

Author responses to Healthcare Journal Reviewers' Comments:

We thank reviewer for their helpful suggestions and constructive comments. We hope that our revisions and responses detailed below point-by-point will improve the manuscript sufficiently for you to recommend publication.

Reviewer 3 Comments and Suggestions for Authors:

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to review this article. This article denotes a great effort by the authors to perform it. The article covers a very interesting and current topic that I am sure in the future they will be able to delimit better. Nevertheless, in my opinion, some parts need to be improved. I detail the comments below:

ABSTRACT

1. P.1, line 21. You can also include the main statistical values of your results.

Author Response: We have added numerical and statistical values related to the significant results in the abstract section, and the changes have been highlighted in red within the text. (line 23-26)

2. P.1, line 31. You can also include other keywords “Taiwan”, and “Physical Activity”

Author Response: We have added the keywords Taiwan and Physical Activity to the abstract, and the changes have been highlighted in red within the text. (line 34)

INTRODUCTION

3. The introduction section needs more references to support the affirmations, for example, the sentences of lines 37,42,43,46 o 47.

Author Response: we have added more references to the sentences in question, and the changes have been highlighted in red within the text. (line 37-52)

4. P.2, line 49. It seems to have a mistake in the reference format, please could you check it and rewrite to do it adequate to the journal format?

Author Response: The content of the article has been revised, and the changes have been highlighted in red within the text. (line 50)

5. P.2, line 56. It would probably be enriching to provide more information on the rejection of the tests, but other aspects could be reduced. In general, in my opinion, the introduction section should be reduced.

Author Response: The content of the article has been revised, and the changes have been highlighted in red within the text. (line 50-52)

6. P.2, line 91. It could be better to only specify the aim of the actual study.

Author Response: The content of the article has been revised, and the changes have been highlighted in red within the text. (line 95-97)

METHODS

7. I have some doubts about the inclusion of volunteer participants from a single region of South Taiwan could introduce a risk of bias to the study, perhaps it could be good to mention it as a possible limitation in the discussion section.

Author Response: The content has been added to the limitations section, and the modifications are highlighted in red within the text. (Line 403-405)

8. Has this study been approved by an ethics committee? Please, could you specify it in the manuscript?

Author Response: Yes, this study has obtained approval from the Chiayi City Health Bureau. The information regarding the approval has been incorporated into the manuscript's methods section, and the changes have been highlighted in red within the text. (line119-120)

9. P.3, line 134. Please, reference the questionnaire PAR-Q.

Author Response: The reference for PAR-Q has been supplemented and cited, and the changes have been highlighted in red within the text. (line144)

10. P.3, line 144. To describe the battery of tests could improve the quality of the study, facilitating, another researcher to reproduce the results.

Author Response: We have added detailed explanations for the measurement of functional fitness and BMI, and the changes have been highlighted in red within the text. (line 162-207)

DISCUSSION

11. P.11, line 334. Could you reference the sentence “Given that older individuals and men are at increased risk of developing chronic diseases,”?

Author Response: The reference has been supplemented and cited, and the changes have been highlighted in red within the text. (line 411-412)

REFERENCES

12. The references format changed in 1-5 from 6 to 27, please, could you rewrite it to do it more adequately?

Author Response: The content of the article has been revised, and the changes have been highlighted in red within the text.