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Reviewer's report:

Page 3 line 19 - please define sedentary behaviour

Page 3 line 16 Lifestyle should be lifestyle

Page 3 line 28 - Walker et al should be followed by a numbered citation rather than the year

Page 3 line 57 - wellbeing whereas before defined as well-being.

Page 4 line 10 - which poses them to a greater risk should read, which increases their risk

Page 4 line 14 - exercise have, should be exercise has

Page 4 line 31 - Given the changes made to the survey I feel it is inn inaccurate to claim that this study has used the HPLP

Methods section - as questionnaire was distributed in both hard copy forms and electronically how did the authors control for duplicated studies completed by the same student.

It is also not clear whether a sample size calculation was conducted, retrospectively or otherwise to show if the study was sufficiently powered to detect any differences.

Page 5 lines 28-54 - Please provide clearer justification for why the survey was refined, references to support the three sub-scales would be beneficial. It is also not clear why a shorter study would lead to questions being properly answered.

Page 5 line 48-54 - Discussion around cronbach's alpha is not clear - how could the survey have an internal consistency of 0.94 if the sub scales ranged from 0.79-0.87

Page 5 line 55 - As no Arabic version of the survey has been validated this should be discussed as a validation
Results

Authors should clarify if any significance testing was conducted to look for differences in the characteristics of health and non-health participants which may explain some of the differences found.

Page 6 line 26 - Any justification for the study being heavily weighted towards female participants.

Page 6 line 32 - Accepted terms are now having overweight or obesity rather than being overweight or obese.

Page 6 line 34 - Be specific - More than half were enrolled in a health college.

Page 6 line 58 - What direction was this significant difference?

Page 7 line 4-17 - As above, you need to be clear what direction the difference is in, where the health or non-health college students more likely to follow a planned exercise programme. This could be made clearer for all of the results - too many to examples to comment on them all.

Page 7 line 10 - Differences between vigorous, light and moderate exercise should have been defined in the introduction.

Page 7 line 43 - Comparisons across gender is severely limited by your skewed sample.

Discussion

Page 8 line 7 - Should read Health promoting lifestyle among adolescents has received.

Page 8 line 8 - Define US as United States (US).

Page 8 line 32 - Should read had rarely asked.

Page 8 line 41 - Should read the majority of students.

Page 9 line 4 - Small p for physical activity.

Page 9 line 6 - Colleges instead of college.

Page 9 line 30 - Should read Meanwhile no significant differences were found.

Page 9 line 52 - Do not, not don't.

Table 1 - BMI categories should be defined i.e. underweight <18.
Gender - Male and Female are not genders they are biological sex - instead men and women

Colleges should be clearly identified as health or non health with total n as this is the main groupings discussed in the paper

Diagnose with a health problem should be Diagnosed with a health problem

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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