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Reviewer's report:

1. In the abstract, the authors must explain what the quality of life questionnaire is.

2. In the results of the abstract, the authors must give the results of the quality of life questionnaire and the work sitting questionnaire.

3. The authors must follow the CONSORT or the STROBE guidelines for the writing of their manuscript.

4. It is not very clear how the subsample was designed. As a matter of fact, this is very surprising that all participants did not provide the pedometer data.

5. The introduction is far too long and must be reduced by 30%.

6. The duration of the post intervention period is not clear.

7. In table 1, the third column must include ONLY the 18 subjects not included in the final analysis. Please also include p-values.

8. In table 2, the second and the third columns must focus on 194 subjects only. Please also include p-values.

9. In table 3, please include standard deviation and a p-value comparing before, during and after.

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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