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Reviewer's report:

Many thanks for the updates made to the article, I feel most of the points have been addressed and I just have a few language suggestions, as detailed below. Please accept my apologies for not making these comments before!

Abstract:

L51 - "PA and ST at baseline" would be better written than "After baseline"

L58 It would clarity to expand the statement "we aim an effect of 20%" - 20% increase in PA? in MVPA? 20% reduction in ST

Background

p4L72 remove "especially" to give more clarity

p4L78-80 could be deleted as the point is covered in "overall health status"

p4L82-83 this sentence would be better rewritten in the positive rather than using a double negative ie "recommend" rather than "do not recommend ...less..."

p4L90-91 repetition - try "amount of PA declines to 16.5%..." and then delete everything after "reach the recommended..."

P5L103 "corresponds to" would be better English than "correspondents"

Baseline-examination

P8L187 "upon consent all they" would be better as "upon consent all"
Study Intervention

P9L235-236 and L239-240 are repeated

P9L247 The section about the 10,000 steps would benefit from referencing

P9 it may add clarity to add further figures with all 3 color bar charts...

Power calculation

p10L268 "in the used study" could be better expressed - maybe refer to the author's names??

p10L272 "there" has not been changed to "their" as identified in the last review

Documentation

P10L285 delete "read out"
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