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Dear Dr Kouvonen

Thank you for your kind response. We have made the changes to the manuscript as you have requested and addressed the reviewers’ comments below.

- The reviewers’ comments have been copied below and our responses addressing each comment are presented in bold bullet points.

Reviewer 1 comments:

**Version:** 3  **Date:** 4 March 2013  
**Reviewer:** Dane Van Domelen  
**Reviewer’s report:**

Summary:

1. The authors have done a very nice job incorporating the suggested revisions and the manuscript is in great shape. Please see the following minor suggestions.

   - **We thank reviewer 1 for their comments**

Major compulsory revisions:

(Delete)

Minor essential revisions:

2. In abstract please clearly indicate that comparisons are for percentages rather than minutes

   - **We have amended the following text in the abstract: “Time in activity levels (as percentage of wear time) during work and non-work time were analysed using paired t-tests and Pearson’s correlations.”**

Discretionary revisions:

(Delete)

Minor issues not for publication:

3. In Abstract Results please remove “during work hours” in first sentence as it is redundant

   - **“during work hours” has been removed**

Reviewer 2 comments:

Thanks very much for your thoughtful and comprehensive revision. A few minor comments

- **We thank reviewer 2 for their comments**
1. You might consider citing and discussing this paper - Employment and physical activity in the U.S. Van Domelen DR et al. Am J Prev Med. 2011 Aug;41(2):136-45. The more detailed information you have about specific times when respondents are working or not are an advance over our analysis of a large data set concerning employment status and objectively measured PA and sedentary time.

   • We have added the following text to the discussion section of the manuscript: “The study analysed work hours as distinct from work days [62] which allowed for separate examination of activity levels during non-work time on a work day.”, citing the Van Domelen article

2. I found the phrase ‘sedentary risk’ a little confusing – do you mean the risk of sedentary time or the risks that might arise from sedentary time?

   • We have modified the title to “The contribution of office work to sedentary behavior associated risk”

3. I am not sure the 3-d graphs used in Figures 2a-d are the most effective. Maybe grouped 2-d histograms with some measure of dispersion (Standard errors?) would be more informative. Similarly, the pie charts used in Figure1 are hard to read when printed out. Perhaps these would be better presented in tabular format – the fact that you put numbers on the pies suggests you can see how the details might be of interest. A table would allow you to present more information as well, such as percentiles or other measures of dispersion.

   • We respectfully disagree regarding the figures. We feel that the 3D diagrams best illustrate the intensity of activity in the time categories (bouts) and show the pattern of variation between the different time periods. Similarly, we feel that the pie charts in figure 1 illustrate the variability between the days/time periods more effectively than a table would provide.

Many thanks,

Sharon Parry and Leon Straker