wonder whether a sensitivity analysis was done to determine how sensitive the results are to other classifications.

*We thank the reviewer for the comment. However, the classification into 3 groups was based on conventions within the field that are used to assess compliance with a key public health guideline. We have therefore retained the original 3 groups in the analyses and have not performed a sensitivity analysis with any other classifications. However, to address the reviewers concern we have added a new justification for our analytical approach and the important link to public health policy on page 7 (paragraph 2).*

**Small changes that that should be made include:**
- change RRR to RR. Relative risks are ratios, thus relative risk ratio is redundant and not the common terminology.

*This change has been made throughout.*

- if one presents a 95% CI, one doesn’t need to also show a p-value.

*We agree that 95% CI are essential for understanding the significance of an association and particularly the variability in those associations. However, we feel that many researchers also find p values informative and have therefore opted to provide both. If the editor feels that p-values are not wanted for the journal we will remove them but we do feel that they are helpful to many readers and so have retained them in the revised version.*

**Formatting**

*We have edited the paper again and checked all sections of the paper comply with the BMC Public Health guidelines.*