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**Reviewer's report:**

+ The authors shed light on an important gap in social capital research: The association between two forms of social capital and health risk behavior of young people.

+ Extremely well written, very good structured. Therefore, easy to read.

+ The manuscript in general and the introduction, research design, and the result section in particular are very clear and transparent. Well-done!

+ Most important risk-factors for children’s health were chosen.

+ Extremely valuable overview of what of social capital is associated with health behavior and what is not. A very interesting finding of this review is that the authors “by looking within and across the various health risk behaviours (we) have been able to identify and highlight the elements of social capital that present as supportive health assets irrespective of the behavioural domain (e.g. positive parent-child relations)…”

+ The authors have been very open and professional in regard to the limitation of cross-sectional surveys. I agree on their conclusions that both mechanism and the direction of causality between social capital and health is needed to develop social capital interventions.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. Page 11: “Studies were not excluded on the grounds of quality”. Why did the authors not exclude the low quality studies? (Maybe this is common in literature reviews and I am not aware of that?) While reading the findings and conclusions I hesitated and I was wondering which of these findings were based on a low quality study. What a pity! The authors should give the information on the quality of the study in Table 1. The trust in the conclusions of the review will increase.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

2. Table 1: What is the meaning of the symbol ‘#’?

**Discretionary Revisions**

3. The article is rather long (more than 7000 words in the main text). Maybe the authors find a way to shorten it?
**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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