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Dear Ms. Pafitis,

Please find enclosed our fourth revised manuscript MS: 2659124091420558, A Reliability assessment of a direct-observation park evaluation tool: the Parks, activity and recreation among kids (PARKS) Tool. We revised the manuscript according to the reviewer’s comments and provided a detailed, point-by-point reply to address all comments and outlined the changes. The point-by-point reply to the reviewer is enclosed with this letter.

We look forward to your editorial response.

Sincerely yours,

Madeleine Bird, M.Sc.
Ph.D. Candidate, Epidemiology
School of Public Health, University of Montreal
Research Centre, CHU Sainte-Justine
5757 Decelles avenue, Suite 100
Montreal, Quebec H3S 2C3
Phone: 514-345-4931 extension 5211
Email: madeleine.bird@umontreal.ca
Reviewer's report

Title: A reliability assessment of a direct-observation park evaluation tool: the Parks, activity and recreation among kids (PARKS) tool

Version: 4 Date: 25 August 2015

Reviewer: Sonja A. Wilhelm Stanis

Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. Page 25, line 584. Second author in reference should be “Wilhelm Stanis SA”

   The name of the second author in the reference has been corrected to include “Stanis”.

2. Page 15, line 330. Change “presence of pedestrian safety items” to “presence of pedestrian safety item” (per response to minor essential revision #6 in last review)

   As per the reviewer’s request, this was changed. However, we decided to change it to “The item presence of pedestrian safety features…” for further clarity. We hope this reflects that it is indeed one item designed to assess the presence of one or more pedestrian safety features.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Page 13, line 298. Remove the first 'directly' in the sentence to read “Thirty-six items on the PARK Tool were drawn from the POST; …”. The confusion is saying that they were directly drawn in the first part of the sentence, but then saying they are not directly comparable in the second part of the sentence. (per response to minor essential revision #5 in last review)

   The first ‘directly’ was removed from the sentence.

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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