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Reviewer’s report:

Sitting is increasingly being perceived as an independent risk factor for all kinds of health related outcomes. This review therefore deals with a very interesting and also relevant topic. The study was well-designed and adds to the knowledge on standing interventions. I have only a few comments.

Major comments

-the main aim of the review is to provide evidence based dosage guidelines. However, in the results section, dosage is hardly being mentioned. The text (both in results and discussion section) should be focused more on the dosage question (instead of only on the effectiveness question). Another solution would be to adjust the main aim of this study where determining dosage could be a secondary objective.

Minor comments:

- Grammar should be checked carefully. Some sentences are very long and not easy to read.

- The literature search was performed until 1st of January 2014; an update seems appropriate.

- In my opinion: too much abbreviations are being used

- On page 6: balance is being classified under 'activity and participation' (ICF) while I believe balance belongs to the 'body functions and structures'.

- It would be relevant to discuss (more in depth), the potential clinical relevance of standing interventions, including the possible explanations for (lack of) effectiveness.

Are the methods appropriate and well described? 
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
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