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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Authors, thank you for your time for putting together this manuscript using data from many studies, which must have been challenging. The study aim to systematically review the correlates of sedentary behaviour in adults using a socio-ecological approach. The review identified a large number of correlates pertaining to the socio-ecological approach, which may be of great use to researchers, policy makers, stakeholders etc. However, I found the discussion largely descriptive, with more needed on who would use this information, what is the translation of these results, which was briefly touched on in the introduction. Comments below.

Major:

1. As above, I found the discussion descriptive and thus overly long. Is it possible to pick out the key messages, and also apply these to who will use these results, what are the implications? You briefly mention stakeholders, and interventions in the introduction, but this is not conveyed in the discussion……Also, can more be made of identified key associations. For example, you identify walkable environments, aesthetic features, green space etc. as being associated with a decrease in sedentary behaviour, but why?

2. The text keeps switching between 'correlates' and 'determinants' particularly in the discussion. The article appears to be based on correlates as per the title and the resulting data. Can I suggest keeping correlates as the key term.

3. Also, there may be scope to discuss how the individual factors may interact with the intra-personal, intra-personal and environmental factors. For example 'age' was shown to have a strong positive association with sedentary behaviour, and would interact with illness, retirement and work, feelings of safety, marital status, and social support, to name a few…..Does age also leads to more sitting because you are more frail or ill?

4. Obvious, but the search is now 18-months out of date, given the proliferation of sitting and sedentary behaviour articles, I'm sure there will be a lot more in the last 18-months.

Minor:

1. Page 5, lines 12-17, this needs a reference.

2. 2.Maybe add numbers to the aims for ease of reading (page 6, lines 48-58).
3. The first paragraph on page 7 feels out of place. Lines 1 - 17 are methods, with lines 17-25 better placed as discussion points?

4. There is no PRISMA statement.

5. How was heterogeneity assessed?

5. It needs to be clearer what publications were included, does 'scientific articles published' include conference abstracts, reports, thesis? I think you need a line saying what wasn't included.

6. Who extracted the data, one person and checked by another, two people?

7. Page 29 paragraph 2. I am unsure what this paragraph is trying to convey, how does the review highlight inconsistencies in the sedentary behaviour term? Surely, if most of the results are of self-reported sitting then this takes into account intensity and posture? Is this paragraph needed?

8. Page 30, line 6 "except for a couple" of studies?

9. Again, I think the conclusion needs a stronger take home message as opposed to just highlighting future research, and the limitations of the studies.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
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**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
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