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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editors,

Thank you very much for your feedback concerning the first revision of our manuscript “Physical inactivity as a policy problem: Applying a concept from policy analysis to a public health issue”. As an attachment, we are sending you the second revision of the manuscript that is based on the reviews by Dr. Gleeson and Dr. Anokye. We would like to thank the two reviewers for taking the time to review the manuscript again. We have made the following the adjustments to the manuscript:

---

Reviewer 1 (Dr. Gleeson):

Minor essential revisions

The authors have reframed the policy problem as 'physical inactivity' which works well. The paper is now much tighter conceptually than the earlier version. However there are two points that need to be worded slightly differently to fit this new conceptualisation of the problem. These are points (4) and (6) in the summary of the analysis which appears in both the abstract (p. 2) and the conclusions (p. 18).

Now that the policy problem is defined as physical inactivity, (4) 'is sometimes difficult to "sell" to the public when its benefits are not highly divisible' should be re-worded to something along the lines of 'is addressed through interventions that can be difficult to "sell" to the public when their benefits are not highly divisible'. (6) 'addresses a broad scope of activities' should be changed to 'must be addressed through a broad scope of activities' or similar.
These points are well explained and elaborated in the body of the paper and it is only the wording in the summary in the abstract and conclusion which needs to be aligned with the new conceptualisation of the problem.

Response: Thank you for pointing out this inconsistency. We agree that rephrasing items (4) and (6) in the abstract and the conclusion will better fit the conceptual changes made in the first revision. We have changed the wording accordingly.

---

Reviewer 2 (Dr. Anokye):

[no comments]

---

We sincerely hope that you and the reviewers will find our manuscript suitable for publication in HARPS in its current form. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any further comments or requests. We are looking very much forward to hearing from you.

With kind regards

The authors