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Dear BMC Public Health Editorial Board

We thank the editor for the opportunity to respond to editorial comments. Below we have provided a point-by-point response to comments provided by the editor and have detailed subsequent changes that have been made to the manuscript.

Chloë Williamson (on behalf of all authors)

1. Please title your conclusions sections

Response: “Conclusions” has now been added as a subheading in our discussion (page 12, line 280).
2. Currently, the contributions of authors Paul Kelly do not automatically qualify them for authorship. In the section “Authors’ contributions”, please provide further clarifications on their contributions, and see our guidelines for authorship below.

Response: Following this comment we have made Dr Paul Kelly’s contribution to the study clearer. By amending the text in the author’s contributions section (beginning on page 14, line 319).

The text used to read:

“TS and PK developed the original research question and supervised CW who designed the study, undertook the initial analyses and drafted the manuscript. TS finalised the analyses. All authors contributed and commented on subsequent drafts.”

And now reads:

“TS and PK conceived and developed the original research questions. TS and PK supervised CW who designed the study, undertook the initial analyses and drafted the manuscript. TS finalised the analyses. All authors contributed to and commented on subsequent revisions of the manuscript. All authors approved the final manuscript.”

3. Please also clarify whether all authors read and approve the final manuscript in your “Authors’ contributions” section.

Response: We believe this has been addressed in our response to Comment 2.

4. In the Funding section, please also describe the role of the funding bodies in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Response: To address this comment we have included a sentence at the end of the Funding section (page 14, line 316).
The section used to read:

“CW completed this work as part of her MSc in Physical Activity and Health; PK is funded by the University of Edinburgh; TS was funded by a College Research Award at the University of Edinburgh and by the Medical Research Council (grant number MC_UU_12015/3) at the University of Cambridge.”

And now reads:

“CW completed this work as part of her MSc in Physical Activity and Health; PK is funded by the University of Edinburgh; TS was funded by a College Research Award at the University of Edinburgh and by the Medical Research Council (grant number MC_UU_12015/3) at the University of Cambridge. The funding bodies did not influence the study design, analysis, interpretation of data or writing of the manuscript.”

5. Please rearrange your figure legends so that the legends are immediately after your references.

Response: we have made this amendment and the figure captions can now be found beginning on page 17, line 398; immediately following our references.