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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Dear Editor,


Thank you for your email requesting further minor revisions to the manuscript. I can confirm the uploaded revised manuscript includes the following requested changes:

1) Could you spell out RCT in the study title?

The title has been changed to read: “A pilot randomised controlled trial of physical activity facilitation for older adults: feasibility study findings”

2) I would like to see a brief justification of the 2:1 randomisation to the intervention: control arm

The following text has been added to page 10 of the manuscript:

“The 2:1 ratio was chosen to ensure adequate numbers of intervention participants remained in the study in order to ensure rich data collection in the process evaluation. This approach is an accepted method of ensuring adequate retention in the intervention arm (56)”

A new reference has been added to the bibliography: Dumville, JC et al. The use of unequal randomisation ratios in clinical trials: a review. Contemporary Clinical Trials 2006: 27(1); 1-12.
The changes to the manuscript are tracked using “tracked changes.” We hope that the paper is now suitable for Pilot and Feasibility Studies and we look forward to your response.

Yours faithfully,

Gemma Morgan