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Reviewer's report:

This study examined socio-demographic, psychosocial and home environmental correlates of adults' TV viewing and Internet use in Belgium. In general, the design is appropriate and well described, the methods provide sufficient details, the data are sound, and the paper is properly structured. Regarding the data analyses, I am not convinced about the examination of moderating effects. Since demographic factors including sex, age and education level have been investigated in regression models, what additional information the authors expected to explain by doing moderator analyses. Since I am not a statistician, the authors may seek advice on statistics from the editors or the other reviewer.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Conclusion in the Abstract is not precisely based on the findings, need to be revised;
2. Method: it is unclear how “social norm” items were selected (or developed) because I cannot find them in the study of Norman et al (Psychol Health, 2004) if I am not wrong;
3. Table 2 is not properly displayed. Further, are there any significant differences among different categories/groups?
4. Education level was associated with both TV viewing and Internet use, but in different directions. The authors suggested that financial aspect may be an explanation why people with low education spent less time using Internet. If it is the case, unemployment (usually link to poor financial status) should be negatively correlated with Internet use, which was contradictory to the results. More data should be provided here to support the speculation, i.e. % having at least one computer at home or % access to Internet in the subsamples of difference education level or employment status.
5. The unexpected result was observed in the association of social norms with screen time. Having said that, it was unclear how these items were developed. How valid are these items? The four factors were all positively correlated to screen time (Table 1) which are also unexpected if I’m right. The meanings behind these constructs need to be clarified.
6. In Table 1, the correlation between self-efficacy reducing Internet use (sum of different items) and Internet use should be negative? (similar to SE reducing TV viewing) Need to check.
Minor Essential Revisions

1. Page 6, line 112, 4,4% should be 4.4%;
2. Page 6, line 120, be specific by consistent use of “domestic screen time” in stead of “sedentary behaviors”;
3. Page 7, line 150, give details on how the score was assigned, e.g ‘1’ means totally disagree to ‘5’ totally agree or vice verse.
4. Table 1. If sum scores were used in the multiple regression models, what’s the point to provide the correlations between individual item with time in TV viewing and Internet use. The readability of this table is not good.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests