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Reviewer's report:

This paper deals with an important subject by addressing sedentary specific correlates for two key sedentary behaviours in adults. There are few other examples in the literature so this paper makes a potentially important contribution. The manuscript would benefit from some revisions.

Major essential revisions

Abstract
1. More specific description of correlates in the abstract to replace ‘some correlates’

Introduction
2. The introduction needs to provide a clearer rationale why specifically TV viewing and internet use are of public health concern and/or evidence that they relate to sitting time if this is the basis for public health concern.
3. Lines 96 to 97: Clarify how and why correlates were based on adolescent studies or remove this sentence.
4. Lines 98-99: Provide evidence to support the statement that these factors are likely moderators for sedentary behaviours in adults.

Methods
5. Sedentary behaviours: Please provide details of the approach to translation of the questionnaire items based on items from US and Australia. Was the reliability and validity of these translations confirmed? It’s not clear if the figures you cite are for the original or the translated version.
6. Correlates: There needs to be confirmation that the scales derived from the PACE materials are functioning in the same way in a different culture and age. Factor analyses need to be run to confirm the structure of the scales and Cronbach Alpha values for each subscale reported in the text. This is particularly important given the text provided on lines 280-287 where individual items have been singled out in the discussion. The paper either needs to demonstrate the psychometric robustness of the original PACE scales or revise these based on factor analyses where they are different in this Belgium population and use these in the analyses. At the moment it is a mix of the two. It could be helpful to provide a table in the methods of the scale items and associated alpha for the scale and
details of any revisions from the original. Then the first table in the results could just deal with the associations. At the moment it’s quite cumbersome to read.

Discussion

7. The discussion drifts into speculation in places., e.g. 242 to 252. I appreciate there is limited literature but the text should be restricted to where there is some supportive evidence provided for these statements.

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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