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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript describes the systematic development of a Typology of choice architecture interventions in microenvironment. That is timely and useful. The report is well written, the methodology is sound. There is no need for major revisions.

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions
None

Discretionary Revisions
The procedure underlying the development of this typology is in principle of an empirical nature. Would it be more appropriate to structure the report in Background/Method/Results/Discussion?

I was interested in the methodology as such. The abstract rightly suggests that the procedure might be useful to develop relevant conceptual typologies in other areas. Unfortunately, this report only provides minimal information ('We repeatedly tested and refined our positions against newly encountered material and validated these decisions in consultation with a multi-disciplinary team of internal and external experts.' I appreciate that details about the procedure are available elsewhere but from systematic reviewing I have learned that resources made available on university servicers often become unavailable over the years when researchers move on. So, would it be helpful to provide some more information in appendix one about how the typology was generated and validated?

Structure background discussion
As in principle empirical, would a background/methods/results/discussion structure be more appropriate?

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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