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Paper title: Socio-demographic, psychosocial and home-environmental attributes associated with adults’ domestic screen time.
Delfien Van Dyck MA, Greet Cardon PhD, Benedicte Deforche PhD, Neville Owen PhD, Katrien De Cocker PhD, Katrien Wijndaele PhD and Ilse De Bourdeaudhuij PhD

Dear Dr. Giles-Corti,

The authors would like to thank you and the reviewers for the interest in our work and the decision to reconsider acceptance for publication of the manuscript after a second revision.

We carefully considered all comments and suggestions made by the reviewers. Please find below the complete list of changes, and our responses to each of the points made by the reviewers.

Our comments and explanations are in bold font, and the specific revisions added to the manuscript are in Italics.

Sincerely yours

Delfien Van Dyck, corresponding author:
Department of Movement and Sports Sciences
Ghent University
Watersportlaan 2
9000 Gent
Belgium
Phone: +32 9 264 63 23
Fax: +32 9 264 64 84
Email:Delfien.VanDyck@UGent.be
Comments of reviewer #1

The authors have responded well to the reviewer critiques. A few minor revisions are:
1) It appears that social norms were measured, not social support. However, in line 324, the authors compare their social norm results to family and peer support in adolescents. However these are 2 different constructs that should not be confused. In line 351, it might be good to add social support to the list of examples for correlates that were not included in the current study (as a study limitation).

We agree that social norm and social support are two different constructs that cannot be compared. Therefore, we deleted the sentence on line 324, where we compared our social norm results with results of an adolescent study examining the associations between social support and total sedentary time. Moreover, as suggested by the reviewer, we included social support to the list of examples of correlates that were not included in this study (fourth study limitation). This addition can be found on page 15, lines 351-355.

‘Fourth, some possibly important correlates (e.g. number of TVs in the bedroom, enjoyment of SB, social support towards decreasing SB) were not included in the questionnaire or were only assessed with a limited number of questions (as was the case for how we assessed social norm from family and friends).’

2) Lines 165-166: it appears your measure of social norms was an adapted version from the previously validated questions that measured social norms towards physical activity (e.g. from reading table 1, it looks like wording was changed to reflect the target sedentary behaviors rather than physical activity as in the original). This should be clarified. Additionally on lines 331-33 you mention that using more-specific questions to assess social norms towards SB was a limitation but if the wording was changed to reflect SB then this isn't as much of an issue. I think you could delete the second part of the sentence if this is the case.

Indeed, the questions we used to assess social norms towards TV viewing and leisure-time internet use were adapted from a previously validated questionnaire to assess social norm towards physical activity. We only changed the wording of these questions: physical activity was replaced by the relevant sedentary behavior (TV viewing or leisure-time internet use). We clarified this on page 8, lines 167-168.

‘The wording of the original physical activity-related questions was changed to reflect social norm towards the targeted SBs.’

We agree that the second part of the sentence on lines 331-334 was unnecessary, so we deleted this part.
Comments of reviewer #2

The authors have already provided adequate responses and clarifications to my previous comments. I have no further questions about this manuscript.

We would like to thank reviewer #2 for his useful comments and suggestions on the first version of the manuscript. It is nice to hear that the responses we provided satisfied the reviewer.

Comments of reviewer #3

I am happy that the authors have addressed my suggested revisions. My only request is that for the sentence beginning on line 284 'Financial aspects may play a role: less-educated adults....' the authors rephrase to make clear the distinction between finance (income) and education as these should not be used interchangeably.

Thank you for this suggestion. We rephrased this sentence on page 13, lines 287-289.

‘Financial aspects may play a role: less-educated adults may have less financial resources and possibly have priorities other than buying a computer with Internet connection for leisure-time use.’