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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Prof. Raffy Mar Gella:

Thanks a lot for those comments on my paper (MS: 1510778420918727). I revised my paper as the reviewers advised and submitted the revised manuscript. Now, I would like to give a point-by-point response to the comments.

Answer to Reviewer's comments:

Reviewer: 1

Q1. How was the SES defined and measured?

Answer: Thank you very much for your advice. I have added the information in the method section (page 8, line 12-15). If you think it was not enough, I will look forward to your further advice.

Q2. I thank the authors for providing their explanation as to why Cronbach’s alpha for Internalizing scale and Externalizing scale were in ranges. However, it is still unclear to me why the alphas are in ranges, unless the authors are referring to the alphas for the multiple subscales that are subsumed under Internalizing scale or Externalizing scale. If this is the case, then it makes perfect sense for the alphas to be in ranges.

Answer: Thanks a lot for this great advice. I have changed the information in the method section (page 9, line 15-16; page 10, line 2). If you think it was not enough, I am looking forward to your further advice.

Q3. The authors’ response to Q5 should be incorporated in the manuscript. Please also specific which subscale in the FES has the low Cronbach’s alpha (0.42).

Answer: Thanks a lot for this great advice. I have added the information in the method section (page 11, line 12-14). If you think it was not enough, I am looking forward to your further advice.
Q4. The authors’ response to Q6 (b) regarding the categorization of age should also be added in the manuscript.

Answer#Thanks a lot for this great advice. I have added the information in the method section (page10, line6-8). If you think it was not enough, I am looking forward to your further advice.

Q5. In the Results section, the authors reported that “Gender only had a low but significant difference on total problems …” Please be more specific here. It would be helpful for the readers to know the directionality of this finding, i.e., boys > girls or girls > boys. Also, consider revise the sentence to something like “Gender only had a small but significant effect on …. ”

Answer#Thanks a lot for this great advice. I have added the information in the result section (page13, line10-11). If you think it was not enough, I am looking forward to your further advice.

Q6. In their response to Q8, the authors stated that “The regression analysis was respective, and multiple ones (with one IV at a time) were conducted.” However, in the manuscript, page 11, line 17, the authors wrote that “All variables ….. were entered into the model.” This sounds like only one regression was conducted for each DV, with all the IVs entered in the regression model at once. Please clarify and rephrase the sentence accordingly.

Answer#Thanks very much for your careful guidance but I think I misunderstood your meaning in the last time. In this study only one regression analysis (with all IVs) for each DV were conducted and there were totally three regression analysis performed respectively. I am sorry to make you confused and if you have any more questions, I am looking forward to your further advice.

Q7. A stronger justification needs to be provided as to why multiple regressions (with one IV at a time), instead of one regression for each outcome (with all IVs), were conducted. If multiple regressions were conducted, please also justify why corrections for multiple comparisons were not used. As I pointed out in my previous review, if separate regression analysis was conducted for each outcome and each IV, this involves testing more than 30 regression models. Thus family-wise error rate needs to be controlled. Say, if the authors tested 20 models, the p value could be adjusted by dividing 0.05 (p value) by 20 (the number of tests conducted). 0.05/20 = 0.025, and this would be the adjusted p value (instead of p = .05) that the authors would use when evaluate whether a finding survives the level of statistical significance.

Answer# Thanks very much for your careful guidance but I think I misunderstood your meaning in the last time. In this study only one regression analysis (with all IVs) for each DV were conducted and there were totally three regression analysis performed respectively. I am sorry to make you confused and if you have any more questions, I am looking forward to your further advice.

Q8. Table 4, specify the significance level.

Answer#Thanks a lot for this great advice. I have added the significance level in Table 4. If you think it was not enough, I am looking forward to your further advice.
Q1. Although the authors have tried to improve the English in the manuscript, there are still many awkward and confusing sentences as well as lots of minor grammatical errors. If the manuscript is accepted, the copy editor or someone else will need to provide significant writing assistance to get the paper in shape for publication.

Answer# I will carefully proofread the whole manuscript and edit and re-word it about the whole problems and language usage at a later stage in the revision process. I will also seek help for copy editor or someone else to improve the readability of my paper. I really appreciate your guidance and careful advice.

Q2. The authors have still not consistently capitalized the names of the instruments (e.g., Child Behavior Checklist), as well as the names of all the scales (e.g., Internalizing), although this was requested in my previous review.

