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Reviewer's report:

This is important and interesting work that should stimulate further research on the interaction between disabilities and the use of modern technology. Other than occasional lapses the manuscript is clearly written. There are some points that require attention, however.

Why were "extremely atypical" values for screen time excluded (line 51-54, page 4)? As written this suggests that an arbitrary decision was made concerning which values to exclude. The authors should be more explicit about what values were excluded, and why? Was it considered implausible that a student might spend zero hours per week on screen time? And, at the other extreme, was it only implausible values (i.e. > 24 hours per day) that were excluded, or was a cut-point that was large but not implausible selected? In either case this should be stated.

Comments needed on biases inherent in self-report of BMI. It is a notable omission that reporting bias for this variable is not mentioned in the discussion. It is probable that individual characteristics including age, gender, ethnicity and others will differentially impact biases in reporting height and weight. This could well bias the findings and must be acknowledged.

The authors should comment on the severity of disabilities likely to be included. Because these are university students certain disability classes including schizophrenia and other serious psychiatric illness, and cognitive disabilities, are likely to be absent (or perhaps in the case of the former, extremely rare) and this should be acknowledged. It would be good, if possible, to have a bit more information on the nature of disabilities. Table 1 gives some general information, but even if a little speculative or based on other research it would be helpful to know what entities are likely to be included among these disability groups. The choice to use the Guía de Atención a la Discapacidad en la Universidad for the identification of disabilities requires greater justification. The reader should also be told more about this instrument and its performance relative to other widely used tools, particularly those from the Washington Group (see http://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/washington-group-question-sets/short-set-of-disability-questions/).

The statement in the background section (line 7, page 4) concerning the relation of sedentary behaviour and "hypokenetic diseases" is glib and vague. It should either be deleted or expanded
and clarified. If the latter it is particularly important to justify the assertion that such an association exists; the fact that it is plausible is insufficient justification. In addition, the authors must clarify what "hypokinetic diseases" they refer to, at least with a few examples. These might include hypothyroidism, depression, and some neurological diseases, but as written at present one is uncertain what diseases the authors are referring to.
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