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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. There are some crucial methods missing from the data reduction section of the accelerometry analyses that need to be included
2. Ie: The MET values used are not exact to the ones in the reference provided. Some reasoning behind why these MET values are chosen is needed.
3. Addition of the cutpoints used would also be of benefit to the reader, especially as 2s epochs were chosen which have not been used in any of the cutpoints evaluated in the Trost reference.
4. Definition of non-wear needs to be included.
5. Definition of the min number of days of recess to be included in the analyses. It says children that didn’t have a full data set (4 days) were excluded, but is this 4 full days of morning and afternoon recess? How many minutes in a recess period did they have to wear it?
6. The discussion should be revised. There are statements of what previous research has found, but they aren’t written in such a way to refute or support the results.
7. More discussion on the limitations of how SES was determined needs to be included or some discussion on how the equipment at the schools differed.
8. Some indication of what the % difference in time spent within each activity category is needed…. Ie: is a 4.5% difference clinically significant?? How many minutes does this constitute?

* Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Edits:

1. Page 10, line 187-188. Revise sentence.. unclear
2. Line 196. Should read “…. Data provided from morning and afternoon recess, excluding lunch recess, were similar to those previously reported….
3. Page 11, line 204. Revise. Unclear
4. Page 12, line 228 …. Should read “Authors also didn’t report”
Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

None
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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