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Reviewer's report:

General
This article is timely and fills a gap in the literature.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1. The Introduction section needs to be a little tighter. It took me a few reads to understand where the author was going. It would be helpful to discuss the structure of the paper early on and state the hypothesis earlier in the introduction. It was not clear to me at the beginning how the literature was going to be reviewed and in what context.
2. Some text seems to be saying the same thing - ex. on page 4 under the built environment and health section paragraphs 2 and 3 could be summarized together (again making it the article a little tighter).

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
1. The recommendations highlighting the future research that is needed is very useful. Researchers also need to understand that they have to partner with people outside their discipline to really address these needs, e.g. urban planners. A comment or two addressing the need for this collaboration would be useful.
2. Similarly, work to address these issues is complex (as the author states) but also needs to involve principles of community-based, participatory methods. You cannot make these changes to a community without first gathering input from the community and involving residents in the planning process. A comment addressing this might also be useful and would allow someone reading the article to garner a few practical skills in doing this kind of work.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

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.