

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Predictors of physical activity among older adults in Germany – a nationwide cohort study
AUTHORS	Manz, Kristin; Mensink, Gert; Jordan, S; Schienkiewitz, Anja; Krug, S; Finger, Jonas D.

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Thorarinn Sveinsson professor Research Centre of Movement Science, School of Health Science, University of Iceland, Iceland
REVIEW RETURNED	17-Feb-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	Well designed and conducted study. The study provides additional knowledge that is important for health promotion strategies for older adults, as well as further research in the area. The manuscript needs some minor editing: 1. All the predictors (determinants) used in the analysis are measured at baseline and used to predict physical activity at follow up, 10-12 years later. This needs to be more clearly reflected in the abstract and the title of the manuscript. 2. Generally very well written paper but the English could occasionally be improved, e.g. in line 291-292 (page 13). The authors could consider seeking advice from a professional English advisor or native English speaking expert.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Alison While King's College, London, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	18-Feb-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a well written manuscript describing a national cohort study exploring physical activity in older people and potential determinants. The manuscript contributes to existing knowledge.
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Point-by-point letter
Reviewers' Reports:

Reviewer: 1

1. All the predictors (determinants) used in the analysis are measured at baseline and used to predict physical activity at follow up, 10-12 years later. This needs to be more clearly reflected in the abstract and the title of the manuscript.

Response: We agree, we now use the term “predictors” instead of “determinants”, because we believe that this term better illustrates the prospective study design being used. The title now reads: “Predictors of physical activity among older adults in Germany – a nationwide cohort study”. Also the abstract and study aims were slightly revised in order to better clarify this aspect (see page 2, lines 16 and 17; page 5, line 84, changes marked in yellow).

2. Generally very well written paper but the English could occasionally be improved, e.g. in line 291-292 (page 13). The authors could consider seeking advice from a professional English advisor or native English speaking expert.

Response: The article was proofread by a native English speaking expert and minor language corrections were conducted throughout the text.

Reviewer: 2

FORMATTING AMENDMENTS (if any)

Required amendments will be listed here; please include these changes in your revised version:

1. Additional file 1 Format

- Please re-upload your "Additional file 1" under file designation supplementary files in PDF format.

Response: We now provide the Additional file 1 under file designation supplementary files in PDF format.

Once again, we would like to thank the reviewers for their reviews. We hope the revised manuscript can now be accepted for publication.

Sincerely yours,

The corresponding author on behalf of all authors