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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. It is clear that the author's have made substantial improvements to the manuscript since their last submission. The researchers have addressed the majority of the reviewer's concerns. However, I do think there is substantial room for improvement of this paper.

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.

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.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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