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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions:

- P5: first paragraph: this is not clear to me: “such a category”? please explain better (line 4: “does” instead of “do”?)

- P7: “We have only used data on bicycling commuting in the inner urban area in this study”: Please add some explanation why suburban data were not included in this paper.

- I still find it difficult to interpret the means of Table 3 without the information mentioned in Table 2. The authors choose to refer to Table 2 in order to understand Table 3, but I think every Table should be understandable on itself. My suggestion would be to add means of Table 3 to Table 2.

- P21: “particularly understanding the behaviour of for bicycle commuting”: this part of the sentence does not seem to be complete, or should ‘for’ be deleted? But still, this need some rephrazing, is not clear to me.
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