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Reviewer's report:

I thought it was a well written and interesting paper on a novel intervention. The aim was appropriate for a feasibility trial.

Major Compulsory Revisions
None.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Methods – Page 9 – For the accelerometer it would be good to know the criteria used for a valid record (e.g. number of days, hours per day), and how non-wear time was identified.
2. Results – Page 12 – Do you have gender, ethnicity and/or measure of socio-economic status to add to the ‘Characteristics of participants’? On page 14 you comment that families from less affluent areas may not feel safe to participate, so it would be helpful to know the SES of the families who took part in the feasibility trial, and whether the participants reflected the demographics of the area.
3. Methods – What time of year was the intervention run? Winter / Summer may make a difference, so would be good to know.
4. Discussion – The low conversion of those receiving information to those randomised is, as the authors say, a concern for recruitment to a definitive trial. A further question from these numbers is whether this intervention is really acceptable or desired by the population. Some formative evaluation may be warranted prior to a definitive RCT for example to the group who did not take part.

Discretionary Revisions
1. Abstract – Under methods include the duration of follow-up i.e. at the end of the intervention, for the primary outcome measure. Could also state that randomisation was 1.5 to 1 in methods. MVPA needs to be in full.
2. Methods – Page 9 - I understand that Evenson’s cut-offs for the intensity of PA from accelerometer counts are now preferred over Puyau’s, at least in this paper: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21131873
As the paper is analysing difference over time then this is not of great concern.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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