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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for this well drafted paper, and it is important to know that the latest findings suggest little improvement in terms of more robust studies (and I would encourage a translational research effort to share the findings with practitioners). My comments are few:

A process map of some description would be helpful in taking the reader quickly through the process from 1553 initial records to the final inclusion number.

Terms used in the search - please say whether these replicated those of Chillon or not and if not whether you added or otherwise selected terms from reading other studies,

It was a shame that this large review of evidence was not included or found or did not meet the inclusion criteria although it would have been no poorer in design than the Beat the Streets intervention. I would suggest (not require) that the authors consider this study.

In the discussion about findings drawn from theoretical aspects no mention has been made of habit. Did this not appear as a behavioural determinant? See eg

I suggest a recommendation to governments to put out research calls addressing safe routes to schools/school travel in order to attract and fund stronger evaluations in order that another review 5 or so years in the future does not continue to find weak methodological study designs and lack of reliable valid measurements.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons
CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal