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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions:

Abstract
Line 37: Does the n=12 represent the number of contact people in total? One person per company?

Lines 35 – 43: The authors should include brief information about the intervention itself in the methods section of the abstract.

Background:
The background section in long and can be shortened, as in some cases, there is some repetition. For example, some of the information in lines 90 and 91 is similar to lines 84 and 85, and lines 101-103 – this information can be integrated and thus allow the background to be more succinct.

Line 73: reference required

Line 94 and 95: I find this sentence unclear. Are the authors implying that nearly half of the working population in Flanders work within 10km of their homes?

Lines 119 – 121: Do the authors have a reference for this intervention?

Lines 121 – 124: This is better placed in the methods section.

Methods:
Lines 138 -139 and Table 1: There appears to be large variations in the number of employees at the various companies. What were the criteria used to define ‘small and medium’ sized companies?

Lines 142 -145: More information on the intervention is required. For example, did employees sign up / register to receive the emails, or were they sent to all employees? How often were these components of the intervention run, and did they take place concurrently or in succession? How often were the incentives given, and was it only to the winners?

Line 147: What is a mobility centre?

Line 185: ‘about two months’ is vague. Also, was the official start in May 2011?
Line 194: Was the interview audio-recorded, or were notes taken? Was the interview based on the questions in table 2, making it a telephone-administered survey?

Results:
In general the results section is sometimes unclear with the authors reporting on both company and employee level information in the same sections. Perhaps, a subheading under each of the RE-AIM sections for company and employee level data might make it easier for the reader to gain a better understanding of the results.

Line 251: Do the authors have any information on those employees who did not answer the survey? For example, distance between work and home, job description. This may help to address potential respondent bias.

The number of employees registered on the program is n=110 and reported as 26% of those eligible. I understand that eligibility was based on the number of employees who responded to the survey. However, Figure 1 shows that n=1116 employees responded. So shouldn’t 1116 be the denominator and not 649?

Line 272: How much is a ‘substantial proportion’?

Line 279 – 280: I find this a bit confusing. Why did only 649 out of the 1116 employees receive the intervention? Based on Figure 1, I would expect that 1116 employees were eligible as they are based at the 7 companies that agreed to adopt the program. Thus the denominator for calculating reach should be 1116 and not 649? Can the authors please clarify this information?

How many of those who were not registered were aware / not aware of the intervention?

Figure 1:
This figure is very useful.

Discussion:
Lines 344 – 356: There is a repetition of the results in these lines. The authors should discuss these findings (even though they state that no other / similar studies relating to cycling were found) and not repeat the results. The authors site references 26, 27, and 8 in the introduction and also reference 7 – perhaps some of these findings can be compared?
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