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Reviewer's report:

General

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Although the authors have made some attempt to address my previous comments they have avoided several of them as follows:

1. The analysis still has too much focus on p-values as opposed to effect estimates. See for example first paragraph of the results where nothing put p-values is presented. The actual effect estimates with 95% confidence intervals are what is really important. With this information readers are able to tell both the clinical importance and the likelihood that an effect is due to chance or whether a type II error has occurred. When p-values alone are the focus all one can do is assess the possibility that a particular result is due to chance.

2. I do not feel the response concerning the assessment of SEP is adequate. What do the authors mean when they say the inter-reliability of the other measures of SES was very poor? Some actual data should be presented to back this up. This is a cross-sectional study but the mention of inter-reliability suggests repeat measurement of SES. We need details of whether this is the case and on how many repeat measures were undertaken. We need the actual values of reliability for each measure. Also this still does not provide justification for combining car ownership and parental education. I would like to see results separately for these two exposures because they represent very different dimensions of SES. I am concerned that the authors have simply selected a composite measure because this gives interesting results.

3. Now that a multivariable analysis has been conducted the statistical analysis section of the methods needs to be re-written to describe what mv analyses was undertaken and how explanatory variables were entered into the model.

4. The discussion still makes claims that cannot be made on the basis of the results e.g. that the adverse lipid profiles in the lower SES group are the result of different levels of physical activity.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Reject because scientifically unsound
Level of interest: An article of limited interest

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

Statistical review: No