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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Authors,

Reviewing your paper has been a pleasure for me.

The manuscript addresses an interesting and important area of health behaviour in school age. Clearly a lot of work went into its construction. This kind of work are necessary because can help to choosing better public strategies for improve the health in this age and to consolidate the habits for developing healthier adults. It is a well written text and only a few corrections and improvements are needed. I show them below and hope that they help you to improve the manuscript.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. Keywords should not be included in the title of manuscript
2. Page 4, lines 95 and 99: Please put each reference following the same criteria.
3. Page 6, line 131: Data collection was realized four years ago. Please include it in the limitation paragraph.
4. Page 6, line 132: One particular strength of the study is the large sample size of European children. However, the sample size in each country is not representative of children from this five countries. For this reason, data analysis for countries should be interpreted with caution.
5. Page 6, line 141: The study include television and computer time as screen-time behaviour. Nevertheless, future works should add the Smartphone time.
6. Page 9, line 200: In my opinion, sample characteristics should be in Methods section.
7. Page 16, line 397: The spacing between paragraphs in these references is not homogeneous. Please review it.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. The research problem was studied in previous studies. You should show clearly the novelty and relevance of your manuscript.
2. Pages 7 and 8, lines 154-182: Metric properties of the measurement of
individual and family environmental factor was not good. Are these questions used in previous articles?

3. Page 13, line 313: You do a good job situating your study in the existing literature, but I would like to see more discussion around why you found differences between countries.

Best regards.
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