Reviewer’s report

Title: Influencing walking behavior can increase the physical activity of patients with chronic pain hospitalized for multidisciplinary rehabilitation: An observational study

Version: 1 Date: 28 Feb 2019

Reviewer: Julius Sim

Reviewer's report:

Line 90. Change patients' to patient's

Line 175. Change 'turned back' to 'returned'.

Line 221. Here, 0.05 is a threshold or cutoff, not a limit.

Line 237. I don't think the word 'indeed' fits here. Presumably the model with 12 parameters was simply the basis for the sample size. Maybe the sentence could begin 'This was based on the fact that…'

Line 270. I would make the derivation of the percentage difference from the model coefficients more explicit, explaining to the reader how the exponentiating of the log coefficients provides these estimates. In Table 3 and Table 4, why not give the bounds of the CI in terms of the differences (the exponentiated coefficients) rather than the log coefficients, so that they are more readily interpreted? I think that this has been done in Figure 4.

Line 648 & 651. These are useful graphs, but I would indicate in the legend how the width of the plots should be interpreted. It will be clear to a statistician, but may not be so to all readers.

Figure 1. I think 'logistical' would be a more usual adjective in this context than 'logistic'.

Figure 5. Readers might be confused by the different size of the black and red circles - presumably this difference does not signify anything? In the middle plot in the last column, some of the red circles appear to have been cut off. You consider using different type of marker, rather than different coloured markers, so that it will be easier for somebody to distinguish them if they print the figure off in monochrome rather than colour. Similarly, in Figure 2 and 3, it might be wise to adjust the colouring so that the lines indicating the quartiles are clearer in monochrome.

There is some inconsistency in the use of 'N' and 'n' to indicate number of participants. I would suggest using 'n' throughout.
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