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**Date**, May 7th, 2015

Dear Editor,

We have re-revised our manuscript “The association between sedentary behaviour and risk of anxiety: A Systematic Review” in accordance with reviewer’s suggestions, and are pleased to re-submit this manuscript for your further consideration. Again, we would like to thank the reviewer’s for their comments and have attached our response to reviewers comments below.

The paper is original, has not been previously published either in whole or in part, and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. The manuscript involves no conflicts of interest, has been read and approved by all the authors, and the requirements for authorship have been met.

We look forward to hearing from you about the outcome of this submission.

Yours sincerely

Dr Megan Teychenne
Reviewer 1:

1. I am somewhat concerned about the accuracy of the quality scoring. In the supplementary file, the authors have included the IV components, whereas (if I am correct) none of the included studies are in fact IVs. And as such, it is not entirely clear to me how the overall score has been derived (see also my comment regarding Lines 170-174).

Although the IV components are seen in the supplementary file – these were not scored since all studies included in the review were observational. Hence, the columns associated appear with N/A in them. In order to make this clearer, we have now omitted the 2 components in the table related to intervention studies only (in the supplementary file). We have further removed text in the methods section referring to intervention study quality scoring.

Minor Essential Revisions

2. Abstract Line 52: I think something is missing in ‘(only)’? Otherwise, I do not quite understand what it refers to.

This was a typo. We have now removed this word.

3. Background Lines 84-86: why not keep the previous paragraph focused on the physical health outcomes only? The authors have mentioned existing evidence for sleep problems, poor psychological well-being etc. before but state here that the relationship for mental well-being is less clear. This is a bit confusing.

We have now clarified this by deleting the lines referred to by the review and removing repetition in these paragraphs. The second paragraph only refers to mental health outcomes now.

4. Lines 127-131: this sentence is now really long. Please consider breaking up.

We have now broken this sentence up as suggested

5. Line 137: should it be ‘WERE identified’? And should it be ‘i.e.’ instead of ‘e.g.‘, of have the authors used other sources in addition to their own library (same comment for Figure 1).

We have now amended these points in the manuscript and Figure 1.

6. Line 153: from this phrasing, it is not entirely clear in what way ‘domain’ is different from ‘sedentary behaviours examined’. In Table 1, I think this is referred to as ‘indicator’?

We have now clarified this, as follows:

Page 6 - “Key study characteristics of the identified studies were extracted including: the country of origin, size/source of study population, study design, domain (e.g. leisure time sitting, occupational sitting, total sitting), measures used, indicator of sedentary behaviour (e.g. computer use, television viewing, screen time, sitting) and study results in terms of association between sedentary behaviour and risk of anxiety.”

7. Line 154: should it be ‘THE association’?

This has now been amended

8. Lines 170-174: could the authors explain the rating in some more detail? E.g., what is the maximum number of components scored? And is the information on ‘intervention’ studies relevant?
Since the information on intervention studies is now irrelevant we have removed this text from the manuscript. We have also removed the two intervention specific components from the Table in the supplementary file. Further, we have added the following text to explain the rating in more detail.

Page 7 – “Thus, since only observational studies were included in this review, a maximum number of six components were scored.”

9. Line 171: please replace the squares for symbols
This has now been amended

10. Results Line 202: I don’t really understand where ‘sitting only’ refers to. I find it rather odd term.
We have now removed the term ‘only’ throughout

11. Line 250: why is ‘(sedentary)’ added here? In Line 308 the authors have done the same but then the other way around, i.e., namely sitting between brackets
We have now removed this information from brackets as it was irrelevant.

Discussion

12. Line 364: why not just state anxiety here? As that is what your review is about? Previously, the authors have always used the term mental health as an umbrella term.
This has now been amended as suggested

13. Abbreviations There are many more abbreviations on page 9. Please include all or none
We have now removed the abbreviations section as suggested since these are spelt out in the manuscript text.

Reviewer 2:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. There is a bit of inconsistency throughout the manuscript in regards to the omission of the intervention study that occurred in response to reviewer 2’s second comment. I agree that the study should not be included, based on the reviewer’s comments. The authors need to make sure that the reason for omitting the intervention is clear in the study selection criteria, quality assessment, and the flow diagram figure. They still read as if intervention studies were included. Additionally, any mention of the now omitted study needs to be removed from the results (e.g., p. 7, line 173). Please also ensure that the newly calculated findings are not inclusive of this omitted study.

We have now removed reference to the intervention study in the quality assessment section and ensured the flow diagram reflects the reason for omitting this study. We have further clarified this in the selection criteria, as follows:

Page 6 - “However, only intervention studies which primarily show the relation between sitting and anxiety (i.e. not just the effect of an intervention on anxiety) were eligible to be included.”
2. Please clarify how the 912 studies that were found in the search (and not duplicates) went down to 177 studies screened by abstract in both the text and the flow diagram.

The 912 studies were screened by title. A total of 177 studies were then included for further abstract screening. We have now clarified this in Figure 1 and in text (page 8), as follows:

“Literature searching yielded 983 studies (see Figure 1). A total of 71 duplicates were removed and thus 912 studies were screened by title. After further screening of abstracts (n=177) and full papers (n = 42) a total of nine studies were included in the review (see Table 1).”

Reviewer 3:

No comments to address