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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript is well written, the data is very interesting and the used references are appropriated. However, I consider that authors should clarify some issues.

1. Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

- Introduction section should be shortened in order to clearly establish the study question. Additional information such as included at first paragraph could be omitted.

- Why did the authors use a limit of 300 min per week whether actual physical activity recommendations for children and adolescents are at least 60 min per day 7 days per week (420 min per week)?.

- How is the minimum age to work at Brazil? I am a bit surprising with that item.

- Discussion and conclusions are supported by data but in my opinion both sections should be shortened in order to facilitate its comprehension.

2. Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

- Sample selection seems appropriated but these paragraphs should be simplified and shortened.

- In my opinion title is adequate but abstract should be rewritten in order to clearly establish the methodology, the main results and the conclusions of the study.

- Keywords should be reviewed.

- Correlates with BRFCH at methods section should be properly explained (e.g. How was the number of physical education classes calculated?).

- As authors indicate at discussion section, I consider the use of self-report methods as a limitation of the study. Then, I would like to know why authors used a questionnaire developed by Bouchard et al. at 1983 (see reference 15) to assess physical activity. Do you know IPAQ?.

- Review the use of abbreviations at text and explain everyone first time appears.

- Discussion section starts with “The results of this study demonstrate…”.

According the limitations of the study I consider more appropriated to use “The
results of this study show…”.
- Review a missed letter “e” at first paragraph of conclusions section.

3. Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
- Did the parents sign the informed written consent?.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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