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Reviewer's report:

Authors identified the risk factors for child/adolescent mental health problems (CAMHP) in developing countries by an epidemiological study. They report the influence of aggravation of child physical punishment and aggravation of maternal anxiety/depression in the aggravation of CAMHP. This study has merits in focusing on the relation between trajectory of child severe physical punishment and the aggravation of CAMHP. However, this study suffers from the lack of some important data.

Major compulsory Revisions
1. Multivariate analysis showed the possibility that aggravation of maternal anxiety/depression might be a risk factor, but it was not significantly related with CAMHP if p<.05 was regarded as denoting statistical significance.
2. Authors identified the trajectory of child severe physical punishment as a risk factor for CAMHP, but they didn’t explore correlations between severity of child severe physical punishment and CAMHP at Time 2. The correlation between variables (child/adolescent exposure to severe physical punishment, mother exposure to severe physical marital violence, maternal anxiety/depression) and CAMHP should be clarified.
3. The outcome in this study is CAMHP accessed by Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL/6-18). CAMHP can involve both internalizing and externalizing problems. Author should show the profile of CAMHP and analyze the relation between subscales and variables.
4. In the background the review of previous similar studies is not enough. What has been clarified so far in previous studies and what has not been clarified yet should be described.
5. There are not sufficient descriptions about the method of sampling. Surely they have been described in the previous report, but they should be described here again because of their importance.
6. The information of scoring is not sufficient for some scales.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. in the “Design and procedures”, “30,6%” should be changed to “30.6%”.

Discretionary Revisions
1. The conclusion should be summarized more compactly. I think that almost contents authors showed should be shown in the discussion.

2. I think that the limitation of this study had better be described backward in the discussion and the strength had better be described at first.
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