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Reviewer's report:

Review of “Agreement between parents and adolescents on emotional and behavioral problems and its associated factors among Chinese school adolescents: a cross-sectional study. Rev. 2”

The authors have made additional revisions and improvements to their manuscript and most of my previous comments have been addressed. My remaining comments and suggestions, which are generally minor, are detailed below.

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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).”

4. 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.”

5. 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.

6. The CBCL and YSR each have 120 items, not 112 (p. 9). On the YSR, 14 of the 120 items tap positive qualities.
7. 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.

8. 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…”.

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

10. 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.

11. On p. 17, the authors should not suggest that adding teachers’ reports would show who is “correct.”

Overall, I still think that this study has the potential to be a good addition to the literature on parent-adolescent agreement. However, I would like to see the issues detailed above addressed.

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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