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Reviewer's report:

This paper describes a systematic review protocol of the effects of school-based interventions on a variety of motivational outcomes toward physical activity in children and adolescents.

I was asked for an open peer review report and I interpret that to include all aspects of the design and reporting of the systematic review protocol. Overall, this is an interesting protocol in an important topic. The reporting and presentation of background and methods could be improved.

Comments:

Abstract. Currently, there are opportunities to improve the transparency of the abstract methods section.

Page 2. Methods. Line 37. The authors' state: "Six electronic databases will be searched (…)". Please, provide names of all intended electronic databases.

Page 2. Methods. Lines 40-41. Please, provide a summary including (physical) interventions of interest. In addition, please provide a summary (list) of outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization (e.g. primary and secondary outcomes).


Page 2. Discussion. Lines 46-50. The authors' state: "To the authors' knowledge, this is the first systematic review that evaluates, (…)". I would omit this from the abstract. You could discuss here dissemination strategy.

Methods

Page 6. Line 144. The authors state the final review will be reported using PRISMA and PRISMA extension for Equity (PRISMA-E). Please, clarify why PRISMA-E. Will you identify, extract, and synthesize evidence on (in)equity?

Authors should describe all intended information sources (electronic databases, but also other sources such as grey literature sources, contact with authors, etc., if appropriate) with planned dates of coverage.

Please, present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database (e.g. Medline), including limits. Could you please clarify whether strategy described in Table 1 is for Medline? Could you please give more references of the databases servers/interfaces e.g. PubMed/Medline or Medline (via Ovid)?

Pages 6 and 7. Eligibility criteria. Please, describe all interventions of interest (and comparators) to allow their replication. Please, see TIDieR Checklist:

http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/tidier/

Page 7. Outcomes and prioritization. Please, include a new subheading for "outcomes". List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes (e.g. primary and secondary outcomes), with rationale.

Page 7. Line 167. Study selection. Authors' could omit the first part sentence ("Utilizing the protocol described in Table 1").

Page 7. Line 171. Study selection. Please, provide version for EndNote e.g. EndNote X9 (Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia, PA, United States).

Page 7. Lines 172-178. Data extraction. Please, describe planned method of extracting data from reports (e.g. piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate or one researcher with verification of a second researcher), any process for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.

Please, list and define all variables for which data will be sought (in PICO terms), and any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications (e.g. for eligible interventions included, note whether any will be clustered or merged into the same group or class, with justification).

Page 7. Risk of bias. Lines 179-188. Please, state how this information will be used in data synthesis.

Page 8. Please, specify any planned assessment of metabias (as per PRISMA-P).

Page 9. Discussion. Please, discuss potential limitations at study (outcome) level, and at review level you anticipate.

Page 9. Discussion. Please, modify/omit the statement: "(line 214) to the authors' knowledge, this is the first systematic review (...)" by "This protocol present the justification and planned methods for a systematic review that (...)".

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

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

Were you mentored through this peer review?

No