I thank the authors of the manuscript for the interesting manuscript on an important topic. To help make the manuscript readable, I believe substantial revisions are required. I have provided below my specific comments.

**Abstract**

Objective: not properly written. Please restate. The following could be one alternative

To compare the level of physical activity among patients with diabetes living in urban and rural areas of Pakistan.

1. **Introduction**

* The first paragraph taken from reference number 1 is very similar to the way the source text is written. Please consider paraphrasing to avoid plagiarism.
* Most of the paragraphs in the introduction section were taken directly from the sources with only slight changes to few words within these paragraphs. This I believe could amount to plagiarism. For example the following expressions described in the original/cited sources were directly copied to this manuscript with only changing of a few words. The meanings of the expressions also indicate that they are not appropriate to be taken to this manuscript.
* ‘The objective of this study is to find areas that require more attention in the field of resources and planning.(5)’
* Is it the objective of the present study or that of Sabri et al, 2007?
* ‘This study helps to identify happening, investigate and evaluate with the help of science and research in the research based trial.(1)’
* Is it the significance of the present study or that of Muninarayana et al, 2010?
* ‘Most patients with diabetes or at the highest risk of developing diabetes do not perform physical activity regularly according to the national standard rate.’
* Is it a statement describing a situation in the US as written by Morrato et al, 2007 or is it meant to describe a situation in Pakistan?
* Considering these issues, I believe, the authors should rewrite the introduction section of the manuscript by properly paraphrasing the ideas they are taking from other sources to build the background of the manuscript.

1. **Objective**

* Please add an indication of the general area of location of the study.

1. **Rationale**

* This section is unclear
* Is it implying that the study already observed that physical activities in rural and urban areas are related to diabetes?
* I believe the study is conducted to assess the level of physical activity performed by diabetes patients in urban and rural areas and to compare them. Before conducting this study it would be inappropriate to assume the result and use it as a rationale to conduct it. It seems like a circular reasoning.
* I think, the authors should consider revising this section
* One potential rationale for the conduct of the study could be the need to narrow knowledge gap in terms of the level of physical activity engaged in by diabetics as part of their life style modification to control the disease and to see its pattern in rural and urban areas for use as an input for possible educational and other related interventions

1. Operational definition of the instrument **Rapid Assessment of Physical Activity (RAPA)**

* The reference used to refer to the instrument RAPA cites another study rather than the instrument itself. I believe the authors should consider changing the reference to an appropriate one such as the following:

Topolski TD, LoGerfo J, Patrick DL, Williams B, Walwick J, Patrick MB. The Rapid Assessment of Physical Activity (RAPA) among older adults. Prev Chronic Dis 2006. Available from: <http://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2006/oct/06_0001.htm>.

How Physically Active Are You? An assessment of level and intensity of physical activity. 2006 University of Washington Health Promotion Research Center. <https://depts.washington.edu/hprc/wp-content/uploads/rapa_03_06.pdf>

* How have the authors chosen the RAPA instrument instead of other possible instruments such as International Physical activity Questionnaire (IPAQ) or the Human Activity Profile (HAP) considering the fact that RAPA was developed for older adults (50 years and older)?
* Has the questionnaire been validate for use in the study area?

1. **Literature review**

* I believe that the literature review section can be combined and harmonized into the introduction section. In doing so, the findings from the different studies described in the literature review section can be summarized and combined where appropriate before integrating them into the Introduction section. If the authors find it useful they can consider the following approach:
* When revising the introduction section, as suggested above, they can consider beginning with the prevalence of diabetes globally, in Asia, and in Pakistan as well. Then the difference in the rural and urban areas in terms of prevalence and reach of various treatment approaches can be added. Following this, the benefit of physical activity as one of the ways to treat and manage ones diabetes. If available, statistical of on the level of physical activities in Pakistan in general and in different parts of the country can be provided briefly. Then, studies around diabetes and physical activity done so far globally (as presented in the Literature review section), as well as in Pakistan can be presented. Then the authors could show the gap they are trying to narrow/fill by conducting the study presented in this manuscript.
* This structure I believe will convey the core message of the background of the study to the audience of the appear effectively

1. **Materials and methods**

* Study setting

I believe the authors could help the international reader by identifying the urban and the rural areas as such. In addition the authors could described the setting s a bit more in terms of their population size and other characteristics. Also, the approach/criteria used to divide them as rural or urban areas could be described.

* What are the rationales for the inclusion and exclusion criteria?
* Please add the reference used for sample size calculation. It’s not shown in the references list.
* How was data collected? Self administered or interviewer administered? In what language?
* Sampling technique: the authors mentioned that they have used non probability sampling technique. However, it would be very informative for readers if they described the process followed in actually sampling the participants.
* ‘Statistical tool’ : please replace with ‘statistical analysis’
* Ethical consideration: was there an ethical approval from an ethics review committee? If so, please describe here.

1. **Results**

* I believe Table 1 is not required as it is described in Table 2 and the age range can be presented in text. The authors could consider taking it out.
* In general, the manner the result section is written seems to repeat all the data points in the tables in the text. I think the authors could focus on the more important and outlying results to describe in the text and leave the rest in the tables for readers to see. Please consider revising accordingly.

1. **Discussion**

* The discussion stresses the role of physical activity in preventing diabetes, however, the study was done among patient with diabetes. How do the authors see this? The physical activity may help in controlling the progression and complications related to the disease.