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Reviewer's report:

General
This is a well written and interesting manuscript which clearly lies within the remit of BMC Public Health. The work is well presented and I enjoyed reading the manuscript. The authors should be commended on their preparation of the paper and I have very few comments to make in relation to the manuscript. I have indicated these below. These comprise some minor grammatical issues plus some areas where perhaps additional information would help strengthen the manuscript.

Specific

Introduction,
line 3: should read ' recent meta-analysis by Tremblay....'
Line 6-7: similarly when referring to Leung’s work it should not be a study of Leung, or a systematic review of Leung. This should read ' A systematic review by Leung et al'. For future reference the authors should only refer to a study 'of' an author when stating 'The' at the onset. For example, 'The systematic review of Leung et al'

Page 5, 2nd Para, Line 5: should read change 'till' to 'until'

Page 6, end of para 1: Were the 'motivating factors' such as bracelets, pedometers, etc provided based on any theoretical rationale for motivation and social support of activity interventions?

Page 7, Demographic variables: Suggest change the start of the first sentence. To 'Participants' age..' or Al children’s ages…'

Results,
Sample characteristics: the authors make a very good section here on how and why participant data was excluded and included. I commend them on this as this is not always apparent in some papers.

P8, The description of beta values here is fine but it may be worth providing some more holistic statement as to what these really mean for readers. For
example, what does a beta value of -0.44 for MVPA mean in real world terms. Such information could be included in the results or in the discussion section as the authors see fit and would enhance the practical application of the manuscript.

Discussion

The discussion section is good and succinct. However, it would be useful if the authors might perhaps frame their results (and possibly the intervention) on some form of theoretical background. On which basis theoretically does the intervention work? E.g., social cognitive theory? This would more strongly anchor their findings in theory and strengthen the impact of their work for future citation.

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 a statistician.
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