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Reviewer’s report:

I thank the authors for the opportunity to read the revised manuscript. I appreciate the authors’ effort in preparing a responsive letter to address the reviewers’ comments. However, there are still some minor issues that I wish the authors could clarify and address.

1. How was the SES defined and measured?

2. 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.

3. 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).

4. The authors’ response to Q6 (b) regarding the categorization of age should also be added in the manuscript.

5. 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 ….”

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. Table 4, specify the significance level.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**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.