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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Methods
In general the methods are very clearly written and easy to understand. The questionnaires are well described and the theory behind the research is well explained.

Please clarify why a minimum of 3 days of wear of the accelerometer was considered sufficient for comparison with the PASE and IPAQ, both of which measure activity over the previous 7 days.

If a patient had had a very active (or inactive) 3 days and these figures are being compared with the average figures from a 7 day period assessed by PASE then this may explain the relatively poor correlation.

Please clarify how many days the patients wore the accelerometer for. How many people wore the accelerometer for the full 7 days?

I am concerned that the authors have stated that the PASE is not valid based on a relatively small sample group and comparison with the accelerometer that captured data over a different time period.

Discussion
The information for test/re-test reliability of PASE and assessing validity with comparison with IPAQ and accelerometer is interesting and warrants publication but before this manuscript is accepted I would like further details as described above.

Conclusion
I would currently remove the sentence “Overall, the test-retest reliability and the construct validity revealed that the PASE was not acceptable for recording PA intensity” from the Conclusion for the reasons described above. Otherwise the conclusion is accurate and a fair summary of the research.

Minor Essential Revisions

Outcomes
IPAQ. Please clarify what is meant by MET?
Table 1

This data was collected at the baseline visit for the study, which was over 2 years ago. A note to this effect should be added either to the paper or to the table so this is clear. Has the data in the table (e.g. age) been altered at all to reflect this 2 year gap?

Discretionary Revisions

Background

Second paragraph- please clarify what is meant by “doubly labelled water” to briefly explain the theory/process.
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