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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

This is a well written and organized paper describing the development of a comprehensive park assessment tool. There are only two small issues that were unclear to me:

page 8, line 171: The tool underwent expert consensus and was piloted among youth from diverse ethnic backgrounds ....

What does this mean? It would be helpful to the reader to clarify the intent behind and what exactly the expert consensus consisted of, as well as what the piloting process resembled.

page 10, line 223: the development of the tool began in 2008, and it's just being published in 2015? I understand there were hundreds of parks that were visited in the development of the tool, and that this may have contributed to the time lag in test-retest results, as indicated in the limitations section. I think it would be helpful to readers if the authors comment on the lengthy nature of this study, and if it influences their tool at all.
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