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We are thankful to the reviewers for their valuable feedback that helped us to reach this version.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1: This was an excellent revision and response to review. Please clarify the following:

The authors are to be congratulated for an excellent revision. A minor revision is needed to add clarity to the manuscript.

It will be of interest to the readership to identify the demographic differences between the pedometer sub-cohort and the other two cohorts.

This is an excellent idea and we have done this accordingly. But only for Table 1.

Please include the sample who completed pedometer data in Tables 1 and Table 2.

Not all subsample with pedometer data completed the main survey, percentages are computed based on valid count. Only demographic characteristics as in Table 1 are updated. Table 2 cannot be updated since only a small sample size of n=27 of the 54 subjects that provided pedometer data completed the survey completely.

and Add the sample size to Table 3.
The sample size is now added to Table 3.

Please clarify in the methods section whether the pre-intervention and post-intervention surveys were sent to all 800 office workers or was the second survey sent only to those who completed the first survey.

This is now mentioned in Methods section.

Reviewer #2: This is still not very clear how the 194 subjects from the second cross-sectional study were selected. Are they part of the 212 initial sample? If not, the authors must assess the statistical significant difference between their baseline characteristics in table 1.

A chi-square statistical procedure would have been appropriate to compare categorical variables. To compare the 1st and 2nd cross-sectional surveys is however tricky, since one of the assumptions of chi-square test is samples of two groups should be completely independent. We invited all workers (n=800) to participate in the survey, first at pre-intervention and again at post intervention. Hence, there is a chance that some of subjects in second sample are part of the first sample. The statistical significance is not appropriate and hence not assessed. We however performed the chi-square test assuming independence and all the p-values comparing the characteristics of subjects in pre were comparable at post in Table 1. We did mention in the results section that “There was little change in the sociodemographic data from pre to post intervention.”