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Reviewer's report:

1. In this second-look review, I have no further major compulsory revisions after carefully reviewing the authors responses to reviewers #1 and #2.

2. I do have a minor essential revision on page 6: I recognize that your definition of "screening" was provided by the AAP but I wish that you would have included the word "brief" so it read... "the use of brief standardized tools..." Lengthy developmental-behavioral instruments that take over 30 minutes to complete, in my humble opinion, do NOT meet the definition of a screening tool.

3. I also had a discretionary revision for you to consider = For your definition of surveillance (which yes, I know comes from 2006 DS&S AAP statement), I request that you somehow succinctly mention that some screening experts consider periodic screening to be a form of "structured surveillance". This notion that the definition of surveillance = the process of recognizing developmental-behavioral problems "without the use of a standardized screen" is considered by some to be an oversimplified and antiquated concept. Please refer to "Enhancing the algorithm for developmental-behavioral surveillance and screening in children 0 to 5 years", Clinical Pediatrics, 2011.

Minor essential revision in the discussion section, page 18: I wish you could have discussed why 348 "(24.9%) were identified with developmental delays through screening, but only 251 (65.4%) of those children were referred to Early Intervention." Why do you think that 97 children with a concerning ASQ-2 or M-CHAT were not referred to EI by the pediatric provider? Maybe you should state that further study is needed on why a pediatric provider's unstructured surveillance or clinical judgement overrode the concerning results of the ASQ-2 or M-CHAT.

Overall, I felt that the authors addressed the reviewer's main concerns and when they choose to not make changes, they provided good reasons for their decisions. I suppose my biggest concern about this manuscript is its length, which may prevent some readers from reading it in its entirety. I'd suggest reducing redundancy and keeping this manuscript less verbose.
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