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Jan 25, 2019

Dear Amelia De Salis, Eva Szunyogova, and Editorial board of BMC Public Health,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity for carrying out these revisions for the manuscript “DISTINCT TRAJECTORIES OF PHYSICAL ACTIVITY AND RELATED FACTORS DURING THE LIFE COURSE IN THE GENERAL POPULATION: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW”. Thank you also for informing me that after these revisions this manuscript could potentially be acceptable for publication in BMC Public Health.

We have revised the manuscript according to the final suggestions. Please find our point-by-point responses to the latest comments at the end of this letter. In accordance with the editor’s request, these last changes are not indicated with yellow nor in any other ways in the manuscript.
Thus, the manuscript and other files are cleaned versions that does not contain any tracked changes etc.

I look forward to hearing from you. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I had still misunderstood some of the submission guidelines.

Sincerely,

The corresponding author Irinja Lounassalo

Faculty of Sport and Health Sciences, University of Jyväskylä, Finland
P.O. Box 35, FI-40014 University of Jyväskylä, Finland
+358-50-546 8744
irinja.lounassalo@jyu.fi

RESPONSE TO THE LATEST COMMENTS OF THE EDITOR:

Editor’s comment:

Please include the email addresses for all authors on the title page. The corresponding author should still be indicated.

Response: The email addresses of all authors has been added in the title page (page 1, lines 4-11). The corresponding author is also indicated (page 1, lines 15-18).

Editor’s comment:

In the "Availability of Data and Materials" section, please detail where the raw data supporting your findings can be found (including information found in any supplementary files). If the raw data is publicly available or can be requested, please state that this is the case, and where the data can be found/requested from. Alternatively, if you do not wish to/cannot share your data, please state (in the ‘Availability of data and Materials’ section) that data will not be shared, and state the reason. Please note that participant or patient data should be de-identified.

Response: The "Availability of Data and Materials" section is rephrased as follows: “All values used in this systematic review are gathered from the included articles [23–49] which are available in the following databases: PubMed (Medline), Web of Science, or CINAHL. If needed, the values used and analyzed during the current review – e.g., for the Figure 2 – are available from the corresponding author on a reasonable request. No individual participant or patient data was used in this review.” (Page 24-25, lines 521-526).
Editor’s comment:

We notice that author XY is missing from the authors’ contributions section. The individual contributions of all authors to the manuscript should be specified in the Authors’ Contributions section.

Response: We sincerely apologize for the unclear phrasing concerning the contribution of XY. Now the initials of all authors are indicated where needed and the sentences have been rephrased as follows: “All authors (IL, KS, AK, MH, SP, AT, XY and THT) made contributions to the conception of the study and were involved in designing it. IL, KS, MH, AK, AT, THT and SP contributed to the development of the selection criteria, and IL, AK and MH to the development of the quality assessment. IL developed the search strategy. IL and KS systematically searched for relevant literature. IL extracted the data from the articles, interpreted it and wrote the manuscript. AK and AT provided statistical expertise. All authors (IL, KS, AK, MH, SP, AT, XY and THT) critically revised drafts of the paper, and read and approved the final manuscript.” (Page 25, lines 533-540).

Editor’s comment:

Please provide figure titles/legends under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References. If Figure titles/legends are within the main text of the manuscript, please move them.

Response: I have provided titles and legends of the Figures under a separate heading after the References. I also provided the titles of the Additional files under another separate heading after the References. I hope this is correct. Figures’ titles/legends are not within the main text anymore, nor are the titles of the tables since all the tables are attached as additional files. However, I must confess that I am a little confused how to refer to additional files that are tables. Now, I have added a term of table in to the text after the term “additional file”, if in fact the table is an additional file. I checked previous publications of BMC Public Health and I hope this is now done correctly. Please correct me, if I have misunderstood how to refer to additional files, figures and tables in the text.

Also, some minor changes were done in the abbreviations' list since certain abbreviations were seen to be useless (e.g., mean and median) and they are now used as whole words in the text. Also, "n = number of cases" was added in the abbreviations. (Page 24, lines 509-515).

Additionally, the marks of the references 32 (Rovio et al) and 24 (Farooq et al) were improved so that the Editorial Manager would validate them. (Page 29, lines 607-609 and page 30, lines 630-632).

Editor’s comment
Thank you for providing a response to the reviewers. As this document is no longer required at this stage of the publication process, please remove it from your submission’s supplementary files.

Response: The previous response to the reviewers has now been removed from supplementary files.

Editor’s comment:

At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Response: I have now followed these instructions.

MINOR REQUEST TO THE EDITOR:

I wrote about this in the previous response letter but I would just like to remind you on the matter again: the PRISMA checklist (Additional file 1) is fulfilled according to the page numbers in the submitted manuscript. Thus, if the manuscript will be published, the page numbers might change after editing the format and layout of the manuscript according to BMC Public Health’s style. If this would be the case, please let me change the page numbers in the PRISMA checklist after seeing the layout of the final manuscript.

RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWERS’ COMMENTS:

Response: The Reviewer 1 only had a comment of “na” and, apparently, Reviewer 2 had none since there were only some instructions for the Reviewer 2. Thus, I assume that there are no comments from the Reviewers that would need to be responded to.

Again, we wish to thank you for following through this process and looking for the reviewers. We hope that these answers are satisfactory, and this manuscript can be considered for publication.