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Reviewer's report:

"PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: This is a multi-country study with a diverse sample of children and adolescents with the aim to validate a sedentary behaviour questionnaire. The manuscript was well written and coherent. Following the reviewers' comments, conclusions were drawn appropriately, showing acceptability and reliability of the questionnaire but not validity. Authors further explained that the questionnaire should not be used as a proxy of sedentary time. However, I still have some recommendations for authors to consider before this is accepted for publication.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
Line 68 - Please present sample for children (parent-reported) and adolescents (self-reported)
separately,
Line 97- Delete "more"
Line 117 - Information about parental consent should be provided in here and not introduced only in line 148.
Line 117 - Shouldn't participants with mobility issues be excluded as they would be outliers of the population for sedentary behaviour parameters.
Line 141 - Please change "subjects" to "participants" in here and everywhere else when appears in the text.
Line 150- Information about exclusion criteria should be presented in line 115 when inclusion criteria were presented.
Line 153 - Previous studies have shown that the Actigraph GT3X is not the most accurate device to measure sedentary behaviour. Devices such as ActivPal provide a better estimate (references below). The authors should justify the use of Actigraph as a sedentary behaviour validation toll and address the limitations of this device.
References:

Line 249 and 250- Please change "achieved" to "recorded"
Line 251 - Could you add the data on what is considered an "important decreases"?
Line 275 to 276 - Please consider the comment provided above in respect to Actigraph compared to other devices such as ActivPal (Line 153).
ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
Yes, this was listed above. "

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
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5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
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