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13 September, 2017

Dear Milica Blagojevic-Bucknall,

I like to thank you for reassessing our submission and providing us with the opportunity to revise the manuscript with minor revisions.

Herewith I send you the revised manuscript titled ‘Validity, reliability and feasibility of commercially available activity trackers in physical therapy for people with a chronic disease: a study protocol of a mixed methods research’ (PAFS-D-17-00087R1).

Below you find a list of changes regarding each point that was raised by the reviewers.
Reviewer 1’s comments:

- In the original submission it was unclear what stage the study is at, and this issue still remains. It would perhaps be more appropriate to retain the original use of tenses but with a clear explanation on which stage the study is at, at the time of submission, which is what the reviewer comments were alluding to:

We retained the original use of tenses, as suggested by the reviewer. We used past tense in the sentences where this was appropriate in accordance with the stage of the study. We added an explanation on which stage the study is at, at this very moment. We did so in the abstract (lines 53-55) at the end of the method section, and in the first paragraph of the methods (line 116-118) in the manuscript.

Few other suggestions:

- In power calculation section, it would be advisable to refrain from use of beta and alpha as the readers may not know what these refer to. Instead the text may simply be re-written as: “For type one error of 0.05 and power 0.9, a conservative sample of 25 participants wearing an activity tracker type would be needed…” Can you also please specify whether your type one error refers to two-sided type one error:

We changed the following sentence as suggested by the reviewer (lines 170-174):

“For type one error of 0.05 and power 0.90, a conservative sample of 25 participants wearing an activity tracker type would be needed to detect differences in the number of steps between trackers (based on a SEM of 1.9 or to identify a correlation of 0.5 as being statistically significant different from no correlation, assuming a one-sided type one error) (27)].”

- Minor points: page 10: “Date of all subjects ARE…” not IS, as data is plural:

We did so accordingly (in the revised manuscript line 214).

- Similarly on page 17 “The selection criteria for the activity trackers WERE…”, not IS, as criteria is plural.
We did so accordingly (in the revised manuscript line 375).

Apart from the above changes based on the received comments, we did not make additional changes except for a few typographical errors:

- Line 152: ‘defined’ instead of ‘defines’ in the sentence “…for cardiovascular disease no type or severity is defined…”

- Line 254: the words ‘are considered’ were added to the sentence “for diabetes type 1 or 2 are considered”

- Line 332: ‘and’ instead of ‘en’ in the sentence: “…and before the activity tracker is introduced into the therapy.”

We look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Kind regards,

Emmylou Beekman, PhD
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