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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory

1. Although the introduction is succinct, I think it misses out key details justifying the study, the importance of the data and why you are choosing to explore this with children. A more detailed introduction would allow this and provide a better overview of the published data so far regarding children's blood pressure and green environments; laboratory studies, field studies and any studies showing secular change in children's BP would be useful here.

2. Line 89- again detail here would be good. How much is BP lowered by? have the studies reported data for children?

3. Line 148- please make it clear what year the BP measures were taken. The images were taken in 2003. When was the BP taken? How many years had the children resided in their houses? is there any information to say how much time they spend outdoors in their neighbourhood?

4. Line 223- 14:00- until what time? and from what time- 11:00am?

5. Line 234- 235: include SD

6. Line 235- Was this significantly different?

7. Line 236-237: include SD

8. Line 237-238- can you make clear how much difference this is in green area?

9. Line 242- not reaching significance

10. Table 1- what does § show in the table? It is unclear with all the different symbols what you are showing here. Some heading e.g. Study has a * next to it, what is this showing?
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