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Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

This paper is an order of magnitude better than the original submission as the authors have worked hard and well to improve it. The only suggestions I'd make at this stage are:

i) discussion under self-rated health dichotomization is still unclear "However, among adolescents the occurrence of "fairly good" and "bad" rating is rare, and so the cut-off point has been moved in this study". MOVED TO WHERE? Need to be clearer about this. Also, not clear where psychological well being scale was dichotomized??

Also, table titles are not clear. For example, Table 2 "% of ill health (moderate self-rated health), psychological well being, long term well being, self esteem etc etc. Need to be clearer that the table is showing the Worse end of the dichotomized scale for each of these four measures. So, the title might read for example, "Percentage of adolescents with poor health, poor psychological well being, poor long-term well being and low self-esteem by gender and country".

Final comment: The conclusions, both in the abstract and in the text, are more like justification than conclusion. Need to have 2 clear sentences saying what the conclusions of the study are.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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