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Please find attached the re-revised manuscript, “Early childhood risk and resilience factors for behavioural and emotional problems in middle childhood”, which we have modified to address the points raised by the reviewers and the editor of BMC Pediatrics. We again found the suggestions provided to be valuable in improving the manuscript.

Point-by-point responses to the requested revisions from the reviewer and editor are provided below.

We are very pleased that the manuscript has received conditional acceptance and hope that the changes incorporated into this version of the manuscript are sufficient to allow for publication in BMC Pediatrics. My co-authors and I thank you again for your work in reviewing and processing the manuscript.

Sincerely,

Jason Cabaj, MD, MSc
Public Health and Preventive Medicine
University of Calgary
Responses to the comments of Reviewer #1

N/A

Responses to the comments of Reviewer #2

1. The authors have addressed all my comments satisfactorily with one exception. The abstract still suggests that the authors are reporting a prevalence of behaviour problems. The second clause of the first sentence of results should be changed to read ‘29.5% and 25.6% respectively of children were found to have internalising and externalising behaviour problem scores in the lowest quintile of the distribution on the NSCLY Child Behaviour Scales’ or something similar. Apart from this minor issue the paper is now suitable for publication.

Response: Thank you for pointing out this issue. The text in the abstract has been modified according to the reviewer’s suggestion.

Responses to the comments of Reviewer #3

1. I am happy that the authors have taken account of my comments - I would have liked some discussion about the unexpected sex differences but as this was a minor comment acknowledgement that this is unusual is sufficient.

Response: The author’s thank the reviewer for all the prior suggestions for improvement. We are glad our changes addressed them adequately.

Responses to the comments from the editor

1. Please state clearly your research hypotheses.

Response: Thank you. A statement of study hypothesis has been added to the concluding paragraph of the background section

2. Please supply the psychometric properties (reliability, validity) of your questionnaire measures.

Response: Thank you for the comment. We have added relevant text to the methods section to address this point.

3. Please add a separate section of "Measures" and put all your predictor and outcome measures in this section.

Response: Thank you as well for raising this point. After the study authors had a thorough discussion about how to address the issue, we concluded that our current description of study variables details the measures used in the present study. We have provided a further introduction statement for the variables section about how the variables were collected.

4. Please follow APA format for the tables.

Response: Thank you for the comment. The tables in the manuscript have been modified to follow style guide for Tables in the ‘BMC-series medical journals – authors’ checklist for manuscript formatting’. We hope they are satisfactory.