Title: Television viewing through ages 2-5 years and bullying involvement in early elementary school.

This longitudinal study examined relations between television viewing through ages 2-5 years and bullying involvement in early elementary school, controlling for maternal socio-demographic characteristics and children’s own externalizing and internalizing problems.

Overall, this revision is significantly improved, and the manuscript itself contains data that are relevant and interesting regarding the links between TV viewing trends over time and bullying, particularly in light of previous studies which have examined these links among older children, without controlling for maternal characteristics and child own psychological distress.

The paper, as currently written, has several strengths: the research question is well defined and the methods appropriate (although not always and described, as detailed below); the data collection clearly took great effort and planning, and seems quite sound as the authors used child, parent and teacher reports; the writing overall acceptable, with the title and abstract accurately conveying what has been found.

Thus, while I believe closer to a final publishable version, some additional revisions must be made:

1. p. 3 authors write: “Bullying involvement is associated with poor emotional and physical health [4], psychosocial adjustment problems [5], psychotic symptoms [6], depression, anxiety, and self-harm behaviors [7].”. Some clarification is needed regarding which outcome is associated with which role of bullying (victim, bully, bully-victim) although this does come later – here it is confusing… Authors could possibly reference the statement they wrote later “Bullying involvement is associated with children’s behavioral and emotional problems” here and then avoid repetitiveness and confusion.

2. p. 4 bottom, “Alongside the studies that examined the effects of the violent content, some studies demonstrated the negative effects of time of TV exposure on aggression [22, 23]” – clearly state that this is regardless of content (i.e.
violent or not) if indeed this is the case. Also at the end of the paragraph on page 5, where you state “Following this view, a possible consequence of extensive TV exposure at young age could include poor social skills and problems with peers”, as this is part of the rationale for your study.

3. p. 5 line 10 “depraved” – does this word not corrupt, deviant, perverted? I am not sure it is the best fit here.

4. p. 5 I think editing will clarify why your study is important: “However, more large population-based studies are needed to ascertain the association between preschool television viewing and bullying involvement in early elementary school, by using Replication studies should use multiple assessments of exposure throughout early childhood and carefully address the issue of possible confounding.”

5. Major strengths of the current study are repeated assessments capture the patterns of the exposure over time, and multiple reporters including peers.

6. p. 5 lines 10-11 from bottom: “Other variables, such as behavioral or emotional problems could confound the association between television viewing and bullying”. You found that it is also other variables, such as maternal age, educational level, family income, child gender, and national origin. Say something about demographic variables as well already here…you even wrote in the methods (p. 10) “Several socio-demographic and psychosocial covariates that may confound the association between television viewing and consequent bullying problems were selected based on previous studies of television exposure in young children [25, 26].” Maybe it would be better placed here.

7. p. 8 “While our analyses are primarily focused on examining the effects of the time of the TV exposure, we acknowledge the importance of viewing violent content in development of aggression”. This reads like a response to the reviewer, not part of the text. Maybe saying on the top of page 7, before the methods begin something like “following Bandura and others' work reviewed above, we also examined the effects of watching violent content on TV at age 5 on…”

8. bottom of p. 15 – top of p. 16 “The results of these analyses showed no increased risks of bullying involvement among the exposed and unexposed to violent content children, except for the group of bullies (see Supplementary Table 3). Children exposed to violent content at age 5 years were more likely to be bullies (OR=1.27, 95%CI: 1.02-1.58).” it is not clear from the sentence what the results are… do you mean to say “The results of these analyses showed no increased risks of bullying involvement among the children exposed to violent content compared to children not exposed to violent content”? and if so, the next sentence seems to be contradictory… these few sentences need fixing.

9. This becomes even more confusing when in the discussion you say (p. 18) “In our study, children’s exposure to violent TV/video content was associated with the risk of being a bully (but not with the risk of being a victim or a bully-victim).
This finding supports the content-based theories that suggest an impact of observing violence on children’s aggressive behavior [24, 43].” So violent TV watching is a risk factor for bullying, not victimization or bully-victimization?


11. p. 19 and elsewhere – you found that maternal age, education, income appear to be the underlying factors associated with both children’s excessive television exposure and bullying involvement. What explanation do you have for this finding? The discussion lacks a clear in-depth discussion of the meaning of these findings. It would be even better if after such an in-depth discussion you would talk of the implication of these findings for prevention and intervention.

12. p. 20 conclusion paragraph: the word “reject” is inappropriate… although there are 3rd variables confounded, much more caution needs to be taken as to the meaning of your findings.

Should the authors agree to undertake the revisions required, I will be happy to review the new version.

Sincerely,
Reviewer

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

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

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