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Reviewer’s report:

As written in the previous report the paper is an interesting and useful paper. It is clear and well written. An important discussion of the validity of the CP diagnoses in the Swedish Hospital Discharge Register has been added and the paper does not need further major revision.

According to the authors all suggested minor revisions from the last review (except one about SES categories) should have been made, however I cannot see this is done or commented on, for the suggestions listed below.

Minor essential revision
1. Page 7, line 8-11
This sentence does not make sense, it has three parentheses and maybe some words are missing.

2. Table 4. Model 6 is not marked with an * to include demographic confounders, but in the text is described so.

Discretionary revision
3. Page 2, line 9
Census of 1985 needs to be explained in the abstract (is already done page 5) or it could be replaced by a more general term like “Swedish national registers”.

4. Page 5, line 11
A more precise definition of geographic location of home (as used in table 1) would be informative here.

5. Page 5, line 11-20
It is unclear why it is reported that perinatal variables were “added to the dataset”. The dataset seem to be in fact the SMBR (birthyear 1987-1993), which was then linked to the Swedish Population and Housing Census in November 1985, The Total Enumeration Income Survey for 1990 and to the Swedish Register of Education of 1990. Maybe this could be rephrased.

6. Page 6, line 12-14
A description of what discharge from hospital includes would be informative. For example whether outpatient clinics are included.

In conclusion:
1. The question posed is well defined and relevant
2. The method is well described and appropriate
3. Data are sound and well controlled
4. Discussion and conclusion are relevant and supported by the data
5. Title and abstract reflects the findings
6. The paper is well written

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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