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Ms Nina Titmus
The BioMed Central Editorial Team

Re: Manuscript MS: 1640803726307167
Titled “Is there a role for workplaces in reducing employees' driving to work? Findings from a cross-sectional survey from inner-west Sydney, Australia”

Thank you for the further opportunity to respond to the Reviewer’s comments. Our responses to each of the comments are itemized below.

Reviewer 1's report:
The authors have answered all reviewers comments satisfactorily and the paper is now suitable for publication.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Our response: thank you.

Reviewer 2's report

The authors have addressed the majority of issues raised by the reviewers. Please would the authors address the following minor points?

Comment 1. The authors mentioned that gender, education level and employment status of parent, and number of cars and children in the household were not associated with driving to work. Please provide % who use a car, unadjusted OR and p-value for those variables in Table 2.

Our response:
We have added information as suggested in Table 2 including gender, education level and employment status of parent, and number of cars and children in the household.

Comment 2. The authors deliberately excluded the children’s mode of travel to school in the model despite a significant association observed between this variable and parents’ mode of travel to work in their previous paper. I think children’s mode of travel to school is an important variable particularly for this study because the study sample was restricted to those mostly responsible for getting the child to school. Parents’ mode of travel to work could influence
children’s car travel (as the authors mentioned in their previous paper), but the other way round could also be true. Some cyclists (in my study) said that they drove to work because they needed a car for other reasons including the school run.

**Our response:**

We understand this point was made by the Reviewer at the last review as one of the **Discretionary Revisions**. As responded, we did not see the value of including children’s mode of travel to school in this study as the relationship between the children’s mode of travel and parents’ mode of travel to walk has already been established in our previous published paper using the same data source (Wen LM, Fry D, Rissel, Dirkis H, Balafas A, Merom D: **Factors associated with children being driven to school: implications for walk to school programs. Health Educ Res** 2008, **23**: 325-334.). In that paper we did not suggest that this relationship was causal due to the limitation of cross-sectional design. Therefore, the relationship would be obvious in this study. To minimize the repetitiveness of the study findings, we deliberately excluded the children’s modes of travel and just focused on “workplace”, which was the aim of the study. Of course, in preparing this paper, we did examine children’s mode of travel to school by including and excluding it in modeling. It made little difference to the results of the study. And also there was no logic link between children’s mode of travel and “workplace”. So we were confident that children’s mode of travel was not a confounding factor in the study.

In addition, it could be misleading if we report the percentage of children modes of travel in this paper. Since the study population was parents who were employed away from their homes, we would have a very high proportion of children driven to school.

Due to the above reasons, we would prefer to exclude children’s mode of travel from the analysis in this particular study. However, we have added the following sentence to the limitations section of the paper (page 11, para 2): “**In particular, the proportion of participants driving to work may have been inflated due to the need to drop off or pick up children from school.**”

**Comment 3. Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field  
**Quality of written English:** Acceptable  
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by as statistician.

**Our response:** thank you.

We hope that the revised manuscript has addressed the reviewer’s concern.

Sincerely yours on behalf of all authors,

Dr Li Ming Wen  
Health Promotion Service, Sydney South West Area Health Service  
Level 9, King George V Building, Missenden Road, Camperdown, NSW 2050 Australia  
Phone: +61 2 9515 9078; Fax: +61 2 9515 9056 Email: lmwen@email.cs.nsw.gov.au