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Reviewer’s report:

This systematic review handles an interesting topic and is very well written. The authors make a compelling case for the relevance of their research. In general, the one thing I would recommend is to pay a little more attention to the diversity of the studies in terms of their population in the discussion section. Besides, two studies (Dolenc & Pisot and Kroeders) are very different from the rest as they are conducted in a clinical/hospital setting. Some specific mentioning might do. Further, the authors could consider the points below in order to improve their manuscript.

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract
Line 44: ‘)’ after ‘databases’ should be deleted
Lines 44-45: I think there is one paper missing here. Nine observational + one intervention makes 10 studies while the authors included 11
Line 47: could the authors add a sentence on the meaning of the positive association? (as done in the main findings, Line 205)
Line 51: should ‘dependant’ be ‘dependent’?
Line 51: should ‘sedentary behaviour’ be ‘SB’?
Line 58: I am not sure whether the key word ‘lifespan’ is really appropriate. In total, the word has been used twice in the entire manuscript and there is no elaboration on youth versus adults or children versus adolescents

Background
Line 73: should ‘;’ after ‘[8]’ be deleted?
Lines 73-74: I think it should be ‘AND poor psychological well-being […]’
Lines 81-82: and what about the findings related to self-esteem? The authors only include a summary on association with depression while in the same sentence, self-esteem has been mentioned too
Line 111: it should be ‘anxiety IS unclear’
Line 112: is the word ‘for’ redundant?

Methods
Line 117: please include a rational for searching from 1990 onwards
Line 118-119: should it be ‘PsychINFO, AND SPORTDiscus’?
Line 124-125: there should be a hard return between the two sub-sections
Line 134: could the authors please explain in the text what ‘domain’ is referring to? (I know it refers to SB, but for any reader it would be easier to specify here).
Lines 138-154: could the authors please explain in which way they have modified the EPHPP? The original format as I know it has 8 components (A to H).
Lines 138-154: it would be interesting to see how each study scores on each component. Have the authors considered to add an overview of the complete quality/risk of bias scoring?
Line 148-149: please make sure to replace the squares with appropriate symbols

Results
Lines 159-160: I don’t quite understand why the authors choose to report % and I am not sure whether they are accurate (i.e., 2 of 11 = 18%, 1 of 11 = 9%)
Line 163: I think the word ‘and’ after ‘adolescents’ should be deleted
Line 194: The authors report that ‘all of the studies were missing essential information regarding the methodological quality’. Have they considered contacting the respective authors for additional information? And if not, why? I understand that this is time consuming, but as the review includes 11 papers only and ALL of them seem to miss essential information, it seems desirable and workable to try to obtain this.
Line 210: should ‘dependant’ be ‘dependent’?
Line 216: the author name should be spelled with a G instead of a Q: UIJTDEWILLIGEN

Discussion
Line 298: consider to place ‘(aged over 10 years)’ right after ‘children’ on the previous line. It now reads odd; adults are always aged over 10 years...
Line 3327-328: it is somewhat confusing that the authors state ‘in particular sitting time and television viewing’ as sitting time can include television viewing as well. Could this be rephrased?

Abbreviations
Line 332: ‘behavior’ should be ‘behaviour’
Should abbreviations like EM/SDI (see results section), be included here too?

Figure 1
In text, it is not explained that additional records were identified through other sources. Please include

Table 1
- could the authors include the respective reference numbers in the ‘Paper’
column?
- last column: the ‘I’ from ‘methodological’ is placed on the second line, please change
- row Granner et al: it should be ‘Caucasian’
- last row: the author name should be spelled with a G instead of a Q: UIJTDEWILLIGEN
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