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Dear Editor,

Re: MS: 5811022013562497 “Validating the Physical Activity and Leisure Motivation Scale (PALMS)”

Many thanks for your email of 1 August 2014 providing Editor’s comments on our manuscript and inviting us to submit a revision. We have reviewed the above manuscript according to your Editor’s comments.

Editor’s comments:

I believe that the authors have revised their manuscript with great care. The key point of contention that remains between Reviewer 2 and the authors is the topic of criterion validity. Whether or not this is an appropriate term to use in this paper really depends on the aim - if the authors aim is to establish whether the PALMS is intrinsically the same as the REMM, then correlation between these two measures can be described as ‘criterion validity’. However, if the authors believe that by correlating the PALMS with the REMM this is demonstrating evidence that the PALMS captures PA and Leisure Motive, then Reviewer 2 is correct. This would not be criterion validity; rather convergent validity.

Please clarify the aims (abstract and introduction) that the purpose of correlating the PALMS and the REMM is to assess how well the PALMS functions/captures the same information as the REMM.

- One aim of this study was to establish whether the PALMS is intrinsically equivalent to the REMM. Thus, based on the Associate Editor’s comment the correlation between PALMS and REMM measures and subscales is described as criterion validity.

- We have added statements to this effect in the following FIVE locations:
  - Abstract: Page 2, lines 13-15
  - Introduction: page 8, line 25
  - Introduction: page 9, lines 16-17
  - Results: page 16, line 5
  - Discussion: page 17, lines 22-23.
We would like to thank the Associate Editor for taking the time to read our manuscript and provide thoughtful and helpful comments for revision. We believe the revised manuscript represents a significant improvement on the original.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours sincerely,

Keyvan Molanorouzi  Selina Khoo  Tony Morris