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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and well-written pilot study looking to encourage active travel to schools using incentives. This is an important study area, particularly in the UK, where the number of children actively traveling to school is declining. This pilot study gives justification for a larger trial which will hopefully add some stronger research to this field. The authors have been fair in their assessments of the feasibility of the study. By and large, the authors have addressed the comments by the other two reviewers. However, there are some minor issues that need to be addressed before publication.

Methods

Lines 133: This should be "GT3X+" not "3GTX+".

Lines 143-144: Please include a reference to justify epoch length. Ridgers et al. used 15 seconds but have not saw 10 seconds being used often.

Lines 171: During waking hours only? Clarify this.

Line 191: Small typo: "the child's ID on placed…". It should read: "the child's ID number being placed…".

Line 201: Adding to the comment regarding the Kappa test results by reviewer 2, including magnitude levels of agreement (slight, substantial agreement etc) in the methods section might help to make things clearer (see https://www.medcalc.org/manual/kappa.php). Reporting p values for Kappa is uncommon so probably not a huge requirement to be reported in this study.

Line 204: Replace "relationship" with "association"… only correlations are being used so no relationships can be ascertained.
Discussion

Line 345: Assuming this should be "practical" and not "practicable".
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There is a need to tidy up the formatting for a number of the references.
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