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Author’s response to reviews:

[7th June 2019]

Dear Editor and Reviewers:

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript and offering valuable advice. We appreciate the time and effort that you and each of the reviewers have dedicated to providing insightful feedback on ways to strengthen our paper. We have addressed your comments with point-by-point responses and revised the manuscript accordingly.

We hereby submit the revised version of our manuscript after addressing the reviewers’ comments. We have highlighted the modifications in the text.

We hope that our edits and responses below satisfactorily address all the issues and concerns you have noted.
I hope that the revised paper is now more suitable for publication in BMC Public Health.

Yours sincerely,

Takashi Wada (t.wada@tottori-u.ac.jp)

Response to Reviewer 1

1. Comments from reviewer:

   Good article. Need some polishing of the English language. Need a bit on emphasis on common health problem in the elderly such as back pain and knee pain which are common. As such, two such article can be cited that emphasis rheumatoid arthritis as a cause of joint pain in the elderly in which exercise will definitely be beneficial:


   Response:

   Thank you for your comments. A native English speaker proofread the manuscript again.

   In addition, we made revisions based on your suggestion. We have added the two references indicated (page 6, lines 80–85). In addition, we also added a reference about low back pain.
[References]


Response to Reviewer 2

1. Comments from reviewer:

A. Abstract section

Background: Objective is slightly different than title. Author has to clarify regarding verb utility or effect (Utility: Positive direction: but effect might be positive and negative).

Method: Missing sampling frame, data collection technique/tool.

Result: It could be liked with objective.

Author should mention regarding what proportion of participant follow this habit (SE).

Response:

Thank you for your comments.

We revised the title (page 1, lines 2–4). In addition, we have changed “utility” to “effect” (page 3, line 24 and page 6, line 94).
Methods: We have added a description of the sampling frame and data collection techniques and tools (page 3, lines 29–35).

Results: We agree with your comment. We have added the proportion of participants with improved SE at the last time point. In addition, we reported the proportion of participants with both groups at each evaluation point (page 3, line 37–page 4, line 40).

In addition, we have included the trial registration because the number of words in the abstract exceeded 350 (page 4, line 49).

2. Comments from reviewer:

B. Background Section:

Author should clearly mention regarding CEP with reference, why it's important.

Response:

Thank you for your suggestion. We have added more information about CEP (page 6, lines 87–91). In addition, we cited two articles on the importance of customized intervention that takes into account individual differences.

[Reference]


3. Comments from reviewer:

B. Methods Section:

Missing information regarding: Study method, Data collection technique/tool and ethical consideration. Author should clearly mention which it is mentioned above. In this section, Author should write in sequence.

Response:
Thank you for your comments.

We have added headings for Study method (page 7, lines 100–109), Data collection technique/tools (page 10, line 159–page12, line 199), and Ethical considerations (page 14, line 229). We have revised the order of sections.

4. Comments from reviewer:

D. Result Section:

Author should clearly mention in first descriptive finding and summarize briefly regarding table and later inferential. Recruitment: Timeline should be placed in methodology section.

Response:

Thank you for your suggestion. We agree with you. We have added descriptive findings at the beginning of the Results section (page 15, lines 252–257). The Recruitment section was moved to the Methods section (page 8, lines 122–123).
5. Comments from reviewer:

E. Discussion Section:

In Beginning, Author should discuss regarding descriptive finding then inferential finding. Author should mention if it is significant then write CI value. Author should justify why you needed blinding.

Response:

Thank you for your suggestion. We agree with you. We have made revisions so that the descriptive findings are presented first, followed by inferential findings (page 17, lines 281–290). We added CI values if there was a significant difference in the Results section (page 16, line 263–277). We added details about the need for blinding in the Study limitations section (page 19, lines 327–330).

6. Comments from reviewer:

F. Conclusion Section:

Please justify, how it was useful for changing participant's behaviors toward exercise (for all follow up period).

Response:

Thank you for your suggestion. We agree with you. We have added text about how the customized exercise programs were useful (page 20, lines 340–342).