Answer# I am sorry for the careless work in my previous revise. I carefully read the full manuscript and changed my expression according to your suggestion. If you think it was not enough, please kindly let me know.

Q3. The content of the underlined sentence on p. 4 about the Chinese findings from the 25-society comparison is more or less correct but the sentence is very confusing. It should be broken into three sentences, as follows: “Rescorla et al.’s (2013) report of CBCL-YSR cross-informant agreement findings in 25 societies included a large Chinese sample, drawn from Wang et al. (2005). As reported by Rescorla et al., the mean cross-informant r averaged across 17 scales was .46 for China. Wang had previously reported correlations ranging from .35-.60 for the same sample (plus 400 dyads excluded from the Rescorla et al. study due to selection criteria).”

Answer# Thanks a lot for this great advice. I have changed my expression in the instruction section (page 4, line 13-18). If you think it was not enough, I am looking forward to your further advice.

Q4. On p. 8, the wording for the 3-level Likert scale for the CBCL and YSR is incorrect. It should read “not true (as far as you know), somewhat or sometimes true, very true or often true.”

Answer# Thanks a lot for this great advice. I have changed my expression in the method section (page 9, line 6-7). If you think it was not enough, I am looking forward to your further advice.

Q5. There is no need to compute Cronbach’s alphas for age subgroups. The authors should report a single alpha for each scale used based on the full sample.

Answer# Thanks a lot for this great advice. I have changed the information in the method section (page 9, line 15-16; page 10, line 2). If you think it was not enough, I am looking forward to your further advice.

Q6. The CBCL and YSR each have 120 items, not 112 (p. 9). On the YSR, 14 of the 120 items tap positive qualities.
Answer#Thanks a lot for this great advice. I have changed the information in the method section (page9, line5,18). If you think it was not enough, I am looking forward to your further advice.

Q7. pp. 12-13. It is not clear from the text how the regressions were done. It seems that predictors significant at $p < .25$ were retained for a multiple regression with all the significant predictors at once, but this is not stated. I think the authors should use $p < .05$ to decide which predictors to retain. Regression results should also include percent of variance accounted for by each predictor.

Answer#Thanks a lot for this great comment. In this study we wanted as more as possible factors to enter into multiple-factor analysis aiming at reducing false negative results. Therefore we changed the standard of $P$ value from $<0.05$ to $<0.25$ to make more factors in univariate analysis be able to enter into linear regression analysis. Previous studies also used it in the statistics [e.g., Sun W, et al. 2007]. I have added the percent of variance in the result section (page13, line14-16). If the explanation is not sufficient, we will be greatly appreciated for your further advices.

Q8. On p. 14, the authors need to cite Rescorla et al. (2012) as the source for the idea that Catholic and/or Confucian traditions might promote familism and hence greater parent-adolescent agreement. In general, the authors should re-structure p. 14-15 to provide a more organized and articulated discussion that addresses why their sample might have high higher levels of agreement. They should set up this discussion by saying “There are numerous reasons why parent-adolescent agreement might have been higher in our Chinese sample than in many previous samples, as outlined below.” Then, each reason should have its own paragraph and each paragraph should start something like “A second reason...”.

Answer#Thanks a lot for your import advice. I have added some information and re-structure the content according to your suggestion in the discussion section (page14, line5-7, 15, 17). If you think it was not enough, I will look forward to your further advice.

Q9. On p. 16, the authors should note that ESs were small for both age and gender.

Answer#Thank you very much for this great comment. I have added some information about your suggestion in the discussion section (page16, line13). If you think it was not enough, I am looking forward to your further advice.

Q10. On p. 17, the authors should highlight more that the Cohesion and Organization scores were higher and Conflict scores were lower in their sample than in Western samples and these were the best correlates of discrepancy and then discuss the implications of these findings.

Answer#Thank you very much for this great comment. I have added some information according to your opinion in the discussion section (page18, line1-9). If you think it was not enough, I am looking forward to your further advice.

Q11. On p. 17, the authors should not suggest that adding teachers’ reports would show who is “correct.”
Thanks a lot for this advice. I have deleted the related information according to your suggestion. If you think it is not enough, please kindly let me know.

These changes are made with considering reviewers’ comments. If the change is not sufficient, we are looking forward for further advices!

I will carefully proofread the whole manuscript and edit and re-word it about the whole problems and about language usage to improve the readability of my paper at the last stage in the revision process. I really appreciate your guidance and help for me.

Thanks in advance!

Best wishes,
Sincerely
Jiana Wang, Lie Wang