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The purpose of this cross-sectional study was to report on the sociodemographic characteristics, physical activity level, and sedentary time among women in a bingo club in Scotland with the goal of potentially designing a health promotion intervention in this group.

Although the overarching goal of the project is interesting and innovative, the topic of this paper—reporting on the baseline characteristics—is not very exciting. However, this paper does provide some supporting evidence that this may be a good target population for a physical activity intervention.

Please find specific comments and suggestions below:

Background, Lines 54 - 55: "Mental health" is not a chronic condition. Please revise.

Background, Line 68: 14% difference in physical activity levels is a little unclear. Is this supposed to be mean level of physical activity? Or do you mean 14% difference in the proportion meeting the physical activity guidelines?

Background, Lines 74 - 75: How popular are bingo clubs in Scotland? Do a large proportion of older women attend bingo clubs?

Methods, Line 103: "Past" should be changed to "passed"

Methods, Lines 143 - 144: What was the reason for asking them to record time spent at bingo in their wear-time diaries?

Results, Lines 214 - 215: Did you assess employment status?
Results, Lines 222 - 223: The sentence that starts with "Five women…." does not make sense. Please revise.

Discussion, Lines 246 - 247: I think a bingo club could be an interesting place to deliver a PA intervention. However, did you in any way assess the women's level of interest in participating in this type of intervention? They may purposely be choosing bingo because they are not interested in more active social activities.

Discussion, Lines 261 - 263: This probably has very little to do with the ability to find time to take part in the study given that both active and less active women were at the bingo hall. This is much more likely to do the fact that often healthier people are the ones who choose to participate in studies, particularly if they know they are health-related. These sentences should be edited to reflect this.

This would very likely be an issue for an intervention as well, where the more active women would be more willing to participate.

Discussion, Lines 265 - 267: Perhaps, but why? Should give some rationale for this assertion.

Table 1: P values cannot be 0. Please edit the p-value for marital status to $p < 0.001$ (or whatever the journal guidelines are for very low p-values).

Table 2: Instead of reporting MET mins/week in each category, I think it would be better to simply report minutes/week or hrs/week for interpretability, particularly given that you simply assigned the same MET value to all vigorous activities and all moderate activities. This would also make it easier to compare time spent in PA to time spent sedentary.

Also, please edit the P-value for weekday sitting so it is not equal to 0.
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