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Reviewer's report:

Responses to Authors

This paper is written very well and attempts to personalize a physical activity correlates survey to youth from Chinese ancestry now living in Australia. The main question I had after reading the paper is of the need for such an instrument and why did you chose the sample to test the survey? Throughout the paper it is unclear of the reasons for modifying the survey, which items were added and how they fared in the factor analysis, how much the added items contributed to the information learned about the Chinese-Australian’s physical activity participation correlates, and how the responses from the sample compared with responses from a generic sample of youth. Also, if Chinese culture was a key indicator for modifying the survey, why not do a focus group first to find out what are the characteristics of this cohort and then test the instrument on recent immigrants to Australia who would have more of a Chinese cultural upbringing that youth who may have been first, second, or third generation with Chinese cultural ties.

Specific items also include the general comments.

1) How long had the Chinese-Australian youth been living in Australia? Were they acculturated into the Australian culture? Did you measure acculturation?

2) If the Chinese version of the instrument was based on Vietnamese perceptions, what evidence is there that the two cultures have the same qualities?

3) Table 1 – please highlight what are the items used to customize the instrument for this population. I can’t see what is different between the original instrument and the new instrument.

4) I am convinced that the population measured is different from the general population of children in your catchment area given their diversity in time living in Australia and that boys differed from girls similarly as most youth.

5) On page 11 you discuss responses with Hong Kong Chinese youth – wouldn’t they be very different from your cohort in cultural expectations?

6) In the discussion I’d like to see more reflection about the questions you added
to the instrument for the Chinese-Australian cohort. Did they provide additional information to understanding the youth’s PA behaviors in light of the presumed cultural influences?

7) In discussion, please compare the responses with the Chinese-Australian cohort using the new instrument with other cohorts using the generic instrument.

7) Bottom line – is a different survey needed for the cohort you studied given their diverse level of years in Australia?