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Reviewer’s report:

My comments of this revised version are still: the research question is too limited, not fully exploiting the material available, the why of the study is described too limited, and the paper is much too long, with many repetition.

More specific: what results were expected? What was the expectation of how sitting time and pa would relate to the excellent ends of the health continuum as measured by self-reported health and quality of life. And why were both health indicators used, was there any expectation that they will act different, why, or why not? It is not clear what we have learned in addition to the findings of sitting and PA analysed in relation to ill-health or diseases.

Having a large dataset is a strong point but also a limitation because small and clinical insignificant associations may often statistically significant, I miss a discussion on this: how relevant is an association of 1.13 for sitting time 0-4 hours.

Adding an analyses of robustness of the findings by subgroup analyses is interesting but this should also be part of the research question (and also why?). Probably some attention should be paid to multiple testing issues here.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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