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Dear Editor

We have revised the manuscript in light of the reviewer feedback. The outline of our revisions is set out below in response to the reviewer feedback.

We are pleased that the reviewer recognized that we had undertaken substantial improvements to the manuscript since their last submission.

Major compulsory- I think that the discussion section could be substantially improved. Much of the discussion section still reads as though results are being displayed. It lacks synthesis of the material, especially in regards to categorizing the results of studies by different guidelines. When I read this paper, I don't see much difference in prevalence estimates according to the guideline categories (more versus less detailed). This should be addressed in the discussion section. Likewise, there needs to be more of a take home message- what is the significance of the findings of this study and how will it advance the field in the discussion section, not just a reiteration of the results.

Response: We have substantially revised the discussion both to develop the synthesis and the academic argument in addition to clarifying the message of the paper.

Minor- in the paragraph "self-reported PA" you indicate that there are 48 studies that used subjective measures. It was indicated that 29 studies used more detailed and 23 used less detailed guidelines with 5 adopting two measures. The numbers don't add up- 29 +23 is 52, which would suggest that 4 used 2 measures or one of your other numbers is wrong.

Response: We have recalculated the number of studies so that there are no errors.

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published.

Response: We have revised the paper to ensure a high standard of English language throughout.

We hope our paper now meets the standard required for publication.

Yours faithfully

Alison While, Fei Sun and Ian Norman