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Reviewer's report:

I think it is an interesting study, as it explores older adults' perceptions about mindfulness and exercise practices. The paper is worthy of publication.

I offer the following specific suggestions to make the paper easier for readers of various backgrounds to understand.

1. Title: "Little things do not get to me anymore": a qualitative study of older adults’ perspectives on initiating exercise and mindfulness practice

The part "Little things do not get to me anymore" is a quote from the participants, and it is catchy. But I think non-native English readers might find it a little difficult to understand. In my opinion, "a qualitative study of older adults' perspectives on initiating exercise and mindfulness practice" is good enough as the title of this paper.

2. Background: After the first paragraph, it would be better to insert a paragraph that explains why you focused on exercise and mindfulness as health-promoting activities.

3. Method: I think it would be beneficial to provide information on how the participants of the MEDEX study were recruited.

4. Focus groups: on line 57, "other community engagement opportunities such as Oasis or library study group"

Adding an explanation of "Oasis or library study group" would be helpful to readers of other cultural backgrounds.

5. Appendix: It seems the question regarding the benefits of participating in the interventions is missing from the interview guide.
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