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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to read this interesting paper reporting the feasibility of conducting an incentive scheme to promote active travel to school.

The authors have addressed most of the previous reviewers comments adequately. I would however suggest they consider:

Looking again at their description of the analysis of the accelerometers. On a positive - they have a high rate of return of data - and it would help the field if they could describe what they did to encourage compliance. The authors have noted the cutpoints used, but do not report how they assess wear time, what cutpoints were used, how much data was lost to non wear etc.

Were there a priori decisions on what would be acceptable recruitment/adherence rates to recommend proceeding to a fully powered trial?

On line 135/136 the authors note at baseline, all participants wore an accelerometer belt simultaneously whereas in post baseline weeks different subsamples were monitored each week. Could you provide a more thorough description of this so it is easier to follow?

Could the authors clarify the role that Sustrans played in implementing/interpreting the study?

I note that the authors have suggested to a previous reviewer that they wish to keep the physical activity data for a potential subsequent paper. It is my opinion that you should try to include at least a broad description within this paper. In their trial registration, they have listed a number of physical activity measures. Some of these are mentioned in this paper. I note that the Number of Participants Who Met Physical Activity Guidelines is not. If they don't want to report this data - they should at least report the completeness of all these measures.

In the abstract there is a spelling error in line 32. Should be GT3X+
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