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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor and reviewers,

Thanks for your valuable and important comments. We have revised the manuscript accordingly and provided our point-by-point responses as follows:

• Please present/report if you acquired the Ethics permit, or alternatively the Ethics exempt for this study.

Response: All students and their parents provided signed informed consent forms, and the study protocols were approved by the institutional review board of Zhejiang Financial College. (Pages 5, line 15-17, Methods section.)

• Please explain the rationale why two types of regressions (mixed regression and logistic regression) were employed for the same outcomes.

Response: We have different outcomes: mixed regression for continuous variables of ST, and logistic regression for binary variables (if prolonged ST). In order to eliminate the misunderstanding, we revise it accordingly (Page 7, line 18).

• Authors can use a generic definition for their sample: school-aged children.

Response: We use a more specific description of 8-19 years old to replace it.
• Please explain the rationale for choosing a zero-mean normalization and how it might influence the findings reported. It is well-known that regressions are rather robust to non-normality. Thus, in general researchers calculate adjusted standard errors, but not aim to transform their dependent outcome.

Response: Generally, the mixed regression model is having higher requirement for normality than general regression model. We believed that the results have much more solid than unadjusted, although the results have not any significant changes before normalization. In addition, we added information about the reason of zero-mean normalization in manuscript (Page 7, line 14-15).

• Some categories used in measurements (probably a direct translation from Chinese) sound strange, e.g. re: presence of parents/others: ‘less’, more,’ quite a lot’. Authors should consider rephrasing for clarity.


• P values in tables presented as 0.000 should be changed to <0.001. In addition, the common practice is to report exact p values, not notions such as p<0.005 or p<0.001.

Response: We have revised them in manuscript and tables.

• Media accessibility categories should be: none, one owner, two owners, three owners, not two owner…

Response: After our carefully evaluation, the word of ‘owner’ was replaced by ‘screen’ in manuscript and tables.

• One may question if environmental factors is an appropriate term for media accessibility and presence of parents. Given the present context, determinants may be a better term.

Response: Thanks for your suggestion. In our study, we have also explored the individual factors. In order to distinguish them, we think that the words of environmental factors are appropriate in current study.
• Table 1. At its present format may be confusing, thus it needs revision. Suggestions: Separate the table into two sections. The first section compares means, sd (independent sample t test). The second one compares proportions (Chi Square test). Put the headings for the columns in the first section as mean (sd) and in the the 2nd section as N(%). This way you will not need any footnotes. In addition, the overall clarity will be improved.

Response: We have revised accordingly (Table 1).

• Figure 3 is more confusing than useful, this information can be easily presented in the text or covered in Tables. Suggestion: remove this figure.

Response: We have removed Figure 3 and revised sentence in manuscript accordingly.

• Please avoid any causal language (you had a cross-sectional study) such as ‘did not have an essential impact’. In addition, seemingly your sampling frame does not include random sampling. Thus, instead of causal statements please use terms such as associated, related, etc. Your study did not test anything about being or not modifiable (you refer to modifiable predictors), please remove these terms.

Response: We have replaced ‘predictors’ by ‘correlates’ in manuscript.

• The term ‘statistical relationship’ is inappropriate”. Just refer to it as relationship observed between … and …

Response: Thank you very much. We have revised accordingly.

Thanks again!

Best,  
Sunyue