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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We have revised the manuscript according to your suggestions.

We want to thank the reviewers' comments. These comments have been important for the improvement of the new version of the manuscript.

We answer each comment from Reviewer 1 in the following lines:

1. GENERAL COMMENTS

- The topic of the manuscript is interesting and I consider monitoring of screen time of people with disability as beneficial.

- If you have data please, divide and provide your results accordance the type of disability.

(Other general comments are similar to the particular ones included in the following section of these responses)

1. RESPONSE

Thank you for your comment.
We have included ‘type of disability’ information in the participants’ characteristics. We have used ‘degree of disability’ as the variable of study in this paper instead of ‘type of disability’ and, therefore, we are unable to provide the results in accordance to the last variable.

2 COMMENTS ABOUT TITLE

- Include ‘in Spain’
- Is it possible to make title to more attractive?

2. RESPONSE

We have included ‘Spanish’ as part of the title.

We have simplified and changed the title in order to make it more attractive. The new title highlights the two main aspects of the paper, that is to say, the variable of study (screen time) and the type of analysis (Self Organizing Maps). The final title is:

"Screen time among Spanish university students with disabilities: a Self-Organizing Maps Analysis"

3. COMMENTS ABOUT ABSTRACT

Include instruments in the methods section.

3. RESPONSE

We have introduced the following sentence to address the reviewer’s suggestion:

“ Instruments used for data gathering were the Adolescent Sedentary Activity Questionnaire (ASAQ) and the International Physical Activity Questionnaire-Short Form (IPAQ-SF)”. 

4. COMMENTS about Method: Participants

Check please writing style, but I think there will be space: Confidence level = 95%). Valid for all equal signs (=) in manuscript.

In my view, it will be interesting know more information about your participants e.g. mean age and SD of age,
Do you have information about types of disabilities (basic division) of participants - physical disability, visual impairments,....

4. RESPONSE

We have checked the manuscript to separate by spaces the equal signs.

We have introduced the following sentence:

“The participants showed a mean age of 40.15 (SD = 12.18), 529 were men, 557 were women and 5 did not specify their gender. They presented different types of disability (physical, mental, sensory, chronic illness and multiple disabilities)”

In addition, we have included the percentage of each type of disability within Table 1.

5. COMMENTS ABOUT Method: Instruments and variables

-Mobile phone: Including also smartphone?

- If you have information add type of disability

5. RESPONSE

Yes. Under the category ‘mobile phones’ we assumed that are all types of mobile phones are included.

We have used ‘disability grade’ instead of ‘type of disability’ for the purposes of this paper. We only introduce ‘type of disability’ as a characteristic of the sample as the Reviewer 1 has suggested in the previous comment.

6. COMMENTS ABOUT Results/Discussion

-These data show high value of SD!! Be careful when you working and comparing the average of ST

6. RESPONSE

The presence of high values in SD is due to the heterogeneity of our sample (e.g. different types of disability and disability grade). In fact, we decided to avoid statistical analyses, such as analysis of variance or multivariate analysis of variance in favor of the neural network analysis called Self Organizing Maps (SOM), which allows working with atypical distributions.
However, we agree with the reviewer that readers have to be forewarned about this issue. Therefore, we have added the following sentences to the end of the limitation paragraph in the Discussion section (see page 13, end of first paragraph):

“[...] We also highlight that our descriptive data show high values in SD and it is probably due to the heterogeneity of our sample. Therefore, we decided to avoid classical statistical analyses (e.g. statistical inference) in favour of an artificial neural network analysis, which allows working with atypical distributions.”

Yours sincerely,

José Devís-Devís

Corresponding author