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Reviewer's report:

The paper is overall, a well written and detailed report of a well conducted pilot randomised controlled trial. I do have a few questions/comments that need to be clarified in the paper.

1) Background: The first paragraph is somewhat under referenced. Additional references could be added, particularly around the acceptability as a health promotion aid in the community

2) Activity levels: Throughout the paper, there are references to 'activity levels' mentioned - with one of the research questions focussed on increasing activity levels. Potentially influenced by the information in the background (inpatients having low levels of activity, with totals of 8 mins of walking and 398 steps per day), I was expecting the authors to be measuring 'activity levels' of the participants overall. However, it appears that 'activity levels' in terms of outcomes relates only to the additional time spent performing the supplemental exercise program. This needs be clarified throughout the paper. (RQ2 and the heading at line 268 for example)

3) Length of followup: It is noted that the participants were recruited over a 4 week period, but it is not clear how long the follow-up period for each participant was. It appears to be until the completion of inpatient rehabilitation program. If this is the case, please include average time of follow-up (average time as an inpatient) in the results table.

4) It would be beneficial to include some supplementary material on the tests used to measure the secondary outcomes - this will not be tests known to all readers.

5) Paragraphs reporting the results of supplementary exercises (lines 260 and 268) - are these minutes per day, per week, or in total? If it is in total, the average follow-up time per group needs to be noted as well.

6) Footnote needed for table 1 for
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