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Dear Editor

Response to the reviewers’ feedback on MS: 2038968182703585

Physical activity in older people: a systematic review

Referee 1: 3708833167913615
Raises no issues.

Referee 2: 8759551487985791
The feedback acknowledges that the original submission was greatly improved but asks for:

**Major compulsory revisions** in the method section regarding clarification of the cut-points of higher and lower guidelines. This is not well articulated and makes interpretation of the results and discussion sections difficult. There seems to be considerable overlap in the "higher" versus "lower" guidelines and it is not clear if it makes sense to divide the studies this way. This issue needs further clarification and explanation. Why is it important? How does it relate to the discussion?

Response:
A distinction has been drawn between more detailed and less detailed guidelines/recommendations re. PA see page 4 of the review under heading: PA recommendations or guidelines. The subsequent text has been amended to clarify the inter-relationship between the guidelines and reported PA levels.

**Minor essential revisions:**
There are still grammatical errors throughout this paper. It is highly recommended that the authors consult with a grammarian. The abstract has several grammar issues that need to be addressed (e.g., starting a sentence with a number) and this impacts the quality of the abstract.

Response:
The text has been edited carefully so that it is of a high standard of written English.

In the limitations study, how did the limitations described impact the present study findings? What concerns are there about the validity of the current findings?

Response:
The major limitations of the review are acknowledged in section headed: Review limitations but nonetheless the review sets out the current available evidence on which researchers can build to provide evidence to inform future public health strategies.

Figure 1 is not readable due to its small font size. I am not sure if this is an error in the submission process or if the authors need to re-examine this figure and change the font size.

Response:
Figure 1 is larger and fully readable.

Figure 2- The axes still do not have labels on them and these need to be added.

Response:
The axes have been labelled.

We hope that the revised manuscript meets the requirements for publication.

Yours sincerely

Fei Sun, Alison While and Ian Norman