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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear editors,

Many thanks for the comments provided by two reviewers. According to their suggestions, we revised the paper point by point. Additionally, we have invited a native to have the language editing again.

Best wishes
Jing Hua, Zhe Mu, Bright I. Nwaru, Guixiong Gu, WeiMeng, Zhuochun Wu

Reviewer's report
Title: Child neglect in one-child family from Suzhou City of Mainland China
Version: 7  Date: 5 December 2013
Reviewer: Diane L Putnick
Reviewer's report:
Review of BMC International Health & Human Rights manuscript “Child neglect in one-child families from Suzhou City of Mainland China.”
The revised manuscript is much improved. All major essential revisions have been made and there’s just one point of clarification left to address.
Minor Essential Revisions:
1. In the description of emotional neglect, one example item states, “scold and bit the child before others.” I believe that should that be scold and HIT the child?
RESPONSE: Many thanks for finding this error. We have changed the word “bit” into “hit”.

Discretionary Revisions:
1. There are still a few grammatical anomalies, but none that interfere with the paper’s messages.
RESPONSE: Many thanks for the review’s comments. A grammatical check has been conducted by a native again.

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.

Title: Child neglect in one-child family from Suzhou City of Mainland China
Version: 7  Date: 14 January 2014
Reviewer: Lil Tonmyr
Reviewer’s report:
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes for the most parts, however, it is unclear why the authors hypothesized
   that there would be higher level of emotional neglect in this analysis.
   RESPONSE: Many thanks for the reviewer’s suggestions. We have added the
   explanation why we hypothesized that there would be higher level of emotional
   neglect in Chinese one-child families in the fourth paragraph of the introduction.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data
   deposition?
   Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately
   supported by the data?
   Yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building,
   both published and unpublished?
   Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   The abstract is generally fine. However I would remove “The 4-2-1” or explain
   it. I don’t know that most readers would understand what it means.
   RESPONSE: Many thanks for the review’s suggestion. We have removed the “the
   4-2-1” from the abstract.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   He manuscript still requires some language editing before publication, e.g.,
   Page 3 – lack of validated and culturally appropriate measures…
   RESPONSE: We have changed the sentence into “…the lack of appropriate validated
   instruments…”.

   Page 3 – semi-structured interviews…
   RESPONSE: We have changed “semi-structure” into “focused (semi-structured)
   interviews”.

   Page 5 – those reported in other studies…
   RESPONSE: We have revised the sentence.
Page 6 – open the envelope after it was returned
RESPONSE: We have revised the sentence.

Page 7 – please remove the Scale of Child Neglect in Urban China, it has already been introduced. The short form would suffice.
RESPONSE: We have changed it into short form.

Page 8 – Scolded and bit…
Scolded and hit
RESPONSE: We have changed the word “bit” into “hit”.

Page 8 – Change severer to more severe.
RESPONSE: We have changed “severer” to “more severe”.

Page 9 – semi-structured…
RESPONSE: We have changed the “semi-structure” into “semi-structured interviews.”

Page 11 – change supervision to supervisory
RESPONSE: We have checked the paper changed “supervision” into “supervisory”.

Page 12 and 15 – removes on neglect.
RESPONSE: We have revised it according to the comment.

Page 14 education neglect to educational neglect, please review sentence since it’s incomplete.
RESPONSE: We have changed it into educational neglect and revised the incomplete sentence.

The reference list also needs attention; the format varies for the various references. Furthermore, as noted in earlier reviews of this manuscript, reference 31 should be updated with a newer reference since it is updated yearly.
RESPONSE: We have checked and revised the format of the references. Reference 31 has been updated with a newer reference.

Still need direction of neglect correlates (page 4) as it is written now one does not know if the risk increases for boys or girls etc. See also page 13, I assume you mean low parental education, young maternal age etc.
RESPONSE: Thanks for review’s suggestion. We have clarified the direction of neglect correlates in the third paragraph of introduction according to the comment (see page 4).

The authors mention that the one child policy is unique initiative globally;
however a similar policy exists in Vietnam (Page 4).
RESPONSE: Thanks for review’s comment. Vietnam has maintained a population policy over the last 50 years. The two-child policy and one-or-two policy has been implemented in the nation in different periods. However, China’s population policy is more rigorous than Vietnam’s which allow the families to have only one child. Therefore, we change the sentence “one child policy is unique initiative globally” into “one-child policy in China is almost unique globally”.

Need to change the phrase: We also hoped the unique factors in one child families were associated with child neglect (Page 5).
RESPONSE: We have changed the sentence into “However, unique factors in one-child families associated with child neglect may also exist”.

Please verify translation of electricity in the sentence Teach the child how to protect against fire, electricity and gas.
RESPONSE: We have changed the sentence into “Teach the child how to protect against fire, power line and gas”.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
As requested earlier please explain method for linking records, was probabilistic matching used?
RESPONSE: Many thanks for the reviewer’s comments. The similar problem the reviewer has mentioned in previous comments (“The attachment that was mentioned in previous version of the manuscript and in this version was not available to me. More importantly there is no mention on how data linkage was conducted.”). However, I am so sorry that I could not understand completely this point. I did not attach the linking data to the original manuscript or to the revised one. I may misunderstand the point, if possible, would the review like giving me an explanation of this problem.