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Author’s response to reviews:

Responses to Reviewers for the manuscript, “How parents perceive screen viewing in their 5-6 year old child within the context of their own screen viewing time: a mixed-methods study.” Our responses are listed in bold text.

Reviewer #1: Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The study presented makes a valuable contribution to the field, and is timely due to the proliferation of screens in most aspects of young children's lives.

I have no edits to suggest for the manuscript. The background to the study was comprehensive, yet succinct, with sufficient justification for the work conducted and how it addresses gaps in current research. The mixed methods approach was well suited to this study; the methods were clearly described and logically presented. I also thought the results and discussion provided new and helpful insights for those working in this field, and will hopefully lead to further studies on this topic.

We thank the reviewer for their positive and supportive comments.

Reviewer 2: I only have very minor comments. I enjoyed reading this paper and find it an important contribution to the literature.
We thank the reviewer for their positive and supportive comments.

-The similarity of SV and ST can get confusing. Consider writing out sedentary time.

We agree that SV and ST can get confusing. We have written out sedentary time throughout the manuscript (see Background pg 5, line 118; Methods pg 8, lines 179-80, 210, and 232; Results pg 11, lines 274-75; Table 1 pg 12; and Discussion pg 21, line 486).

-I didn't catch where AAP was written out, consider keeping it written out.

AAP, or the American Academy of Pediatrics, was originally written out on page 5, Background section, line 115. We have opted to write this out throughout the manuscript as suggested by the reviewer (see Background pg 5, lines 120-121; Methods pg 10, line 238; Discussion pg 19, line 447; and Conclusions pg 21, line 499).

We have also deleted ST and AAP from the original list of abbreviations.

-It would help to have the lowest 1/3 of deprivation defined since deprivation is a different term than is used in other countries.

The Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) indicate local levels of deprivation, which covers a broad range of issues and reflects unmet needs due to a lack of various resources, not just financial. As such, it attempts to measure a broader concept of multiple deprivation, made up of seven distinct domains of deprivation that individuals experience by living in a geographic area. These domains of deprivation include: Income; Employment; Health and Disability; Education Skills and Training; Barriers to Housing and Services; Living Environment; and Crime. Those individuals in the lowest 1/3 of deprivation would be those experiencing less deprivation across these various domains than those in the middle or upper third of our sample. We have revised the section in the Methods on pg 8, lines 191-194 to further describe IMD for those readers unfamiliar with the concept.

-Is the number of kids at home related to anything in particular?

We included this variable, in addition to number of parents in the home, to provide context as to family structure, and also to provide information that allows others to compare the family structure our sample to others in the literature.

-Reading is non-SV, but it's still sedentary. Can you address this distinction in the discussion?

The aim of the present paper is to highlight different parental views and approaches to managing their child’s SV within the context of their own SV. The information included in the Results section on pg 14 (line 315) and the illustrative quote (lines 320-321) provides a nice example of how some parents choose a non-SV-related behaviour to provide relaxation for their child. We recognise that reading is a sedentary behaviour. However the point we are making is not around increasing physical activity during ‘relaxation time,’ but illustrating how some parents use relaxing activities for ‘down time’ that are not linked with SV. As such, we did not add into the
Discussion this distinction of both reading and SV being sedentary behaviours, as we felt it was tangential to the aim of the paper.

-Missing comma after e.g. Ln 312 pg 14

Thank you for spotting this – we have added a comma as indicated.

-What does Mid SEP mean? Ln 322 pg 14 I must have missed when you defined this acronym. Consider writing it out since there are a fair number of acronyms in this paper.

Thank you for identifying that we failed to define this acronym within the manuscript. We used the term ‘socio-economic position’ (or SEP) as a way to more clearly identify level of deprivation within our sample for the parent providing the quote. Low SEP would be someone who had an IMD value within the highest 1/3 of deprivation; Mid SEP would be someone who had an IMD value within the middle 1/3 of deprivation; High SEP would be someone who had an IMD value within the lowest 1/3 of deprivation. However, we recognise that this adds in another acronym and we feel it would be simpler to refer to this as low, mid, or high deprivation. We have added a line in the Methods section explaining this (pg 8, lines 196-199), and we edited the text below each illustrative quote accordingly throughout the Results section (pgs 14-18).

-Ln 473 pg 20 missing a period

Thank you – we have added in a period as indicated.