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Reviewer's report:

This study addressed a timely issue but often described in the literature. While the study has some merits it has different points that need a clarification before the paper is suitable for publication. Some comments and possible amendments are placed below:

General comments

Short version of IPA doesn’t assess different dimensions of Pa such as recreational, ........We only get total PA values.

In general the authors are too many references in some parts that could be clearly deleted because they are just an over reporting citation, which, from my point of view makes any sense

Specific comments

Page 3 , 1st par. Authors mentioned older adults, why. It doesn’t make sense in this context.

The end of 2nd parg needs a reference

What the real problem under study is ? The perceptions ? or how the variables from the ecological model affects PA ? Studies about environmental features and policy are well know in the literature even in Canadian population.

If, as stated, one of the aims is to look at these variables influences on PA by gender, age and education, this points should be raised before instead to try to explain the importance of study for the lack of information. This is a big epidemiological study, which is worthy. So, the reader needs to understand how the variables under study are related or not so far and the relevance of its interpretation at individual and population level.

Results- the age groups should be clarified. The idea of one group comprising individuals aged 15 untill 40 years old has several implication even with regard to results interpretation.

I the methodological approach included a questionnaire that assessed different points such g«has self-efficacy, facility availability and so forth why are the authors carried out a exploratory factor analysis ?
In statistical analysis the expression “table 1” is repeated.

Discussion should be enhances. I do think that authors might increase their discussion points if they just try to pointed-out the novelty of their findings and what they can bring for further developments in this area. I do think that just interpret their data by comparison with those that agree or disagree is far behind the potential of this data base.

I don’t be sure that authors can use the correct interpretation for the differences of PA according the dimensions analysed (please see limitations). At least they need to be coherent regardless they talk about men or women. Once again the problem of the age groups need a strong comment in this analysis (15 years-old is completely different of 25, 30 and 40 years-old).

This is true for other issues. How can a 15 years old feels more barriers and have less free time than older ones.

This study addresses several variables and I do feel that would be more interesting to make a global point of the findings found. Authors might make the point of the most important and new outcomes using them to give potential advices for further studies, developments or intervention strategies (for instance perceived health benefits was not related to PA. Authors stated that limited item for assess perceived PA benefits would be a limitation. Why is this not true for other positive interactions ?)

Authors stated as a limitation that the survey assessed total PA only.... This is true so change the description in abstract as my previous comment.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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