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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript “Development and testing of a past year measure of sedentary behavior: the SIT-Q” develops a new questionnaire of adult sedentary behavior and analyzes its reliability and validity compared with a 7 day activity diary. The paper is well written and clear, the statistical methods used are appropriate and therefore, I have only some minor essential revisions that should be incorporated to provide a stronger version:

ABSTRACT
Line 10: “Following a number of iterations during development”. I think that this sentence should be excluded from the abstract. It does not provide key information for the reader.

INTRODUCTION
• Line 1: “Sedentary behavior (time spent sitting)”: Add …or in a reclined position.
• Last line of second paragraph: “Hence, self-reported methods of data collection are likely….”. I suggest finishing this sentence as “… in case of limited economic resources”.
• Page 5, first line: “Currently, few questionnaires…” (INCLUDE REFERENCES)
• The next line:
“Such measures … rigorously”. I disagree with the term rigorously. Objective methods (i.e. PAL) are more accurate tools than questionnaires. Rephrase this sentence.

METHODS
• Development of the SIT-Q:
In my view, authors are included excessive information (2 pages) in this section. Write a maximum of 1 page.
• Measurement property study (page 7):
Include basic information of the study participant in this part.
• Statistical analyses
Authors say that absolute agreement was used. Rename the technique as “percent agreement”.

RESULTS
Development of the SITQ (page 11-15)
Again, reduce the information to no more than 2 pages (Authors can include further information in a Supplementary file).

CONCLUSION (page 20)
Delete the three first lines. Authors need to be more direct in this section.
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