Reviewer's report

Title: Feasibility of an incentive scheme to promote active travel to school: a pilot cluster randomised trial

Version: 0 Date: 18 Apr 2017

Reviewer: Greig Logan

Reviewer's report:

Manuscript review - Feasibility of an incentive scheme to promote active travel to school: a pilot cluster randomised trial

General overview:

This is a strong feasibility study which uses a lottery type incentive to encourage ATS. The authors have conducted appropriate analysis and reported results clearly and concisely. The discussion provides transparent reasoning and provision for future methods, needing no changes.

The introduction and methods sections contain some points needing further clarification and justification, and are outlined specifically below.

I commend the researchers for conducting this worthwhile research, and fully appreciate the difficulties faced when accessing schools with limited resources. I believe that with the following corrections, this manuscript is worthy of publication.

Specific comments:

Line 91: I suggest the justification for a coin toss is not needed

Lines 114-115: Please report whether translation was performed in the study if known and comment on whether it may or may not have influenced reliability of data.

Line 118: Suggest not using 'vis-à-vis'
Line 119: It seems as if you are saying that accelerometer data is used to validate the child and adult ATS report questionnaires so that accelerometers don't have to be used in the larger study. Please can you explicitly state here whether this is the case?

Line 132: Perhaps justify why child reports were completed in researcher presence as recall may be affected.

Line 136: Size of subsamples?

Line 137: How does this see seasonal change? Please omit if not justified.

Lines 138 - 141: Please rephrase this for clarity - it seems quite muddled.

Line 143: Please reference your choice of epoch length

Line 148: Please state how many schools were approached and responded in the first instance.

Line 186: Change 'in' to 'of'. Why were only those who used ATS approached? Surely those who don't could be persuaded to use ATS by incentive and is therefore of great value. Please justify.

Line 326: Move 'no harm' statement to results section.
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