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Author’s response to reviews:

Authors response to reviewers and editor.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit a revised version of our manuscript (SSMR-D-19-00022), entitled “Longitudinal changes in body composition and waist circumference by self-reported levels of physical activity in leisure among adolescents: The Tromsø Study, Fit Futures».

We thank both reviewers and the editor for their valuable comments and suggestions. Below you will find our point-by-point response, and in the submitted manuscript you can see the tracked changes.

We hope you will find the revised manuscript satisfactory, and look forward to your reply.

In the meantime,
Response to reviewer 2:

- Reviewer writes: “The authors have responded well to the majority of my comments. However, I think the manuscript requires a further minor revision. The authors have now adjusted for study specialisation and consider that this adjusts for some of the variance in socioeconomic status. Do the authors have any evidence to support this statement? I think at the very least the lack of socioeconomic measures adjusted for in analyses should be included as a limitation, but that this was mitigated by the inclusion of study specialisation (with associated references).”

- We acknowledge this limitation, as parental occupation or level of education is a preferred indicator of socioeconomic status. However, there is some evidence to suggest that study specialisation is correlated with level of parental education, and therefore may be used as a proxy measure of socioeconomic status. The limitation of lack of adjustment for socioeconomic status, together with the evidence supporting inclusion of study specialisation, is now included on page 16, lines 1-5.