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Reviewer's report:

Please number your comments and divide them into
• Major Compulsory Revisions

The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example, additional necessary experiments or controls, statistical mistakes, errors in interpretation.

o 1) Page 4 – accelerometry dose create the possibility of reactivity to wearing the device. Please comment.

o 2) in the methods section the % of Swedes that are members of fitness clubs/facilities should be listed. Also a better description of whether the facilities are private/public and whether the public facilities such as tennis courts are charged (money cost) to use should be provided.

o 3) page 16 – check your interpretation of the article by Sallis – if this was a cross sectional study he should not have concluded what he did. If it was a longitudinal study please provide more details about the study design. If cross sectional I think that the Sallis paper supports the idea that businesses know where to build their facilities which is where the exercisers live.

o Overall it is a well written paper and easy to follow. My concern is that the paper has an ecological aspect. You know where they live and where physical activity facilities are located, but you do not know if the active used those facilities. You are back to the problem of, “do physical activity businesses build where exercisers live, or do facilities make people active?” If facilities make people active you should recommend that governments build more public facilities, and that businesses should build in those same types of places. I think that governments would build more if they had the money and businesses would build in places that make business sense. But governments do not have unlimited funds and businesses will not build in places that are unlikely to be profitable.

o Your list of limitations is complete.

• Minor Essential Revisions

o Table 3 – “Mars”?

The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures,
the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

- Discretionary Revisions

- Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the questions below constitute the report, bearing your name, that will be forwarded to the authors and published on the site if the article is accepted.
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