

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form ([see an example](#)) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Lack of Knowledge of Physical Activity Guidelines: Can Physical Activity Promotion Campaigns Do Better?
AUTHORS	Sherar, Lauren; Knox, Emily; Esliger, Dale; Biddle, Stuart

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Justine Leavy BSc, MPH Lecturer, School of Public Health Curtin University, Western Australia Australia No conflict of interest
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Aug-2013

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Overall</p> <p>This is a well written and timely contribution to the physical activity literature. Especially at a time when internationally, physical activity guidelines are undergoing update and review. Furthermore, the rapid changes in communication technologies and the channels available to communicate messages in just the last five years reinforces the authors' comments that it is easy to create confusion and lead to inaccurate responses around the type and amount of physical activity required for good health in both the general population and disadvantaged groups. In addition the authors highlight the need for more than mediated approaches and the importance of a comprehensive approach .</p> <p>I trust my comments are useful to the author(s). My recommendation is to publish with minor non-essential revisions.</p> <p>I have no conflict of interest.</p> <p>Minor revisions</p> <p>Key messages (page 3) line 47 should be gauge not gage.</p> <p>Background – clearly written. I would suggest you could add the words 'most current' page 5, line 33 so it is consistent with reflecting changes in messages and the various campaigns.</p> <p>Methods- write out NHS in full for non-UK readers, page 7</p> <p>Results Table 1</p> <p>Age - add (years) to the table label</p> <p>Discussion – page 12, line 25. I would start a new paragraph "In recent years..."</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	R. Patti Herring Loma Linda University, US No competing interests
-----------------	---

REVIEW RETURNED	19-Sep-2013
------------------------	-------------

GENERAL COMMENTS	I wanted to make a few minor comments on the paper but I am not familiar with editing a PDF document. My comments were not major. They were just editorial in nature. Very nicely written manuscript.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Huhman, Marian University of Illinois
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Sep-2013

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is a straightforward description of a study with clearly reported results. Well written. Discussion section was well-done with many explanations of the findings offered. I didn't see a limitations section.</p> <p>Two comments:</p> <p>1) The background section is written in present tense, at least much of it. For example, page 6, lines 15-16. Generally, I think most articles are written past tense . . . "objectives of the study were. . ."</p> <p>2) The 2013 sample was 70% female. And females were significantly more likely to know the guidelines. Is it possible that the 18% awareness level in 2013 was higher than 2007 levels partly because the sample had more women in it? If you think so, then this should be stated as a limitation. (Of course, the 18% awareness in 2013 was not significantly higher than the 11% in 2007.)</p>
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

We would like to thank the reviewers for their time in reviewing our manuscript and providing useful feedback. We have addressed all comments and made all of the requested edits.