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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

On behalf of my team and my co-authors I re-submit with revisions our article entitled “Inequities in energy-balance related behaviours and family environmental determinants in European children: Baseline results of the prospective EPHE (Epode for the Promotion of Health Equity) evaluation study” to your journal Biomedical Central Public Health.

In line with your request, we have revised the section “Authors’ contributions” as follows: “All authors participated to the design of the study. AV, MJG, PG, GR, SH, JMB, HdP, TLSV and SdH were responsible for monitoring the data collection process. KM and AV conducted the statistical analysis. KM prepared the initial draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed to the writing of the manuscript and critically revised the manuscript. JCS supervised the data analysis and writing of the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.”

Please find below our replies under each of the reviewers’ comments. We thank the reviewers for their valuable comments. It was a pleasure to take them into account.

Responses to the comments of Reviewer 3

1. Line 38: The second half of this sentence doesn’t make grammatical sense.
   - We agree with the review and have corrected the sentence (line 38)

2. Line 113: The figure should be numbered, and there should be some indication where it should be inserted in the text.
   - We agree with the reviewer and have corrected the indicate to “figure 1” (line113)

3. Lines 130-153: Is this part of the EPHE Parental Questionnaire? Giving that the formatting of sub-headings is similar, it's not clear if it is part of this questionnaire, or if it's a different questionnaire.
   - This is a well-taken point. Therefore we have changed the subheadings as follows:
     a. line 120 “Development of the EPHE parental questionnaire”, b. line 130 “Assessment of energy-balance related behaviours in the EPHE parental
questionnaire”, c. line 154 “Assessment of determinants of energy-balance related
behaviours in the EPHE parental questionnaire”.

4. Lines 154-165: I found this paragraph confusing. The authors first mention one
item, but then go on to describe a 5 point and 8 point likert scale (which sounds
like to two items to me). It's not clear to me how this then links to the social
environmental determinants that are listed. Although the authors provide a
reference for the questionnaire, what they present here should still make sense to someone
who hasn't read the other reference.

- We regret to have confused the reviewer and we agree that the measuring scales
were not described in detail and. Therefore we have added the relevant details
(lines 155-173).

Yours sincerely,

Krystallia Mantziki, MSc
Junior Researcher
Department of Health Sciences
VU University of Amsterdam
De Boelelaan 1085 | 1081HV Amsterdam
Room: W&N O-534 | Telephone number: +31 (0) 20 59 85288 | e-mail:k.mantziki@vu.nl