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Reviewer's report:

The authors have improved on their description of the diagnostic procedure.

Major compulsory revisions:

But one thing appears not to have changed. In the results section under the heading "Childhood precursors of convictions for delinquency", the authors state that:

"Because the MRO variable represented overlapping constructs with the overall MR variable, it was not included in the equation."

But in table 2 I find a "ns" indicating that the variable has been included, but was found not to be significantly associated with crime. This makes me wonder what was really done, and I need a consistent answer to that question in order to be able to make the final decision concerning this manuscript.

Also, I am not entirely happy with the selection of variables for a regression analysis based on statistical significance of the univariate relationships. I will accept it, but with reservations. The reason being that selecting variables that are significant is capitalizing on chance. This is, however, not actually the case in relation to the two most important research questions which are concerning ADHD/CD and emotional disorder/CD, but it is in relation to the other variables in the study.

The study will be much more convincing, if all the variables that were originally intended to be included in the study were included in the final regression model, but excluding MRO for conceptual reasons. To keep the number of variables down, you may also omit "residual disorders", which is basically not feasible as a variable.

Minor essential revisions:

CGAS: Please write out in full when first mentioned

Discretionary revisions:

Consider revising the title to reflect your focus on ADHD and conduct disorder. I think including these two in the title will attract more readers.
Consider revising the research questions to be stated as 2 hypotheses and an exploratory research question. I think the research questions are in fact hypotheses and that their scientific rigor is downplayed too much when they are stated as exploratory questions.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.