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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)

In the Introduction the authors state with reference to 3 previous studies that “unexpectedly few studies defined or examined sedentary lifestyle and associated factors at the population level.” Maybe the authors could elaborate on this statement since there are a very large number of studies on this topic. Indeed, it is not clear what new knowledge the present study adds.

The prevalence of sedentarisms is rather high. Was the used cut-off vaules relevant for the data collection method used in the present study and was it relevant i relation to the recommended 30 minutes of moderate physical activity five days per week?

What was the theoretical and/or empirical basis for the different covariates included in the analyses?

In the Abstract is is concluded that promotion of physical activity in Portugal may lead to reduced cardiovascular disease in this population. It does not seems to be the most obvious to conclude on basis of a cross sectional study.

In the Introduction the authors state with reference to 3 previous studies that “unexpectedly few studies defined or examined sedentary lifestyle and associated factors at the population level.” Maybe the authors could elaborate on this statement since there are a very large number of studies on this topic. Indeed, it is not clear what new knowledge the present study adds.

What was the theoretical and/or empirical basis for the different covariates included in the analyses?

What was the basis for classifying alcohol drinking in current, ex and never drinkers. Why not discriminate in relation to consumptions levels?

The last paragraph in the Method section seem to be a part of the results.

Why was 1800-2900 used as reference category for Energy intake?

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

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?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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