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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr Croker

Thank you for the invitation to resubmit this paper. Please find our responses to your comments below.

Yours sincerely

Nia Coupe

The first reviewer requested clarification over who carried out the double coding of BCTs - was this an author or not. The manuscript states that a researcher carried this out (which I take to mean not an author), but could you please be explicit over whether this was an author or not.

Response: We have now explicitly stated that the researcher was not an author.

Firstly (and importantly) you rightly used person-first language to refer to people with overweight/obesity throughout most of the manuscript. However, the title is not consistent with this and I would strongly recommend amending this.

Response: Following correspondence with yourself, the title is in line with this.
Additionally, please also change the sentence on page 3 (line 12-14) so uses person-first language (i.e. "classified as having...").

Response: We have included “classified as having”.

Page 3 (line 22)- should be BMI ≥25

Response: Typo corrected

Page 14 (line 1)- the word 'device' has been omitted

Response: The word ‘device’ has been added.

Very minor, but you don't need a capital 'A' in activity in the headings on page 14 (line 43) and page 15 (line 45)

Response: This has been corrected.

In addition to these, we have also modified a response from a previous reviewer’s comment in relation to the inter-rater reliability:

Page 8, line 38: "Papers were assessed independently by three raters with good agreement?" - How was 95% 'good' agreement assessed?

And

Page 8, line 50: "The BCTs were double coded by a second researcher" - not clear if the second coder was one of the authors (or not). Please clarify. Also, how was 'good agreement' corroborated between authors for BCTs (i.e. 79%)?

Old response: These had originally been calculated using percentage agreement. We have now calculated this using Cohen’s kappa, which we have reported.

New response: Following discussions within the team and further reading, we realised an error in reporting Cohen’s kappa. Firstly, in relation to the bias ratings, it is not usual to report inter-rater reliability, and as such we have removed this. Secondly, regarding the BCT inter-rater reliability, we have also identified that Cohen’s kappa is not appropriate given that it does not take into account the number of negative ratings that are usual within BCT coding. As such, we have used PABAK (prevalence-adjusted-bias-adjusted-kappa), which does account for this, and has previously been used for rating BCT reliability (ref in paper).