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Author’s response to reviews:

First, we would like to thank you for your meticulous review. We believe it is necessary to hone our job. Below we have answered all questions asked.

1. Colocation: please add 'protocol for a feasibility trial'

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We have added “protocol for a feasibility trial' in the title.

2. Colocation: “The authors do not need to state they are masters students in their affiliations if also health professionals”.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We have made the requested change.

3. Colocation: “Page 6 there is no need to give the address and phone number of the clinic. Please remove”.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We have made the requested change.
4. Colocation: “Exclusion criteria should be established and applied at the beginning of the study for recruitment of patients. The text may be better rewritten as 'Participants presenting with clinical conditions that could preclude the performance of physical exercises in an orthostatic position, such as cardiovascular, orthopaedic, or neurological conditions, and older adults unable to interact with the games.' Monitoring for onset of these conditions during the study should be highlighted under adverse events and managing risk.”

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We have made the requested change.

5. Colocation: “P6 line 53 replace 'term' with 'form'”.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We have made the requested change.

6. Colocation: “Page 7 line 4 please rewrite 'The same-trained researcher, blinded to treatment allocation, will evaluate all participants at three time points: immediately....'. Isn't blinding likely to be broken during assessment in conversation?”

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We have made the requested change and added the explanation on blinding.

7. Colocation: “P9 line 54 heading would be better as 'Randomisation' not 'Allocation'. Also the block size is not usually given in a study protocol”.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We have made the requested change.

8. Colocation: “P10 line 16 does not make sense about not disclosing their allocation to the therapist as the therapist taking part in the training sessions will be doing the session only for EG so will know the allocation. This sentence could be deleted”.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We have made the requested change.

9. Colocation: “P11 line 9 'and calculate estimates for the likely effect sizes and 95% confidence intervals' please say why it is necessary to calculate effect sizes on this small sample. Is it to determine whether change can be seen over time using these outcome measures in order to determine the most appropriate primary outcome for the main trial?”

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We have made the requested change.

10. Colocation: “Page 12 lines 9-43 move the hypotheses to after the objectives on page 5 line 46”.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We have made the requested change.

11. Colocation: “Page 13 discussion please explain the implications of this study eg. that the feasibility study is in preparation for a main trial that will go ahead if all feasibility criteria and hypotheses are met”.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We have made the requested change.
Answer: Thank you for your comment. We have made the requested change.

12. Colocation:”Table 1 trial registry dataset could be an additional file but should not be Table 1 in the main paper”.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We have made the requested change.