AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

RESEARCH UNIT FOR
GENERAL PRACTICE
AALBORG, DENMARK

October 28th 2016
Dear Dr Justin Keogh

We want to thank the reviewers for giving their valuable comments and we have now edited our manuscript entitled “Comparison between Mother, ActiGraph wGT3X-BT, and a hand tally for measuring steps at various walking speeds under controlled conditions” accordingly.

Below you will find our replies and changes that were made. The original comments from the editorial staff and reviewers are in black and our replies and associated actions are in blue.

We believe that our manuscript is now suitable for publication in PeerJ.

Henrik Riel, M.Sc. in Clinical Science and Technology
Research Unit for General Practice in Aalborg
Department of Clinical Medicine
Aalborg University
Denmark

On behalf of all authors.

Editorial and technical changes
Title
We suggest that you consider amendments to your title for clarity. You might consider:
"Comparison between Mother, ActiGraph, and a hand tally for measuring steps at various walking speeds under controlled conditions"
Reply: We agree that the title would benefit from this amendment and has now been changed to "Comparison between Mother, ActiGraph wGT3X-BT, and a hand tally for measuring steps at various walking speeds under controlled conditions".

Standard Manuscript Sections:

To follow PeerJ house style and standard sections, please title your section headings. Your manuscript should contain an *introduction*, methods, results, and discussion section. Please refer to the author instructions for this: <https://peerj.com/about/author-instructions/#standard-sections>.
Reply: The section ”Background” has now been changed to ”Introduction”.

Data not Shown:

We noted your statements “Data not Shown” on pg 9, lines 173-175: "Q-Q plots were assessed and as data did not appear to be normally distributed, a Shapiro-Wilk test was performed (data not shown) and confirmed that data were non-normally distributed ($p<0.05$) (data not shown)."

We would like to draw your attention to our Data Sharing policy as detailed at <https://peerj.com/about/policies-and-procedures/#data-materials-sharing>. Of course, the inclusion of this statement does not necessarily mean that our policy is being violated, so please can I ask you to leave a note to staff at <https://peerj.com/manuscripts/13208/declarations/#other> or email me (at editorial.support@peerj.com) to let me know the reason(s) for not showing this data in this instance?
Reply: The DOI from the publicly accessible data has now replaced the “Data not shown” as recommended by the editorial staff.

References:

In the reference section, please provide the full author name lists for any references with et al. If you have used EndNote, you can change the references using the steps provided on our author instructions here <https://peerj.com/about/author-instructions/#reference-section>.
Reply: The full author names have now been added to any references with ”et al.”.

Reviewer 1
Comments for the author

I am left with some minor comments only.

Line 106: '…of a Motion Cookie are 5*2.2*0.4' It looks better to provide also a decimal following 5 (I assume it is 5.0).
Reply: We agree that it looks better to add the decimal and this has now been done.

Line 238-239: 'The PDs of ≤2.5% measured by Mother was not interpreted as being clinically relevant as it was less than 3%, however'
I would suggest to write it as: …by Mother was interpreted as being clinically irrelevant… (otherwise it looks like you did not interpret the results)
Reply: To improve the reporting we have changed the phrase according to this comment.

Figure 2: the lower limit of the 6.4 km/h should be in red color.
Reply: The reviewer's point is valid and the colour has now been changed from black to red.

Reviewer 2
Validity of the findings
The analyses are thorough and appropriate for the nature of the data. Selected speeds and thresholds are clearly justified. I am therefore confident the findings and subsequent conclusions are valid. The authors may also wish to state in the 'Future Work' that testing in overweight/obese subjects is warranted given that previous studies have noticed greater motion sensor inaccuracy in these groups (due to tilting).
Reply: We agree that testing in overweight subjects would be of interest in future studies and have added this to "Future work"; Line 282-283"…and should also include participants with a larger BMI than included in this study as the waist circumference can influence precision due to tilting (Crouter et al. 2005)."