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Reviewer’s report:

Based on all reviewer comments, the authors have considerably improved their manuscript. Their conclusions are much more balanced and with deleting the two clinical/hospital setting studies they are providing a clearer overview of the existing evidence on the association between sedentary behaviour and anxiety. However, 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).

Please consider the points below to further improve the manuscript.

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract

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

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.

Methods

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

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).

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’?

Line 154: should it be ‘THE association’?

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?
Line 171: please replace the squares for symbols

Results
Line 202: I don’t really understand where ‘sitting only’ refers to. I find it rather odd term.

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

Discussion
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.

Abbreviations
There are many more abbreviations on page 9. Please include all or none.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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